

УДК 902(470)"880/999"

Шинаков Е.А., доктор исторических наук, профессор, Брянский государственный университет имени академика И.Г. Петровского (Россия);

Федосов А.В., старший преподаватель, Брянский государственный университет имени академика И.Г. Петровского (Россия).

АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ПРИЗНАКИ КРИЗИСНЫХ СИТУАЦИЙ НА РУСИ IX – X ВВ. В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ УКРАИНСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ¹

В статье говорится о кризисных ситуациях на Юге Руси, которым посвящены работы украинских археологов и историков последних десятилетий. Таких ситуаций, нашедших отражение как в археолого-нумизматических материалах, так и в современной украинской историографии, было четыре. Это: 1) события середины IX в., отразившиеся в гибели нескольких раннероменских (волынцевских) городищ (Битица и др.), либо в результате междоусобий в Хазарском каганате, либо вторжении венгров, либо норманнов; 2) конца IX в., отраженные в кладях и связанные с присоединением Олегом южной части восточнославянских земель к Руси; 3) середины X в., отразившиеся в смене денежно-весовой системы на Юго-Востоке Руси и связанные с отделением от нее земель северян, вятичей, части радимичей после древлянского восстания и гибели князя Игоря; 4) конца X в. – начала XI в. (гибель части роменских городищ, клады, отразившиеся в погребальном обряде и инвентаре гибель части военизированного населения и этносоциальные трансформации), т.е. присоединение всех южно-восточнославянских «племен» к Руси при Владимире Святом и связанные с этим изменения. Украинская историография содержит наиболее интересные материалы и идеи по первому и четвертому периодам, о втором почти не говорится, третий представлен, но гораздо слабее, чем в синхростадиальной российской историографии.

Ключевые слова: археология, историография, Древняя Русь, украинская историография Древней Руси, конфликты и войны.

DOI: 10.22281/2413-9912-2023-07-03-137-142

The Ukrainian historiography of the late Soviet and early post-Soviet periods paid little attention to the archaeological evidence of the conflicts of the ninth and tenth centuries in Rus'. This can be explained by the fact that archaeologists, who had full information, rarely rose to the level of general historical generalizations, and historians "condescended" to the material sources. Nevertheless, in several cases attempts to combine them with the facts of internal and external political and military history of Rus' did occur, but only for its southern half (which, however, is natural). The historiography reflects the conflict situations of four periods - the first third of the ninth century; the end of the ninth century; the middle of the tenth century; the end of the tenth century. One or several most studied archaeological monuments are associated with each of these periods.

It should be noted that the most complete and correct archaeological sources for socio-political reconstructions were used by A.V. Tymoschyuk. However, he can be considered a

Ukrainian (specifically - Bukovinian) scientist only by the place of the beginning of his scientific, archaeological mainly, activity, because his conceptual in this aspect works he created already being a Moscow scientist. On the other hand, Chernigov scientist, who was also an archaeologist originally, Yu.Yu. Shevchenko since the second half of the 1990s became a "Petersburgian" scholar. However, his conceptual archaeological-historical works were published earlier, and he falls under the subject of the article.

A total of over a dozen Ukrainian academic works, ranging from non-graduate, formally regional, to academicians of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, were used in its preparation.

The conflict situations under study are the following:

1. The "civil war" in the Khazar Khaganate in the first third of the ninth century, which also affected its Slavic regions. In particular, in the first place, it is the ancient settlement of Bititskoye, the Volintsevo part of which perished

¹ Research work was carried out within the framework of the grant of Russian Science Foundation №3 -28 -00281 "Ukrainian historiography of Ancient Rus' at the end of twentieth - the beginning of the twenty first centuries: concepts, sources, trends".

© **Shinakov E.A.**

© **Fedosov A.V.**

in fires “most likely in the early ninth century” (Priymak 1994. S.15). The Ukrainian researcher D.T. Berezovets defined it as “a strong point of the Khazar domination over the Slavic territory” (Berezovets 1965. S.55 - 56), and the Kiev archaeologist of Bryansk background O.V. Sukhobokov and his colleagues considered it “as one of the strong points on an important route from the Khazaria to the Baltics and Scandinavia” (Sukhobokov, Voznesenskaya and Priymak 1989. S.104). There is no answer about who exactly destroyed this point, but the Sumy archaeologist V.V. Priymak at least mentions during which events it happened - during the interne-cine war in the Khazar Khaganate (Priymak 1994. S.15).

