

УДК 902:336.71(477)«134»

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2307-7778/2026.1.1>

Bohdan BARAN

*Assistant at the Department of History of Ukraine, Archeology and Special Branches of Historical Sciences
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University,
1a Gromnitskogo Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, 46027 (bohdan.baran@tnpu.edu.ua)*

Богдан БАРАН

*асистент кафедри історії України, археології та спеціальних галузей історичних наук
Тернопільського Національного Педагогічного Університету імені Володимира Гнатюка,
вул. Громницького, 1а, м. Тернопіль, Україна, 46027 (bohdan.baran@tnpu.edu.ua)*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8245-0202>

Volodymyr KITSACK

*PhD in History, Associate Professor at the Department of History of Ukraine, Archeology and Special Branches
of Historical Sciences
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University,
1a Gromnitskogo street, Ternopil, Ukraine, 46027 (Kitsak@tnpu.edu.ua)*

Володимир КІЦАК

*доцент кафедри історії України, археології та спеціальних галузей історичних наук
Тернопільського Національного Педагогічного Університету імені Володимира Гнатюка,
вул. Громницького, 1а, м. Тернопіль, Україна, 46027 (Kitsak@tnpu.edu.ua)*

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7180-0588>

SETTLEMENTS AND NECROPOLISES OF THE LEFT BANK OF KIEVAN RUS AS ARCHAEOLOGICAL MARKERS OF PROTO-URBAN FORMATIONS

Abstract. The article examines the problem of urbanization in Kievan Rus and the specifics of settlement structures on the left bank of the Dnieper in the 11th–12th centuries. **The aim of the article** is to identify the causes of the emergence and decline of proto-urban centers (Gochevo, Gornal, Zeleny Gai, Lypove) in the context of international trade. **The research methodology** is based on archaeological, historical-comparative, and typological analysis of materials from fortified settlements, villages, and necropolises, as well as on the study of written sources on trade privileges. **The scientific novelty** lies in establishing that these settlements were proto-cities, whose functioning directly depended on state support for the Bulgar-Kyiv land route. It was found that their heyday in the 11th and first half of the 12th centuries was due to trade agreements during the reign of Vladimir Sviatoslavich, and their decline was caused not by military destruction, but by political destabilization of the route. **The conclusions** state that study found that the left-bank proto-cities constituted a “dead-end” line of urbanization, oriented toward transit capital without stable ties to the rural hinterland. Their demise in the mid-12th century was the result of rivalry between the Volodymyr-Suzdal Principality and Volga Bulgaria. It has been proven that the process of urbanization was nonlinear, and the lack of an internal economic base made such centers vulnerable to changes in the geopolitical situation.

Key words: archaeology, Kievan Rus, settlement structures, proto-cities, Left Bank of the Dnieper, urbanization, trade route, decline of settlements, international trade, 11th–12th centuries.

ГОРОДИЩА ТА НЕКРОПОЛІ ЛІВОБЕРЕЖЖЯ КИЇВСЬКОЇ РУСІ ЯК АРХЕОЛОГІЧНІ МАРКЕРИ ПРОТОМІСЬКИХ УТВОРЕНЬ

Анотація. У статті розглянуто проблему урбанізації Київської Русі та специфіку поселенських структур Дніпровського Лівобережжя XI–XII ст. **Мета статті** – з'ясувати причини виникнення та занепаду протоміських центрів (Гочево, Горналь, Зелений Гай, Липове) у контексті міжнародної

торгівлі. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на археологічному, історико-порівняльному та типологічному аналізі матеріалів городищ, селищ і некрополів, а також на вивченні писемних джерел щодо торговельних привілеїв. **Наукова новизна** полягає у встановленні того, що зазначені поселення були протомістами, функціонування яких безпосередньо залежало від державної підтримки сухопутного шляху Булгар–Київ. Виявлено, що їхній розквіт у XI – першій половині XII ст. був зумовлений торговельними договорами часів Володимира Святославича, а занепад – не військовим знищенням, а політичною дестабілізацією маршруту.

