

5. Verstyuk V. F. (2019). Sobornist' v ukrayins'kiy suspil'no-politychniy dumtsi ta real'niy politytsi. *Ukrayins'kyi istorychnyy zhurnal*, 1, pp. 67—93.
6. Fayzulin Ya. & Skal's'kyi V. [upor.]. (2008). *Akt zluky Ukrayins'koyi Narodnoyi Respubliki i Zakhidno-Ukrayins'koyi Narodnoyi Respubliki: svitlyny, karty, dokumenty*. Kyiv: Ukrayins'kyi instytut natsional'noyi pam'yati.
7. Turchenko F. H. (1994). *Novitnya istoriya Ukrayiny (1917—1945 rr.)*. Kyiv: Heneza.
8. *Ukrayina v mizhnarodniy politytsi*. (1919). Kaminets': Orhan druku UHA "Striletsy".
9. Zhyttyepysy ukrayins'kykh vozhdiv. (1919). *Halyts'ka armiya*. Kaminets': Orhan druku UHA "Striletsy".
10. Krevets'kyi I. (1919). *Ukrayins'ka memuarystyka, yiyi suchasnyy stan i znachynnya*. Zhyttyepysy ukrayins'kykh vozhdiv. Halyts'ka armiya. Kaminets': Orhan druku UHA "Striletsy".
11. Krenzhals'kyi D. (1919). *L'viv v ukrayins'kykh rukakh 1—21.XI.1918*. Kaminets': Orhan druku UHA "Striletsy".
12. Myshuha L. (1919). *Na Volyni. Pershi khvyli Ukrayins'koyi derzhavnosti*. Kaminets': Orhan druku UHA "Striletsy".
13. *Istoriya povstannya lystopadu-hrudnya 1918 r.* (1919). Kyiv: Drukarnya Kyievo-Pechers'koyi lavry.
14. Baykov L. L. (1918). *Pidhotovka narodu ta viys'ka do zakhystu Bat'kivshchyny*. Kyiv: Vydannya i drukarnya Tovarystva "Chas".
15. Yavornys'kyi D. I. (1919). *Ukrayino-rus'ke kozatstvo pered sudom istoriyi. Chytano v Katerynoslavs'komu Universyteti 20.IX.1918*. Katerynoslav: Slovo ; Drukarnya I. Kh. Mordkhylevycha.
16. Pachovs'kyi V. (1919). *Halychyna i Naddniprians'ka Ukrayina*. Kam'yanets' na Podillyu: Vydannya Narodnoho Ministerstva Presy y Informatsiyi UNR. Ch. 71.
17. *Holovnishy pravyla ukrayins'koho pravopysu, ukhvaleni Ministerstvom Narodnoyi Osvity dlya shkil'noho vzhytku na vsiyi Ukrayini. Pidypsano 17 sichnya 1919 r. ministrom narodnoyi osvity, profesorom Ivanom Ohiyenkom.* (1919). Kam'yanets'-Podil's'kyi: Vydannya Podil's'koyi Huberniyal'noyi Narodnoyi Upravy.
18. Ivanov-Mezhenko Yu. (1919). *Mizhnarodna detsymal'na bibliohrafichna klasyfikatsiya*. Kyiv: Holovna Knyzhna palata.
19. *Prapor Ukrayiny*. (1919). Lystopad.
20. *Derzhavna Narada za pidypsom keruyuchoho spravamy M. Myronovycha*. Lystivka (1919). 28 zhovtnya. [B. m.].
21. *Kyiv v nashykh rukakh*. Lystivka (1919). 31 serpnia. Kam'yanets' na Podillyu.
22. *Do naseleennya*. (1919). Lystivka. 31 sichnya. Vinnytsya.

Надійшла до редакції 7 січня 2025 року



ІСТОРИЧНІ РОЗВІДКИ

УДК 94(477)".../084":930]=111

Mykola Kravchuk,

Senior Researcher

of the M. M. Bogolyubov Institute of Theoretical Physics
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine,

e-mail: osarus@ukr.net

Essays on the History of the Ancient Rus'

It is well known that "The Tale of Bygone Years" (TBY) — the primary source of the history of the Rus', began with three questions: "Where did the Rus' land come from?", "Where did the Rus' land stand up?", and "Who began the first principedom in Kiev?". But it is much less known, that until recently there were no satisfactory, definitive answers to them. In this essays certain answers are proposed and justified constructively and with sufficient details, by using a new metahistorical method, that was based on the ideology of the modern quantum theory (details see in [1]).