O.V. Sukhobokov, without specifying the reasons for the destruction of the settlement, recognizes the fact of burning of its Volintsevo (“Khazar”) part fortifications, but implicitly earlier than V.V. Primak, namely at the end of the eighth century (Sukhobokov 1992. S.74-75), when the “civil war” in the Khaganate had not yet begun. The Oposhnya settlement supposedly confirmed the latter dating, as its fortifications, according to O.V. Sukhobokov, were also destroyed by the fire “not later than the second half of the eighth century” (Sukhobokov 1992. S. 137). However, its substantiation, based on a combination of the moulded Romny and circular Volintsevo pottery, is not indisputable. At the same time both the Bititsk and Oposhnya sites are the result of the activity of the Khazar Khaganate in the Slavic lands, and the latter entered the territory no earlier than the mid- eighth century. And these strongholds of the Khazar power, judging by the thickness of the cultural layer and the number of objects, existed for at least several decades. And written sources do not note any conflicts in the course of which these two powerful fortresses could be taken in the second half of the eighth century. However, according to the opinion of the Kiev researcher O.V. Komar, the decline of the Bititskoe settlement at the end of the eighth century can possibly be connected with “the first stage of the Normans’ penetration to the Desna river basin” (Komar 2003. S.103 - 104).

2. The conflict-ridden events of the late ninth and early tenth centuries, associated with the unification and conquest activities of Oleg the Wise, the movement of the Hungarians from the

Black Sea to Transylvania and Pannonia under pressure from the Pechenegs and the appearance of the latter on the borders of Rus’ are very poorly reflected in the modern Ukrainian historiography. The construction of the fortifications of the Vypolzovskoe (Vypovzivskoe) settlement on the Desna between Kyiv and Chernigiv is attributed by the researchers of Kiev and Chernigov to 883-885, linking their construction to the preparation of Oleg the Wise’s campaigns against “the Drevlyans, Seevrians and Radimichs” (Motsya, Sytiy, Skorokhod 2014. S. 36).

The Bukovinian archeologist I. Voznyi noted the destruction of a number of settlements of the Tivertsi at the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries, which were later restored. He connects it with Oleg’s policy to subdue the Tivertsi in 885, who “in alliance with the Ulichs managed to defend their political independence” (Voznyi 2009. S. 464). O.V. Sukhobokov, following M.P. Kuchera, notes the termination of existence of only 3 of 90 settlements of the Severians’ Romny culture at the end of ninth century, and this is associated not with Oleg’s activity, but with the arising of the Pecheneg threat (Sukhobokov 2012. S. 270, 276). Ukrainian researchers obtained new information about the cause of destruction of the Novotroitskoe settlement on the Psyol River, which was almost completely explored by the Leningrad expedition of I.I. Lyapushkin in 1958-1960. On the territory free from buildings Hungarian burials were found, connected, according to their researcher V.V. Priymak, with the time of the settlement fall in the late ninth century (Priymak 2007. S.70-71). Another settlement of the Romny culture, which also perished at the end of the ninth century, but as the result of the Rus’ military activity, is situated in the Korovel stow near the village of Shestovitsa outside Chernigov. A combat camp of the Rus’ was built there (Kovalenko 1999. S.41; Kovalenko, Motsya, Sytiy 2003. S.55-56), as it is considered by the Kievan and Chernigov researchers. Other Chernigov scholars supplement this conclusion: it was from here that the Rus’ conducted campaigns to the Caspian Sea through Khazaria (to which in exchange mercenaries, bodyguards of the Khagan, were delivered) in 912/913 and 943/944. The leader of one of them was HLGW of the Schechter Letter, a Chernigov voivode or prince (Umanets, Shevchenko 1995. S.66).