Висновки. У результаті дослідження з'ясовано, що лівобережні протоміста становлять «тупикову» лінію урбанізації, орієнтовану на транзитний капітал без стабільних зв'язків із сільською округою. Їхня загибель у середині XII ст. стала наслідком суперництва між Володимиро-Суздальським князівством та Волзькою Булгарією. Доведено, що процес містоутворення був нелінійним, а відсутність внутрішньої економічної бази робила такі центри вразливими до змін геополітичної кон'юнктури.

Ключові слова: археологія, Київська Русь, поселенські структури, протоміста, Дніпровське Лівобережжя, урбанізація, торговельний шлях, занепад поселень, міжнародна торгівля, XI–XII ст.

Problem statement. Despite considerable attention to the problems of urbanization in Kievan Rus, a number of settlement structures on the left bank of the Dnieper in the 11th–12th centuries remain outside the scope of comprehensive analysis. These are specific complexes of monuments (Gochevo, Gornal, Zeleny Gai, Lypove) which, in terms of their topography and material culture, fall outside the general typology of ancient Russian cities, resembling the early medieval trade and craft centers of Northern Europe. A particular difficulty is the inclusion in scientific discourse of later historiographical reports, which contain unique information about state regulation of trade but require critical verification by archaeological data. The reasons for the emergence and sudden decline of these centers in the mid-12th century remain controversial, especially regarding the role of transit trade and political circumstances.

Purpose of the article. To determine the causes of the emergence and decline of proto-urban centers on the left bank of the Dnieper River in the context of the functioning of the Bulgar-Kyiv land trade route. Based on archaeological materials and written sources, to reconstruct the role of state regulation of trade (in particular, treaties from the time of Volodymyr Sviatoslavych) in the development of these settlements. To prove that their demise was not the result of military aggression, but rather a systemic crisis in transit trade, confirming the existence of “dead-end” lines in the process of Old Rus' urbanization.

Presentation of the main research material. Among the issues that are of keen interest to contemporary medieval studies, one of the foremost is the emergence and development of cities–settlements that are characteristic only of the era of civilization, a phenomenon that to a certain extent was an indicator of its existence. The study of all issues related to urbanization is also relevant for researchers of the history of the Slavs in the Middle Ages, particularly those who lived in Eastern Europe, and more specifically, in the lands of modern Ukraine.

Despite a significant body of research devoted to the urbanization of Kievan Rus, a number of settlement structures on the left bank of the Dnieper in the 11th–12th centuries remain outside the scope of comprehensive analysis. These are specific complexes of monuments (Gochevo, Gornal, Zeleny Gai, Lypove) which, in terms of their topography and material culture, fall outside the general typology of ancient Rus' cities, resembling the early medieval trade and craft centers of Northern Europe. A particular difficulty is the inclusion in scientific discourse of reports from later historiography, which contain unique information about state regulation of trade, but require critical verification by archaeological data.

Today, historical science has made progress in studying various aspects of this multifaceted topic, the list of which would take up most of this work. Therefore, we will only note that recently most researchers have come to the conclusion that there were different paths in the formation of a

particular urban center, which could have arisen on the site of a tribal center, a state fortress, a craft settlement, etc. It has been established that early or proto-urban formations (or, as they are more often called, “embryonic cities”) in some cases, as a result of favorable conditions, turned into medieval cities in the modern sense of the term – a permanent settlement in which most of the surplus product produced in the large rural district – the volost – was concentrated, processed, and redistributed [1, p. 105-107]. Others, due to changes in historical circumstances in a specific geographical micro-region, turned into ordinary villages or simply disappeared as settlement structures.

In particular, at the end of the 1st millennium AD, proto-cities were known in the European part of the ecumene in Scandinavia (Birka, Hedeby, Shirishgal), in Great Moravia (Mikulčice, Pohansko, Staré Město), in the Carolingian Empire, and in other territories. They are also known in Eastern Europe – Gnezdovo near Smolensk, Timerovo near Yaroslavl, Shestovitsa near Chernihiv. At the end of the 1st millennium AD, proto-cities were known in Scandinavia (Birka, Hedeby, Shirishgal), in Great Moravia (Mikulčice, Pohansko, Staré Město), in the Carolingian Empire, and in other territories. They are also known in Eastern Europe – Gnezdovo near Smolensk, Timerovo near Yaroslavl, Shestovitsa near Chernihiv [1, p. 141].

