



УДК 94(477)"375/5":930] =111

Mykola Kravchuk,

Senior Researcher

of the M. M. Bogolyubov Institute of Theoretical Physics

of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

osarus@ukr.net

Essays on the History of the Ancient Rus^{*}

II

*The Huns, by some strange instinct, moved, instead of south, to the northwest;
They hooked their path into the Caucasus, tore several Caucasian peoples
from its soles and carried them away with them.
This whole nomadic crowd poured into Europe...
And the Goths, those Goths who were considered
its invincible stronghold and strength, yielded to them.*

N. Gogol

1. The invasion of the Huns and its consequences

However, the Huns, in general, appeared on the border of Europe and Asia back in the II century [1b], although their "appearance there went almost unnoticed, and for two centuries almost nothing was known about them in Europe", argued the famous historian A. Novoseltsev. He quite reasonably believed that all this time "the Huns were fighting the Alans, whose nomadic camps extended from the Caspian Sea to the Don" [2]. And if we remember that before this the Goths attacked the Alans, then it is clear that it was not easy for them to fight on two fronts, which is why the fight with the Huns ended in the 80s of the IV century with the defeat of the Alans, and then the Huns won and the Goths.

But it is worth immediately noting that at the beginning of the millennium it was the Alans who were the main obstacle to the nomadic hordes from Asia (not too large, however); however, they tried to play a similar role in the future.

As for what happened after their defeat, it is worth quoting Academician A. Sakharov [3a]: "...at the same time as the Goths, other tribes and peoples were removed from their places. Thus, some of the Alans ended up in Spain and North Africa. At the same time, apparently, some of the Caucasians, represented by the Basques, appeared beyond the Pyrenees. The wave of the "great migration of peoples" grew along with the ongoing invasion of the Huns into Europe, but before that the Huns, according to archeology, subjected the population of the East European Plain, and primarily its southern regions, to terrible devastation. People went into the

forests, beyond impassable swamps, and continued their difficult lives there. The sunny black soils of the south and the warm oak forests remained in the hands of the nomads".

But the Huns provoked many changes in Western Europe: for example, when they defeated the Ostrogoths in 375 (perhaps it is from this date that the "long" VI century should be counted), they fled to the west — first to the borders of the Roman Empire, declaring themselves her subjects. However, the Goths soon rebelled (seemingly due to hunger), and in the battle of Adrianople in 378 they again defeated the Roman troops, where Emperor Valens, this time one of the two co-rulers of the empire, also died. All this served as the strongest "argument" for the dividing of the Roman Empire into the western and eastern parts, which followed already in 395.

Let us remember that it was in that year, immediately after the death of Emperor Theodosius, that the Eastern Roman Empire, which later became known as the Byzantine Empire, separated from Rome. However, by that time the old "empire was like a thousand-year-old oak tree, which amazes with its terrible thickness and whose middle had long since turned to rot and dust", as N. Gogol very aptly put it [4], and therefore it is not surprising that soon the Gothic "king" Alaric will take Rome itself!

And all this was a consequence of the further advance of the Huns to the west, when the Ostrogoths "squeezed out" by them, rushed deep into Byzantium, and quite far at that. Having defeated the Byzantine army (see above), they marched along the entire Adriatic coast of the Balkans, but did not linger there, because they were heading to Italy,

^{*}Продовження. Початок див.: Вісник Книжкової палати. 2025. № 3. С. 48—52.

where they "frolic" enough, so much so that they took Rome itself. It is interesting to note that they besieged it three times — from 408 to 410, when they finally took the *"Eternal City"*, and note that "king" Alaric himself immediately left it, and a couple of weeks later he died! [1b; 5].

The Visigoths, having passed through Europe north of the borders of Byzantium, first founded the *"Kingdom of Toulouse"* in the west (in 419) — the first barbarian kingdom on the territory of the Western Roman Empire, which existed until 507. After which some of them crossed the Pyrenees, then stopping at the westernmost tip of the continent of Europe — in Spain, a former Roman province.