It should be noted that this method gives some view "from above" on the history, not reducing its to enumeration of dates and facts. But instead it gives the possibility for analysis of entire historical processes, while exploring not only their content, but also clarifying the deep meaning, including some moments, which not be taken into account by many historians before us.

Here we begin a study of the Ancient Rus' (more exactly — East Slavic civilization) from its origins — prehistory and circumstances of its origin, emphasizing the special role of Sc-CHT (Scandinavian Culture-Historical Type) in the relevant processes.

Then we examine such long-standing problems as "the emergence of the name Rus'" (a la A. Bickner), and the "Norman problem" (a la W. Tomsen), offering a completely constructive solution to both, as well as other related problems of the first Heroic time of the East Slavic civilization.

But later we also identify the "progenitors" of this civilization — well-defined historical Giant personalities, starting with Oleg the Prophetic. But the fundamental role in the process of its birth was played by Svetoslav the Great, who essentially turned out to be the Father of civilization. And moreover, it became its Beacon, which in many ways highlighted the future of this civilization, which is described in some detail.

I

Essays on the history of Europe and Eurasia in the 1st millennium AD

Asia has become a popular volcano. Every year it threw out new crowds and herds from its depths, which, in turn, drove those erupted before from their places. They crossed the mountains and reached Europe. The peoples, one might say, did not move forward, but mechanically pushed others from their places. These were not conquerors, but some kind of slaves who acted only out of fear of punishment. The chain of peoples from the east and northeast thus stretched throughout Europe to the very south.

N. Gogol "On the movement of peoples at the end of the V century"

1. Introduction: About the "Great Migrations"

So briefly, but very expressively, Nikolai Vasilyevich described almost two centuries ago the "Great Migration of Peoples", which played a central role in the history of not only Europe in the 1st millennium, but also Eurasia. Moreover, the latter here means the *inner part of the continent, mainly the steppe and forest-steppe between the Carpathians and Manchuria* (according to L. Gumilyov). But the apogee of this migration was the period from the end of the IV century to the VII century, which we proposed to call the "Long" VI century (or briefly **VI L-century**, [1]), which will be discussed later.

Of course, migrations of peoples in Europe and Asia took place before the new era for many hundreds of years. For a brief, and at the same time quite detailed review of events in the indicated territory at that time (from the point of view of an archaeologist!), we refer to the review article by academician P. Tolochko in [2]. But even in the new era, in addition to the "Great Migration of Peoples" itself (unfortunately, too briefly touched upon by him in [2]), there was both a prehistory and a post-history of it, which noticeably changed the ethnic map of Eastern Europe, ultimately. Moreover, in many ways, all this gave rise to the new political map of Europe, and not only in the zone affected by the mentioned relocations! And since this zone often included the territory of our future civilization, this topic is an essential part of its prehistory.

On the other hand, another academician D. Likhachev noted: *"It should be taken into account that not all particular problems of history and cultural history of such a dark period as the 1st millennium AD are sufficiently illuminated"*. This opinion is confirmed by modern historians, for example, O. Potokina writes: *"Although mountains of words have been written and said about the era of the Great Migration of Peoples, it still remains little studied and in many ways completely unknown (! — Authors). It was the time of birth and death of states and tribes, a turning point, a transitional stage*

between antiquity and the Middle Ages in the history of Europe" (in "Z—S", No. 4; 2014). True, we believe that some of the above formulations can and should be significantly clarified and supplemented, which is what we will try to do.

It should be taken into account that this period marks the time of the death of not just "states and tribes", but also the collapse of the Great Roman Empire, which is often identified with the entire ancient civilization of the 1st level — in general (although here too it is necessary clarifications that will be given later). And also the birth on its ruins of not only new states, but also entire local civilizations, moreover, even of the 2nd level (but more precisely here we should talk about the corresponding Super-systems, for which we refer to Chapter I in [1]).

Thus, in western Europe, this period marked the beginning of the formation of a new stage in the evolution of class society, for which there is not much written evidence. Therefore, it is clear that before dealing with the migrations of peoples, one should look at the political map of Europe at the beginning of the 1st millennium, when almost its entire life was in one way or another connected with the Roman Empire, which seemed to be at the zenith of power and glory.