Research into the above-mentioned and other similar sites has shown that they were all focused on trade (primarily foreign trade) and had little connection with their rural surroundings. A characteristic feature of these sites, which various scientific publications refer to as centuries-old open trading and craft settlements, etc., is the presence of a small and sparsely populated fortified settlement, a large unfortified settlement located nearby, where, in addition to residential buildings, traces of craft production have been found, as well as a necropolis that is quite large in terms of the number of complexes (by the standards of medieval Europe) [2, p. 44-46]. Everything indicates the large number of inhabitants in each of these settlements.

Most of them, due to changes in the routes of trans-European trade routes at the end of the 1st millennium AD, simply declined and turned into ordinary settlements. To a certain extent, the scientific community has come to accept the idea that such settlements were characteristic of the European region precisely during the period of class formation among various ethnic groups.

It seemed as if the issue had been completely resolved: during the transition of a particular people to the era of civilization, there is a “dialectical” selection in terms of the “survival” of individual proto-urban settlement structures [2, p. 55].

However, during a comprehensive study of archaeological materials from the era of Kievan Rus, particularly in the territories of the Dnieper Left Bank, a distinct group of sites from the beginning of the 2nd millennium AD attracts attention. These sites differ significantly in their morphological and functional characteristics from the general mass of synchronous monuments of this period (11th–12th centuries), which are usually represented by small rural settlements without a clear internal structure [3, p. 37-38]. Unlike typical agricultural centers, these sites show signs of a more complex socio-economic organization, which allows them to be considered in the context of early urbanization processes.

In particular, we are talking about unique settlement structures located in the village of Lypove in the south of Chernihiv region, near the village of Zelenyi Hai near Sumy, as well as complexes of monuments near the villages of Hornal and Gochevo in the territory of modern Kursk region. All of these sites are located in strategically important places—at the watersheds of key river systems (Seim, Sula, Siverskyi Donets) [3, p. 39], which determined their potential role in the region’s communication network and contributed to the concentration of the population outside the traditional princely centers.

The last two locations, Gornal and Gochevo, have been known in scientific literature since the early 20th century, when the first stationary studies yielded very interesting and numerous archaeological materials, mainly from burial mounds [4, p. 98-100]. The scale of the necropolises and the richness of the accompanying inventory, already recorded at the initial stage of study, testified to the

high social status of the inhabitants of these settlements and their integration into broad cultural and economic ties, which requires additional analysis in the context of the trade routes of the era.

The complex of monuments near the village of Gochovo consists of a small hillfort, several open settlements, and a large necropolis, which had 3,648 burial mounds at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. Analysis of archaeological sources allows us to confidently say that a settlement existed here from the turn of the 10th-11th centuries, which apparently appeared as a result of state building by the Grand Prince of Kyiv, Volodymyr Sviatoslavych, during his campaigns to strengthen the southern borders of Kyivan Rus. The Old Russian fortress near the modern village of Gochevo, which stood directly on the border with the Steppe, served a defensive function throughout its existence [4, p. 105-108]. This is evidenced, in particular, by the relatively numerous (compared to other Old Russian burial grounds) burials of warriors in the excavated mounds. The most intense life, as evidenced by the findings, took place here in the 11th and first half of the 12th centuries. Starting from the middle of the 12th century, the number of inhabitants sharply decreased. This, in turn, led to the abandoned area of the settlement being used by the remaining inhabitants as a Christian (non-burial mound) cemetery. It should be noted that there is no clear evidence of the destruction of the fortifications or the settlement itself as a result of military action.

When describing the second of the above-mentioned sites in the territory of the modern Kursk region—a complex of monuments near the village of Gornal (also known as Bilgorodka-Mykolaevka)—it should be noted that at the beginning of its study, it had already been significantly damaged by the buildings and lands of the famous Bilgorodsky Monastery. After the monks' activities, only about 300 burial mounds remained from the large necropolis [4, p. 107-108]. Two large settlements and an open village have also been preserved. As a result of research, it was established that life on the so-called Great Settlement, built by the bearers of the Romny archaeological culture (the chronicle-mentioned Severians), ceased in the 70s of the 10th century and, as a result of military confrontation (apparently with the Pechenegs), was never restored. Later, in the 11th and 12th centuries, life continued intensively in this micro-region in a large open settlement and a small settlement.