But the Vandals "outdid" everyone — in alliance with the Alans and other tribes, they traveled almost all of Europe, then stopped briefly in Spain. However, apparently, they did not make peace with the Visigoths, who had settled there since 416 — despite their kinship in Sc-CHT!

Therefore, in 428, the Vandals crossed to Africa, and it was there that they captured (already in 439) the famous *Carthage*, the capital of another Roman province, then known as the "granary" of Rome. Moreover, three years later, Rome was forced to officially recognize the resulting *"kingdom of the Vandals and Alans"* with King Geiserich (sometimes written Genserich) — already the second barbarian one. As we see, during this period Sc-CHT again loudly declared itself in world history; however, not the last time, as we will see later! [1b].

The fact was that Rome was then fighting off the onslaught of barbarians from the east, of which the most dangerous were the above-mentioned Huns, who settled on the Danube after 420, where they founded the *Hunnish Empire* of the same variety as the *Gothic Empire*, only with its center in the steppe Panonia. However, A. Novoseltsev more accurately described this "empire" as a *"conglomerate and ephemeral Hunnic union"*.

On the other hand, although the reasons that prompted the Huns to move westward remain unclear to historians to this day (see [5] for details), one of the factors contributing to their military success was not only their enormous numerical superiority but also the improvement of the nomads' primary weapon — the *bow*. This was recently revealed by the British historian Peter Heather. He found that the *"Hun asymmetric 130-centimeter bow had much greater stopping power than the symmetric bow of the Scythians: unlike the Scythian bow, when shot, the arrow penetrated the enemy's armor and did not hinder the horseman, who also kept a safe distance from the enemy"* (quoted from "Z—S," No. 10, 2015).

By the way, similar **"technical" reasons** manifested themselves repeatedly in subsequent history, as we will see. But now let's return to the Huns, who then attempted to conquer all of Europe, reaching almost to the Atlantic. Their leader Attila boldly declared, *"where the hoof of my horse touches, there will no longer grow grass!"* (according to Gogol [4]).

However, upon reaching Orleans in the Roman province of Gaul in 451 AD, Attila faced worthy resistance from the "last Roman" commander Aetius in the famous Battle of the Catalaunian Plains. As a result, Attila had to retreat all the way to Pannonia, where the Huns attempted to regroup, but apparently, there wasn't enough grass for their horses?

When Attila died in 453 AD, the following year saw *"the Huns defeated by the Gepids, in 463 AD by the Bulgars, and in 469 AD by the Byzantines. After these events, the dominance over the Black Sea steppes shifted to the Bulgars"*, according to Gumilev ([4b]). Thus, the "empire of Attila" practically instant was disintegrated, and little remained of the Huns.

However, the invasion of the Huns had quite a few consequences. For example, the same Novoseltsev noted that it was after him and in the steppe regions of Eastern Europe in the VI—IX centuries that *"there was intense mixing and mutual influence of three ethnic groups: Iranian, Ugric and Turkic. Ultimately, the latter prevailed, but this happened quite late"* [2], also noting that *"the only reliable remnant of the Huns "in terms of language in our time are the Chuvash!"*

But then, already *"in the early Middle Ages, the most famous proto-Turkic ethnic groups were the Bulgars and Khazars"* (aka), and they were closely related, in his opinion. And these Bulgars, after the departure of the Huns, returned to the Azov and Caucasus regions, occupying territories right up to the Black Sea coast, and the Khazars — the steppes of the Western Caspian region; we will need these remarks later.

As a result, it was the invasion of the Huns that turned out to be the deepest penetration of nomads into Europe and, although it was repelled, the weakened Rome did not triumph for long.

Now the vandals decided to "thank" him, and after the murder of Emperor Valentinian III, the last representative of the legitimate dynasty, Geiserich's soldiers took the "Eternal City" in May 455, with virtually no bloodshed... But over the next two weeks they completely robbed it, for example, removing even the gilded roofs from the temples, thereby leaving their "mark" in history, known precisely as **vandalism** (see details in [5]).