However, this impression turned out to be deceptive, especially when this empire was subjected to increasing pressure from barbarians from the north and northeast. Here we will be most interested in the latter direction, or more precisely, in the Danube region, where the barbarian Geto-Dacian tribes showed particular activity in the 1st century, and it was then that they united into a large tribal union.

It was they who became the first barbarians to whom the proud Romans began to pay "donations" (or, more simply, *tribute*), although not for long, because already in 109 Emperor Trajan (98—117) — the same one under whom the territory of the Roman Empire reached maximum size — had already thoroughly defeated the Geto-Dacians, and

made Dacia itself a Roman province. It was he who then built the famous Trajan Val (Rampart) near the mouth of the Danube, although all this did not help the Romans when new barbarians appeared there in the next century.

On the other hand, it is well known that in the northern Black Sea region, and in the Crimea — in particular, back in the second half of the 1st millennium BC, Greek city-colonies appeared, which continued to exist in the 1st millennium AD, although already under the auspices of Rome (acad. P. Tolochko speaks in more detail about this rather voluminous topic in the collection [2]).

But in the adjacent steppe territories, their nomadic inhabitants undergone more frequent and radical changes, so that from the very beginning of new era, the dominant position there — after expulsion of the Sarmatians was occupied by the *Alans* — a union of tribes also of Iranian origin. They came from foothills of the Northern Caucasus, periodically returning there after being pushed out of the steppes by other waves of conquerors, a phenomenon observed throughout the subsequent millennia.

In the west, they bordered on Geto-Dacians mentioned above, but soon, from the II century onwards, the first groups of new settlers appeared in the Black Sea region — *Goths*, tribes of Scandinavians origin, who soon expelled both of them from the northern Black Sea region and the Danube region. However, it is unfortunate that they receive disproportionally little attention in the papers of P. Tolochko in [2].

In our opinion, it should be them, the *Goths*, who should be considered the first migrants of the new era (from the mentioned *Great Migration of Peoples*), although they come not from Asia, but from the Northern Europe, as will be discussed in the next paragraph.

2. The appearance of Sc-CHT in the arena of history and the first split of the Slavdom

In fact, then, for the first time in history, a new actor showed itself, having all the signs of a special CHT (*cultural-historical type*, which was discussed in the book [1]), namely **Sc-CHT**, formed by the tribes then living in Scandinavia. The fact that they form a CHT is obvious directly from the definition of the latter (see [1]); it is possible that it was a subsidiary of the larger German one, but we still consider it justified to separate it into a special **Sc-CHT**, since it will manifest itself more than once in history, as we will see later.

Thus, it is known that at the end of the first century AD several alliances of Scandinavian tribes began moving to south at once, first crossing from Sweden to the southern coast of the Baltic — like a kind of "landing force" (although it is not known exactly for what reasons — either because of climate change, or because "*passionary impulse*", according to Gumilyov [3]). But they did not stay there for long, soon heading to the southeast, and it is precisely this process that should be considered, in our opinion, as the beginning of the above-mentioned "Great Migration of Peoples".

Among these tribes, three related alliances are usually distinguished: *Ostrogoths* (or Ostgoths), the *Visigoths* (or Westgoths), and the *Gepids*. True, it is somewhat less known that somewhat later the *Vandal* tribes moved to south from the same region. Only the first three moved along the Vistula, and then through the Carpathians, while the latter moved somewhat to the west, apparently skirting the mountains.

It is curious that in parallel, and in connection with these processes, *Slavdom* (\approx Slavonic) is clearly manifested on the pages of history: the first information about it is found in the writings of Greek and Roman authors of the first centuries AD (where they were mentioned under the name of the Wends). And their habitat area at the mentioned time, back in the early XX century, was identified by academician A. Shakhmatov in the territories of present-day Slovakia and southern Poland. True, enough archaeological data has now accumulated indicating that this region occupied by the Slavs (Slavians) at the beginning of the new era included, in addition to the one mentioned above, a somewhat larger strip from the Elbe and Vistula in the west, and to the Pripyat basin in the east, as the studies of academicians V. Sedov [4] and P. Tolochko show (for more details we refer to [2]), with which most historians agree.