3. The third period of conflicts in the Southern Rus' is connected with unsuccessful campaign of prince Igor to Byzantium in 941 (in 920, according to the Novgorod Chronicle), his death during the attempt to collect additional tribute from the Drevlians and the subsequent (and partially preceding) disintegration of the Old Russian state. Basically these events were archeologically reflected in the works of the Kiev researcher B.A. Zvizdetsky in 2001-2005. In the capital of the Drevlians Iskorosten', burnt by soldiers of Olga and Asmud in 946, the traces of a big fire were found on the settlement site №1 and an adjacent settlement, whose life ceased in the middle of the tenth century and "the centre was shifted to the area of the town site №3" (Zvizdets'ky, Petrauskas, Pol'guy 2004. S.85-86).

But Iskorosten' was not the only Drevlian town that perished during this conflict. The traces of fire and cessation of life in the middle of the tenth century were also recorded on the Malinsky settlement in the basin of the Teterev River in the Zhitomir region (Zvizdets'ky 1994. S.124). Some burials in the "Iгорева Mogila" tract, including those with Scandinavian warlike equipment, testify who destroyed the fortress №1 in Iskorosten' (Zotsenko 2004. S. 87-88). Academician of the NAS of Ukraine P.P. Tolochko, using mainly the results of excavations by B.A. Zvizdecky, draws attention to the perfection of the fortifications of Iskorosten', which explains his opinion that it was besieged for many months, and to the presence of other fortresses in the Drevlian land, which had to be captured, destroyed and then replaced by "strong points of the Kiev power" (Tolochko 2006. S. 162, 163).

This researcher, nevertheless, on the basis of archaeological materials, emphasizes special importance of destruction of the capital of the Drevlians, which had connections "with Great Moravia, Lesser Poland, the Baltic region and the Arab East" and "as a city was not inferior to Kiev", for "actual dismantling of the Drevlian autonomy" (Tolochko 2014. S.18). At the same time archaeological sources indicate that the main reason for the termination of life on most (15 out of 20) existing Drevlian fortified settlements at the end of the first millennium AD was not directly connected with the military actions of Olga and Asmud, but with the consequences of "administrative and fiscal" reforms of the princess (Zvizdets'ky 2008. S. 97).

However, the events of the mid-tenth century have found archaeological reflection not only in the land of the Drevlians. In the opinion of the already mentioned V.V. Priymak and the member of the Institute of Ethnic studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Yu.A. Pugolovok, during the same period and as a result of Igor's military activity the Novotroitsk fortress of the Severians' Romny culture on the Dnieper Left Bank also ceased to exist (Priymak 2007. S. 61; Pugolovok 2018. S. 221). They argue that the reason for that is finding on the settlement of some earrings of the "Volyn-Ekimauts type" of the first half of the tenth century, which, in their opinion, are a "heritage" of the campaigns against Byzantium, including, most probably, in 944. Even if this is true, the reason for the destruction of the fortress remains unclear, unless the Severians, subjugated by Oleg, rebelled against Igor and he tried to maintain their subjugation.

Regarding the question about a possible reflection of the 940s crisis in the land of the Severians, O.V. Sukhobokov too. However, he denies both the presence of military conflicts there and then, and even more so their archaeological indicators. The existence of the Severians', Vyatichi' and a part of Radimichs' own monetary and weight system, that have found more and more evidences in the recent 20 years, this scientist attributes to the influence of "Alano-Bulgarian bearers of the Saltovo culture" under the aegis of the Khazar Khaganate (Sukhobokov 2012. S. 274, 275). However, O.V. Sukhobokov passed away in 2008, before most of these numismatic works appeared, and he referred only to the earliest work on this subject of one of this article authors (joint with A.V. Grigoriev) and the most significant book of the latter (Shinakov, Grigoriev 1990; Grigoriev 2000). It is possible that O.V. Sukhobokov would have changed his viewpoint by now. As for the impossibility of conflicts, he also cites "external to the Severians" "political factors" as the presence of the Khazarian Khaganate and the "Varangian-Russian upper class of Kiev" (Sukhobokov 2012. p. 271).