2. The collapse of the Roman Empire and the birth of the Byzantium; "wanderings" of barbarian tribes across Europe

As a result of all these events, it turned out that only 21 years later, in 476, this kind of "patchwork" Western Roman Empire (aka *Hesperia*) completely crumbled, but the Eastern — Byzantine Empire existed for almost another thousand years, although its existence was far away not cloudless! We will meet with her more than once, and we will explain this phenomenon, but now we will summarize: according to N. Gogol, it was the invasion of the Huns that should be considered one of the most important elements of the Great Migration of Peoples in the first millennium AD, and that is without "quotation marks".

And not only because of the massive numbers of these nomads, but also because of the influence that the Huns had on all of Europe as a whole, and therefore the V century is sometimes considered the "peak" of the Great Migration. However, we still prefer to talk about the **VI L-century** (i. e., "long" VI century), which began after the appearance of the Huns, and the subsequent division of the great Roman Empire, which included the V century, as well as the VI, and ended only in the VII century.

With all this, we should not forget the role of Sc-CHT in these processes, no less important than the role of the nomads — he played the role of a trigger in many processes!

From the following considerations it will become clearer, whence such statements have appeared. But at once we note that all the above-mentioned tribes entered the world history, and in the list of peoples involved in these campaigns, often include and Slavs. However, in [7] specifically noted, referring to the Gothic period, that "*in the written sources of those times there is not a single mention of the Slavs, or tribes that could be identified with the Slavs or Balto-Slavs*". And then also that "*the Huns did not use them (Slavs) as a military force*".

It seems to us — for the reason that in those times the Slavs were at too low level of social development — they had neither stratification, nor any internal structuring. But for the subsequent period — from Hunnish invasion to Avar invasion — Slavs have already shown themselves, why and relations with the subsequent conquerors became different, because Slavs have learned lessons from the previous experience.

The fact is that even such historians as S. Pletneva and E. Chernykh, noted a number of

processes going on in "*migrating communities*", aimed at the destruction of the tribal way of life — on the one hand, and leading to social differentiation — on the other, which just contributed to the birth of a new social quality. Moreover, Chernykh emphasized that "*such processes have a special power and transience precisely in the epochs of great migrations*" [8, p. 248].

We are convinced that these processes also induced similar, albeit weaker, processes in those communities with which the nomads in one way or another encountered, in this case — in the Slavic. And this — despite the fact that we know nothing about the influence of the Goths on the cultural, and social development of the Slavic, but the influence of the Huns on them, although known, but only in a purely destructive way, which is already mentioned in the above quote by A. Sakharov.

Also archeological materials say the following: "...by the end of the IV century the whole Chernyakhovskaya culture ceased to function... and only in several places of the forest-steppe zone remained its islands", as witnessed by V. Sedov in [9]. And then he adds: "In the first decades of the V century" and in the more northern Vistula-Oder region the corresponding "Przeworska culture ceased to function" too.

And yet, however much we may dislike "barbarians" and especially nomads, they often played a very important role in history, as will be discussed in the next remark:

Note 1. The important historical role of the above-mentioned Great Migration of Peoples was noted not only by N. Gogol, but also later by N. Y. Danilevsky. He used it as an example of the activity of "*temporarily appearing phenomena... like the Huns, Mongols, Turks, who, having accomplished their destructive feat, having helped the civilizations struggling with death to extinguish their spirit, and having scattered their remnants, disappear into their former insignificance*". He called them "*negative Actors of mankind, the so-called scourges of God*" [10], although he recognized that the results of their activities, after all, contributed to progress. And it is worth noting that Nikolai Yakovlevich believed that they formed neither a cultural-historical type (CHT), nor a civilization (as well as nomads in general), but a century later L. Gumilev already defined a place for some of them in his scheme — as *Super-ethnoses*.