But regarding the information about the three Slavic tribal associations of the Wends, Sklavins and Antes, dating back to the Gothic historian Jordan (VI century), there is now no complete clarity either in the circumstances of their appearance or in other moments, as emphasized in [5]. Moreover, it is not present in the statement that supposedly "these associations underlay the three modern groups of the Slavs — Western, Southern and Eastern, as was believed in Slavic studies since the XIX century," or more precisely, for this "*there is no basis grounds*" (according to [5]), which is noted absolutely correctly! Thus, the question turned out to be open,

and it seemed to us that the reason for this was the failure to take into account several factors of an external nature, which we need to dwell on in a little more detail.

And one of these factors is now before us — the fact is that the Goths moved on south directly through the center of the Slavonic's habitat, as if "cutting" it into two parts, and at the same time "pushing" the Slavs (those who managed to scatter!) to west and east, respectively. And since this was not a campaign, but a resettlement, it lasted almost the entire II century, and perhaps even at the beginning of the III century; as a result, the western branch of the Slavs kept moving away from the eastern one. Therefore, it is precisely this, in our opinion, that gave rise to the beginning of the corresponding division of the Slavs into Western and Eastern.

It's just the beginning, but further circumstances contributed to this process, as we will see below, and we note that the border between them passed precisely along the route of movement of the Goths, which became the first historical action of the new Sc-CHT — in fact, its accidental action!

The Goths themselves then continued their movement on south — to the Black Sea region, which was then controlled by the Alans, as noted above. And now the Alans were defeated by the Goths, after which they divided — one part went on west, to the Danube region, where at the end of the IV century we find them already in alliance with the Vandals, who appeared there earlier (and were officially located since 335 in Panonia already as "federates" — by decree of Emperor Constantine I the Great). And the second, the main part of the Alans returned to the Northern Caucasus, and we will meet with them more than once.

It was the Goths who dominated the Black Sea region almost until the end of the IV century, turning out to be a difficult, let's say, neighbor for the Roman Empire. Moreover, having reached the Northern Black Sea region, the Goths eventually formed a *pre-state*, or *proto-state* (nowadays it is fashionable to use the term *potestar state* in such cases), which included many tribes that they had conquered along the way, incl. and some Slavic.

In history it was called the "Gothic Empire" of Germanarich — after the name of the last leader. And to imagine what it was, let us cite the opinion of L. Gumilyov (who followed the Gothic historian Jordan in this): *"The Goths became masters of the mouth of the Danube (where the Visigoths settled) and modern Transylvania (where the Gepids settled).*

To the east, between the Don and the Dniester, the Ostrogoths reigned" ([3b]). True, Gumilyov's subsequent statement that the Goths allegedly subjugated "almost all of Eastern Europe, the lands of the Mordovians and Meri, the upper reaches of the Volga, almost the entire Dnieper region, the steppes to the Crimea and the Crimea itself" should not be taken seriously, because there is confirmation of this entire list their "possessions" do not exist.

Note 1. As for the Roman Empire itself, *"by the beginning of the III century in most of the empire there was already desolation of land, degradation of crafts and an acute shortage of labor caused by the low productivity of slave"*. This is how the crisis that began was interpreted in "World History" ([6]), where greater details are given, but now we can offer a simpler and more convincing explanation of the **causes** of this crisis.

In the last third of the II century, the territory of the Roman Empire was subjected to the first smallpox pandemic known in the new millennium, which was called the *"Antonine Plague"*, since its peak occurred precisely in the years 165—180. Moreover, the death toll is estimated at approximately 5 million people, so smallpox depopulated entire regions of the empire. It is from here, from an **external** circumstance followed, that the "acute labor shortage" probably occurred, and only then can we talk about the "low productivity of slaves"!

Then, as we will see below, not only the Goths, but also other barbarian tribes began to move, essentially beginning an assault on the empire. So the beginning of the crisis of the slave system in it was provoked precisely by these external circumstances, and then it developed in other directions, as described in the same "World History" [6].