Only one Ukrainian author, joining the article of Russian authors about one of the thirty hoards of dirhams cut into a circle, implicitly agrees with such a consequence of the conflict situation of the mid-tenth century as the

emergence of a “separate” monetary-weight system, - V.V. Koloda (Koloda, Lebedev, Eukov 2014). Some Chernigov scholars supplement the numismatic evidence about the events of the 940s with the fact that 4 coin hoards of this time belonged to Sveneld’s more successful “autonomous” retinue. At the same time a special dynasty was formed in Chernigov, related to the Khazar aristocracy through “the Assyian and Savirian princesses”, with whom the burials in Shestovitsy are connected (Novik, Shevchenko 1995.P. 97, 98, 99). The destruction in fire of fortifications of the Vypolzov fortress on the Kievan-Chernigov border in the middle of the tenth century could also be a possible illustration of the Kievan-Chernigov conflict (Mocia, Sytyi, Skorokhod 2014. S.36).

4. The fourth conflict situation connected with Russian state-genesis at the end of the tenth and the beginning of eleventh centuries is recognized and covered to the greatest extent in the Ukrainian historiography. In its course and as a result all East Slavic ethnopotestary formations of the South were finally annexed by Rus’. In the archaeological aspect it is especially well reflected in the materials of the Severian south-east. It is based on the archaeological excavations of the 1970s and later, carried out mainly by Ukrainian researchers. Y.A. Pugolovok, summarizing these materials, mentions seven archaeological complexes, which reflected these conflicts in different degree and character, and about a dozen of authors (including the authors of excavations themselves), who share this viewpoint (Pugolovok 2018. S. 222, 224). However, they are mostly the authors already mentioned in the article, like O.V. Sukhobokov, V.V.

Pryymak, A.P. Motsya, but there are also new names: they are mainly Poltava and Kiev researchers - Osadchy, Suprunenko, Berest, Kulatova, Geiko, Zolotnitskaya, Mironenko.

A forcible annexion to Kiev is marked by the traces of fire, especially on the fortifications; by treasures, both material and monetary; the fact of transfer of the fortified settlement to another place, though in its vicinity, or a change of the settlement type to unfortified; change of the burial pattern at the nearest burial ground, appearance of new warrior burials of the tenth and eleventh centuries, especially with Scandinavian features, and later - foreign burials for that region. Two periods of fires and destruction of the Romny settlements stand out - “after 970s” and between 1015-1019 (Priymak 1999. p.40; Pugolovok 2018. S. 224). The latter period is sometimes and partially compared with the campaign of Prince Boris in 1015 (Priymak 1997. S. 110; Korinny 1992. S. 53-54). Perhaps the only researcher who “blames” not so much the “activities” of Vladimir, as for their cause, namely increased Pecheneg aggression for these archeologically fixed changes and partial desertion of the area of the northern settlements, is O.V. Sukhobokov (2012. S. 276 - 279). But at that time the Russian, but separate Chernigov dynasty was also terminated in a military way: according to one version in 992, during the Chernigov Christianization (the "Chernaya Mogila" belongs to the last prince of the local dynasty) (Umanets, Shevchenko 1995, S. 65), or, by another (based on the Byzantine sources and a share of fantasy), in 1016 (the last prince in this variant was Vladimir’s “brother”, Sfeng) (Novik, Shevchenko 1995. S.100).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF CONFLICTS IN THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES RUS’ IN THE MODERN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY¹.

The article refers to the crisis situations in South Rus’, which are studied in the works of Ukrainian archaeologists and historians in recent decades. There were four such situations, reflected both in the archaeological and numismatic materials, and in modern Ukrainian historiography. These are: 1) the events of the mid-ninth century, reflected in the destruction of several early-Romny (Volyntsevo) settlements (Bititsa etc.), either as a result of feuds in the Khazar Khaganate, or invasions of the Hungarians, or Normans; 2) the late ninth century, reflected in hoards and connected with the joining of the southern part of the East Slavic lands to Rus’ by Oleg; 3) the mid-tenth century, reflected in the change of the monetary and weight system in Southeastern Rus’ and associated with the separation of the Severians’, Vyatichi’s and part of Radimichs’ lands after the Drevlians’ rebellion and Prince Igor’s death; 4) the end of the ninth century and the beginning of the eleventh century (the demise of some Romny sites, hoards, reflected in the funeral rites and inventories death of a part of the paramilitary population and ethno-social transformations), that is joining of all the South-Eastern

¹ Research work was carried out within the framework of the grant of Russian Science Foundation №3 -28 -00281 "Ukrainian historiography of Ancient Rus' at the end of twentieth - the beginning of the twenty first centuries: concepts, sources, trends".