Two other sites in the region under study—settlements near the villages of Lypove and Zelenyi Hai—became known in scientific literature primarily as a result of the pioneering fieldwork conducted by M. Makarenko in the early 20th century [5, p. 4]. His reports and collections of materials laid the foundation for further study of these objects, but the limitations of the methods available at the time did not allow for a complete reconstruction of their functional role. Modern research, carried out using the latest archaeological methods and an interdisciplinary approach, has significantly increased the amount of information about certain features of these interesting objects, allowing us to clarify their chronology, layout, and place in the settlement system of the Kyivan Rus' era.

Near the village of Zelenyi Hai, as well as near Hornal, there is a complex settlement structure that includes two hillforts, a large open settlement, and a large burial mound with 2,427 mounds. Such a large number of burial sites indicates the long-term functioning of the necropolis and a significant population density in this micro-region. Archaeological data indicate that one of the hillforts was abandoned by its inhabitants at the turn of the 1st–2nd millennium AD, probably due to a change in defense strategies or social priorities. In Old Russian times, the descendants of the chronicle-mentioned Severians continued to live on the site of a large unfortified settlement, as evidenced by the cultural layer and material inventory [5, p. 5]. However, from the middle of the 12th century, the number of inhabitants there declined sharply, which, in turn, led to the same phenomenon that we observe in Gochevo: the vacant area of the abandoned settlement began to be used as a Christian (non-burial mound) cemetery. This process reflects not only demographic decline, but also the transformation of sacred space in the context of Christianization and the decline of the settlement's commercial function.

When M. Makarenko published his report on his work in Lypove, he could not contain his emotions at what he had seen: "...this group of burial mounds may be the only group of Slavic burial mounds in the south in terms of their number and preservation." [5, p. 5]. This description of the necropolis is still relevant today. After all, there are more than 1,200 burial mounds in the middle of the modern village (according to some sources, there were 5,000 at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries). Not far from the necropolis, a small fortified settlement and a fairly large open village have been discovered. It is striking how the inhabitants used the terrain: in the marshy floodplain of the Romen River, there was a hill connected to the floodplain by only a narrow isthmus, where fortifications were built. The safety of the inhabitants of the open settlement was guaranteed, except in winter (when the nomads mainly left for the Black Sea steppes). We can speak of intense life in this place starting from the first quarter of the 11th century, although a weak cultural layer from the Romny period (end of the 1st millennium AD) can also be traced. After the middle of the 12th century, life gradually died down, although there is evidence that a small settlement functioned here until the invasion of Batu Khan's hordes in the 13th century [5, p. 6-7].

It is easy to see that all of the monuments discussed above have a number of characteristic features that typologically bring them closer together.

The main feature is the presence of a small fortified settlement, an open settlement, and a burial ground with a large number of mounds. The topographical location of these settlement structures indicates the desire of the inhabitants to settle closer to water, which was obviously related to the needs of craft production, as evidenced by numerous finds. The fact that there are unprocessed fragments of Ovruch pink slate, a type of shale from the Right Bank Polissya, in the Lypovets settlement area indicates intensive trade with fairly remote areas. Archaeological and anthropological materials indicate the presence of multi-ethnic elements among the inhabitants of these settlements, although the vast majority of them were autochthonous—descendants of the chronicle-mentioned Severians [5, p. 7].

The fact that in ancient Rus, both in Zelenyi Hai and in Gornal, larger and better fortified northern settlements were left, and the population lived mainly in open settlements, indicates that defensive functions (except for Gochevo, which was located directly on the Rus-nomadic border) were not a priority. This is confirmed by the location of three of the four settlements considered at a certain distance from the border with the Steppe.

Another feature that brought them closer together is the chronological limits of their functioning: intensive life in these centers lasted from the 11th to the first half of the 12th century. It did not cease as a result of military actions—residents most often left settlements in peaceful circumstances. No traces of fires have been found here either.