Therefore, it is not at all by chance that the center of the empire shifted to the east by the end of the III century, and so quickly that already *"in 330, under Emperor Constantine I (306—337), the capital of the empire was moved to the city of Byzantium, which was named Constantinople"* (see in [6]). This city was an important strategic point at the junction of Europe and Asia, and Constantine understood this — for several years he prepared the transfer of the capital of the already *Christian* empire. And moreover, on May 11, 330, he solemnly entrusted the city to its patroness, the Mother of God (and at a solemn liturgy in the Church of St. Irene). This, in fact, turned out to be the *birthday* of the Byzantine Empire, although it officially appeared only 65 years later!

The reasons for the transfer are indicated above, but not the least of these is the aforementioned increase in pressure on Rome from the Germanic tribes. In Byzantium, it seemed to be calmer, although immediately after arriving at a new place, the Goths, along with other barbarian tribes, repeatedly attacked not only its colonies in the Black Sea region, but also the main territory of the empire.

Moreover, back in 251, in the battle near Philippopolis, they defeated the Roman troops

under the command of Emperor Decius himself, known as the "soldier's" emperor, and he died there. And after this, the Romans entered into an "alliance" with the Goths, hiring them to guard the borders, although later it was they who played a significant role in the collapse of the Roman Empire. True, first the Gothic "empire" itself, at the end of the 4th century, fell under the blows of the first truly large wave of steppe nomads, this time the *Huns*.

References

1. Kravchuk N. V. The Meta-history as a key to comprehension of human history. Kiev : Stal'. 2022. 132 c.
2. Essays on the history of Ukraine / [P. P. Tolochko, N. F. Kotlyar, A. I. Oleinikov and others]; under the municipality ed. P. P. Tolochko. Kyiv: Kievskaya Rus, 2010. 480 p.
3. Gumilev L. N. a) Ethnogenesis and the biosphere of the Earth. Moscow : Iris-press, 2004. 557 p.; b) From the Rus' to Russia. Quest for a fictional kingdom. Moscow : AST, 2002. 839 p.
4. Sedov V. V. The Old Rus'sian nationality: historical and archaeological research. Moscow : Languages of Russian Culture, 1999. 316 p.
5. Essays on the history of Russia / ed. Academie RAS in Ukr. Kyiv : Nika-Center, 2007.
6. The World history: in 10 volumes / Ch. ed. Zhukov E. M. Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1957. Vol. 3. 896 p.

Микола Кравчук,
старший науковий співробітник
Інституту теоретичної фізики ім. М. М. Боголюбова
Національної академії наук України
Нариси історії цивілізації Давньої Русі

Добре відомо, що "Повість врем'яних літ" (ПВЛ) розпочинається трьома запитаннями: 1) "Звідки пішла Руська земля?", 2) "Як постала Руська земля?", 3) "Хто спершу почав княжити в Києві?". Проте майже невідомо, що донедавна вичерпних відповідей на ці запитання надано не було.

У статті здійснено спробу надати чітко визначені та конструктивні відповіді, для чого використано новий метаісторичний метод, що базується на методах сучасної квантової теорії [1]. Зазначимо, що цей метод надає погляд на історію начебто "згори", однак не зводить її лише до опису фактів і переліку дат, а натомість уможливорює аналіз історичних процесів, охоплюючи моменти, які історики не враховували раніше.

Дослідження східнослов'янської цивілізації починаємо від її витоків — передісторії та умов зародження, з акцентом на особливій ролі Скандинавського культурно-історичного типу (KIT) у цих процесах. При цьому намагатимемося надати конструктивні відповіді на "проблему О. Брюкнера" та "Норманську проблему" й пов'язані з ними питання Героїчних часів Давньої Русі.

(Далі буде)

Надійшла до редакції 4 лютого 2025 року

До уваги передплатників!

Угоду щодо передплати на видання Книжкової палати України
можна укласти безпосередньо з установою.

Звертайтеся у відділ підготовки та розповсюдження видань

тел. (044) 292-65-73

e-mail: vydannya@ukrbook.net

Свідоцтво про державну реєстрацію КВ № 21783-11683ПР від 31.12.2015.

Формат 60x84¹/₈. Ум. друк. арк. 6,05. Тираж 25 пр. Зам. 18.

Журнал надруковано на обладнанні Книжкової палати України

Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 1954 від 24.09.2004.

До уваги читачів: електронний варіант журналу "Вісник Книжкової палати" ISSN 2076-9555 (онлайн-версія)
розміщено на сайті Національної бібліотеки України імені В. І. Вернадського в розділі "Наукова періодика України":

http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/VKP/index.html