Slavic “tribes” to Rus’ under Vladimir the Holy and the changes connected with it. Ukrainian historiography holds the most interesting materials and ideas on the first and fourth periods, the second is almost not mentioned, the third is presented, but much weaker than in the synchronostadial Russian historiography.

Keywords: archaeology, historiography, Ancient Rus’, Ukrainian historiography of Ancient Rus’, conflicts and warfare.

References

1. Berezovets D.T. Slavs and tribes of the Saltov culture // *Arheologiya*. 1965. Vyp.19. S. 55-56. (In Ukrainian)
2. Vozny I. Historical and Cultural Development of the Population of the Upper Siret and Middle Dniester Interfluvium in the X - XIV Centuries. Part 2. Material, spiritual culture and socio-historical development. Kyiv-Chernivtsi, 2009. (In Ukrainian)
3. Grigoriev A.V. The Severian land in VIII - the beginning of XI century according to archaeological data. Proceedings of the Tula archaeological expedition. Vol. 2 Tula, 2000. (In Russian)
4. Zvizdets’ky B.A. Malynske settlement of the Drevlyans // *Antiquities of Russia-Ukraine*. Ed. by P.P. Tolochko. Kyiv: Kyiv Academy of Eurobusiness, 1994. S.119 - 125. (In Ukrainian)
5. Zvizdets’ky B.A., Petrauskas A.V., Pol’guy V.I. New studies of ancient Iskorosten // *Ancient Iskorosten and Slavic Cities of the VIII-X centuries*. Chief ed. O.P. Motsya. Kyiv, 2004. S.51 - 86. (In Ukrainian)
6. Zvizdets’ky B.A. Settlements of the IX-XIII centuries on the territory of the chronicle Drevlyans. Ed. O.P. Motsya. Kyiv, 2008. (In Ukrainian)
7. Zotsenko V.M. Scandinavian artifacts of South-Western Russia // *Antiquities of Russia-Ukraine*. Ed. by P.P. Tolochko. Kyiv: Kyiv Academy of Eurobusiness, 1994. S.87 -105. (In Ukrainian)
8. Kovalenko V.P. New researches of Shestovytsky archaeological complex // *Archaeological chronicle of the Left Bank of Ukraine*. Issue 1. 1999. Ed. by O. Suprunenko. Poltava, 1999. S.33 - 43. (In Ukrainian)
9. Kovalenko V., Motsya O., Sytyy Yu. Archaeological research of the Shestovytskyi complex in 1998-2002 // *Antiquities of Central and Eastern Europe of the VIII-X centuries: materials of the International field seminar, 17-20 July 2003*. Ed. by P.P. Tolochko. Chernihiv: Severyanska Dumka, 2003. S.51 - 83. (In Russian)
10. Koloda V.V., Lebedev V.P., Enukov V.V. Bezlyudovo Treasure and Its Place in the Monetary System of the Seversk Land // *Bezlyudovo Treasure, X c. To the 125th Anniversary since the Birth of R.R. Fasmer. Archeology of the Eurasian Steppes*. Vol. 18. Editor-in-chief P.N. Petrov. Kazan, 2014. S. 6 - 160. (In Russian)
11. Komar O.V. On the time and circumstances of the adoption of the title “khakan” by the ruler of the Rus’ // *Retinue antiquities of Central and Eastern Europe of the VIII - X centuries. Materials of the International field archaeological seminar (Chernihiv - Shestovvitsya, 17 - 20 July 2003)*. Ed. by P.P. Tolochko. Chernihiv: Severyanska Dumka, 2003. S. 102-107. (In Ukrainian)
12. Korinny N.N. Pereyaslavl land of X - XIII centuries. Kiev, 1992. (In Russian)
13. Motsya O.P., Sytyy Yu.M., Skorokhod V.M. Vypovzivskyi archaeological complex in the light of new research 2009-2013 // *Cities of Ancient Russia. Collection of scientific papers in memory of A.V. Kuza*. Scientific editor P.P. Tolochko. Kyiv: Ancient World, 2014. S. 26 - 37. (In Ukrainian)
14. Novik T.G., Shevchenko Yu.Yu. Princely Dynasty of Chernigov and Kiev Rurikids // *The Desna Antiquities. Materials of the interstate scientific conference “History and Archaeology of the Podsie region” in memory of F.M. Zavernyaev*. Ed. by E.I. Prokof’iev. Bryansk, 1995. S.96 - 100. (In Russian)
15. Pryimak V.V. Territorial structure of the Middle Desna and Middle Vorskla interfluvium of the VIII - early IX centuries. Sumi, 1994. (In Ukrainian)
16. Pryimak V.V. Formation of the territorial structure of ancient Russian monuments in the north-east of the Left Bank of Ukraine // *Lyubech princes' congress of 1097 in the historical fate of Kyivan Rus’*. Materials of the international historical and archaeological conference dedicated to the 900th anniversary of the Congress of Russian princes in Lyubech. Edited by P.P. Tolochko. Kyiv, 1997. S. 109-114. (In Ukrainian)
17. Pryimak V.V. Some aspects of the history of the Dnieper Left Bank of the X-XI centuries