Returning to the question of the characteristics of proto-urban centers in Europe, let us compare their parameters with the complexes near Hornal, Gochava, Zeleny Hai, and Lipovy: a small fortified settlement – a large village – a burial ground. According to these main characteristics, the aforementioned sites from different periods (one or two centuries) turned out to be of the same type. From this, we can conclude that the four complexes from the beginning of the 2nd millennium CE on the left bank of the Dnieper were also proto-cities. However, this raises the question: what caused their emergence and decline?

At one time, O. Motsya, while studying routes, came to the conclusion that there was a land trade route from the Middle Dnieper region to Volga Bulgaria. This route was not chosen arbitrarily, but taking into account the specifics of medieval land roads (attraction to watersheds) and the geographical features of the area. Caravans could travel along the line Kyiv – Seim and Sula watershed – upper Siverskyi Donets – Don (between Voronezh and the mouth of the Tikhaya Sosna) – Moksha and Sura watershed – Volga. Reconstructing the part of the route, the researcher identified 10 points, including the aforementioned Gornal and Gochevo [6, p. 30-40].

Relatively recently, new archaeological materials have appeared that have made it possible to clarify this route [7]. It became possible to include both Lypove and Zelenyi Hai in the peculiar “caravanserais.” Another piece of evidence for including them in this group of trading posts was the analysis of numerous jewelry items found in the studied burial mounds. In particular, the percentage of silver in metal women’s jewelry from Lypove sometimes reached 90. And this was at the beginning of the 2nd millennium CE, when, due to the crisis of eastern silver, significant problems arose in Rus in supplying the precious metal [7, p. 88-118].

The chronological framework for the functioning of the proto-cities on the left bank of the Dnieper discussed above is explained in M. Kotlyar’s “History of Social Life in Rus: Essays.” According to a report he found in one of the chronicle collections that has not survived to this day, a trade agreement was concluded between Volga Bulgaria and Kievan Rus in 1006. During the reign of Grand Prince Volodymyr Sviatoslavych, Bulgarian merchants were given special seals that granted them the right to trade freely on the territory of Rus. In return, Rus merchants, having documents from the governors, could safely make trade trips to Bulgaria. The terms of the agreement stipulated that Bulgarian merchants were allowed to sell and purchase goods exclusively in cities, while visiting villages and conducting transactions with representatives of the administration (tiuns, virniks, ognishchans) and smerds was prohibited [8, p. 169-188]. It is likely that it was precisely from this time, when the safety of the trade route was guaranteed at the highest state level, that the aforementioned left-bank centers began to function intensively, which, in turn, contributed to the concentration of the population (craftsmen, merchants, etc.) here.

Calculations of the number of people who lived there yielded the following figures: Gochevo – about 1,000 inhabitants, Zeleny Hai – over 500, Lypove – up to 1,300. For comparison, the population of the Scandinavian settlements of Birka and Hedeby was 500-600 and 1,000 people, respectively [9, p. 82-83]. Of course, the relative nature of these figures should be taken into account due to fluctuations in population during the trading seasons (spring-autumn) and periods of relative calm. Moreover, there is no guarantee that the recorded number of burials was 100 percent complete.

The gradual decline of life in the proto-cities on the left bank along the Bulgar-Kyiv route beginning in the mid-12th century can also be explained. During the reigns of Yuri the Long-Armed, Andriiy Bogolyubsky, and Vsevolod the Big Nest—rulers of the then-powerful Vladimir-Suzdal Principality—there were constant clashes with Volga Bulgaria due to trade, political, and military rivalry. As a result of this new historical situation, the old system of the ancient trans-European trade route, one of the branches of the Great Silk Road, was apparently destroyed.

In our opinion, the specific materials considered in this work allow us to say that the process of urbanization did not proceed smoothly and straightforwardly even at the stage of developed feudalism. Not only on the left bank of the Dnieper, but probably also in other territories, there were dead ends in the evolution of urban formations. Some proto-cities that failed to establish stable ties with their rural surroundings eventually (as at the end of the 1st millennium CE) turned into ordinary rural settlements, while others simply ceased to exist.

At the same time, analysis of the chronology of the decline of settlements (mid-12th century) shows that their demise was not the result of military aggression, but rather a systemic crisis in transit trade caused by political confrontation between the Volodymyr-Suzdal Principality and Volga Bulgaria. This allows us to draw a general theoretical conclusion: in the process of Old Russian urbanization, there were “dead-end” branches of evolution, when an exclusive focus on transit capital without the formation of stable ties with the agricultural hinterland made settlements vulnerable to changes in the geopolitical situation. Thus, the left-bank proto-cities serve as a striking example of the non-linearity of urbanization processes in medieval Eastern Europe.

Bibliography

1. Толочко П. П. «Стародавній Київ» (1966, перевидання українською).
2. Івакін Г. Ю. «Історичний розвиток Києва Х–ХІІІ ст.». К., 1996.
3. Михайлина Л.П. Формування слов'янського ранньофеодального міста на р. Прут. *Роль ранніх міських центрів в становленні Київської Русі: Матеріали історико-археологічного семінару*. Суми. С. 37–39. 1993
4. Ясновська Л. В. «Українська археологія в листуванні Д. Я. Самоквасова». *Археологія*. 1994. № 1. С. 98–108
5. Макаренко Н. Е. Короткий звіт за археологічні дослідження в Сумській окрузі за рік 1929. *Науковий архів Інституту археології НАН України*, № 309/11.
6. Моця О. П. Шляхи часів Київської Русі: темпи руху на «путях». *Археологія*. 2010. № 2. С. 30–40
7. Моця О. П., Халіков А. Х. Булгар / Київ : шляхи, зв'язки, долі. Київ: Ін-т археології НАН України, 1997. 192 с.
8. Котляр М. Ф. «Історія суспільного життя Русі: Нариси». К.: Ін-т історії України НАН України, 2016. 288 с.
9. Groslund A. S. Birka IV. The Burial Customs. *Uppsala*, 1981. P. 82, 83.

References

1. Tolochko, P. P. (1966). *Starodavnii Kyiv* [Ancient Kyiv]. Kyiv, Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
2. Ivakin, H. Yu. (1996). *Istorychnyi rozvytok Kyieva X–XIII st.* [Historical development of Kyiv in the 10th–13th centuries]. Kyiv, Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
3. Mykhailyna, L. P. (1993). *Formuvannia slov'ianskoho rannofeodalnoho mista na r. Prut* [Formation of the Slavic early feudal city on the Prut River]. In *Rol rannikh miskykh tsentriv v stanovlenni Kyivskoi Rusi: Materialy istoryko-arkheolohichnoho seminaru* [The role of early urban centers in the formation of Kyivan Rus': Proceedings of the historical-archaeological seminar] (pp. 37–39). Sumy, Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
4. Yasnovska, L. V. (1994). *Ukrainska arkheolohiia v lystuvanni D. Ya. Samokvasova* [Ukrainian archaeology in the correspondence of D. Ya. Samokvasov]. *Arkheolohiia – Archaeology*, (1), 98–108 [in Ukrainian].
5. Makarenko, N. E. (1929). *Korotkyi zvit za arkheolohichni doslidy v Sumskii okruzi za rik 1929* [Brief report on archaeological research in the Sumy district for 1929]. *Naukovyi arkhiv Instytutu arkheolohii NAN Ukrainy*, No. 309/11 [in Ukrainian].
6. Motsia, O. P. (2010). *Shliakhy chasiv Kyivskoi Rusi: tempy rukhu na "putekh"* [Routes of the Kyivan Rus' period: Travel speeds on the "puty"]. *Arkheolohiia – Archaeology*, (2), 30–40 [in Ukrainian].
7. Motsia, O. P., & Khalikov, A. Kh. (1997). *Bulhar – Kyiv: shliakhy, zviazky, doli* [Bulgar – Kyiv: Routes, connections, destinies]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Institute of Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
8. Kotliar, M. F. (2016). *Istoriia suspilnoho zhyttia Rusi: Narysy* [History of social life in Rus': Essays]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine [in Ukrainian].
9. Gräslund, A. S. (1981). *Birka IV. The Burial Customs*. Uppsala, Sweden, pp. 82–83.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 12.02.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 08.03.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 26.05.2026



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу (CC BY 4.0)