in the light of studies of chronicle of Lviv // Poltava archaeological collection - 1999 (to the 1100th anniversary of the city of Poltava based on the results of archaeological research). Poltava: Archaeology, 1999. S. 28-43. (In Ukrainian)

18. Pryimak V.V. Putyvl principality of Chernihiv - Sivershchyna. Poltava, 2007. (In Ukrainian)

19. Pugolovok Yu.O. To the question of the inclusion of the south-eastern lands of the Severians in Rus' // Antiquities of the Dnieper Left Bank Region: a collection of scientific works / Edited by I.I. Korost, scientific editor - O.B. Suprunenko. Kyiv-Kotel'va: Central Publishing House of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine and UTOPIC, 2018. S.216 - 228. (In Ukrainian)

20. Sukhobokov O.V. Dnieper Forest-Steppe Left Bank in the VIII-XIII centuries (based on archaeological research in 1968-1989). Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1992. (In Ukrainian)

21. Sukhobokov O.V. "The unknown land": the population of the Middle Psel river basin in the XIII centuries on the materials of the Romny - Old Russian complex in Kamennoye village. Kyiv: IA NAS of Ukraine, 2012. (In Russian)

22. Tolochko P.P. Kiev and Iskorosten' in the middle of the X century // Slavs and Finno-Ugrians. Contact zones and interaction of cultures. Collection of reports from the Russian-Finnish symposium on archeology and history, October 7-10, 2004. Ed. by A.N. Kirpichnikov et al. St Petersburg: Nestor-History, 2004. S.161- 164. (In Russian)

23. Tolochko P.P. Once again about the beginning of the Old Russian state // Collection of scientific works in memory of A.V. Kuza. Scientific editor P.P. Tolochko. Kyiv: Ancient World, 2014. S.11 - 20. (In Russian)

24. Umanets A.N., Shevchenko Yu.Yu. Evolution of Chernigov to the X century in the context of Kievan Rus' statehood // The Desna Antiquities. Proceedings of the interstate scientific conference "History and Archaeology of the Desna region" in memory of F.M. Zavernyaev. Ed. by E. I. Prokof'iev. Bryansk, 1995. S.63 - 66. (In Russian)

25. Shinakov E.A., Grigoriev A.V. On the possibility of statehood on the territory of the Late Romny culture of the X century // Study of historical and cultural heritage of the Romny region: problems and prospects. Ed. by V.B. Zvagal'sky. S.66 - 68. (In Russian)

Об авторах

Шинаков Евгений Александрович - доктор исторических наук, профессор кафедры отечественной истории факультета истории и международных отношений Брянского государственного университета имени академика И.Г. Петровского, email: shinakov@mail.ru

Федосов Андрей Владимирович - старший преподаватель факультета дополнительного образования Брянского государственного университета имени академика И.Г. Петровского, email: fedosov-andrey@yandex.ru

Shinakov Evgeny Aleksandrovich, Doctor of History, Professor of the Department of the Domestic History of the Faculty of History and International Affairs of Bryansk State University after academician I.G. Petrovsky, email: shinakov@mail.ru

Fedosov Andrey Vladimirovich, senior lecturer of the Faculty of Additional education of Bryansk State University after academician I.G. Petrovsky, email: fedosov-andrey@yandex.ru