We suppose it is possible to consider them (under certain conditions!) as *unstable n-CESES-systems* (hereinafter we write shorter — *n-Super-systems*) of *intermediate, "fractional" level*, which

are grouped around the value $n = 1/2$ (for details see Appendix 1 of the introductory volume [1a]). And if to speak more precisely, the Huns of the V century should be attributed a value in the interval $0 < n \leq 1/2$, while for the Mongols of the XIII century it turned out that n lies in the interval $(1/2, 1)$, as we will show in the future.

And moreover, from the very beginning we considered that exactly such systems of fractional level should be considered as a direct generalization of the concept of formation to this level! And let us note that immediately after we learned about the proposal of E. Chernykh to distinguish "intermediate" associations, Chernykh's proposition suggestion to single out "intermediate" societies into a "special type of formations" (in the collection [8]), this assumption seems quite natural!

Note 2. Returning to the main topic, we note that academian V. Sedov still did not link the unambiguously observed decline in the late IV—V centuries only with the actions of the Huns. He also noted the following **geophysical** circumstances: *"...the situation was aggravated by a significant deterioration of the climate... From the end of the IV century in Europe came a sharp cooling, especially cold was the V century". At the same time, "soil moistening sharply increased, the levels of rivers and lakes increased noticeably, groundwater rose, and swamps proliferated"* [9]. Though now it is already known for sure that very serious cooling actually began later — only in the beginning of the second third of the next VI century, about what we will speak later.

But the peak of the mentioned migrations of the Germanic tribes fell precisely on the V century. And V. Sedov argued that this cooling was the strongest for a millennium, and that only by the end of the VII century warming was outlined, which entailed a new rise in agriculture, and the expansion of the area of settlement of the Eastern Slavs (for more details see [9]). And a little lower he noted that from the V century there was also observed the resettlement of the Slavic population of Povislenie — it *"migrated to the north-east, moving along the elevated lake-glacial ridges from the Masurian Lakes to Valdai"* — i. e. just in those places where later, already in the VII century we find the tribes of *Polochans, Slovenes* and *Krivichi*.

So, by that time the Eastern Slavic had already significantly moved away from the Western Slavic, and on the way to the north-east indicated by V. Sedov, they probably encountered the Baltic and Lithuanian tribes, although there were no traces of clashes with them — their way of life was very

different! Especially if we take into account the fact that by that time the Slavyans had already determined the main occupation: agriculture based on farming, together with the beginnings of cattle breeding [9]. And the Balts were still dominated by hunting, fishing, and gathering the gifts of nature.

The Western Slavs began to develop, mostly peacefully too, the territories along the Oder and Elbe, freed after the departure of the Germans to the west, and also in the south — in the Podunavie, where — like in Transnistria — after the collapse of the Hunnish "empire" the Eastern Slavs from the basins of the Pripyat and Desna began to advance here.

By the way, there is a curious opinion that since at that time there were significantly fewer Slavs in the Carpathians and the Pre-Carpathian regions, some remnants of the Geto-Dacian tribes penetrated there, namely the *tribes of the Carps*, which were "squeezed out" from Pannonia by the Visigoths and Vandals who came to the mountainous area — in the Pre-Carpathian region, on the territory of present-day *Galicia*. They managed to establish themselves there for a long time, partially assimilating later with the Slavs.

And, in general, the Eastern Slavs in the beginning of this period "on a level of development appeared lower than in the Roman period", according to P. Tolochko (in [11]), based on the data of archeology. Also he asserted that already in VI—VII centuries several different Slavic (archaeological!) cultures corresponding to different tribes — Antes, and others were formed. But in fact by that time — after the mentioned invasions, the Slavs already had the rudiments of stratification, while in the form of internal structuring, because the tribes mentioned by the historian were already unions of tribes. And even as large as the *Ante union*, which after the Huns' departure had mastered not only the forest-steppe lands, but partially also the steppe lands — from the Podneprovie to the Podonia!

Other tribal unions were smaller, such as the southern ones — the *Tivertsi* and *Ulich* (or *Uglich*), which in the VI century were located along the rivers Tisa, Southern Bug and Dniester, and, apparently, it was them, and perhaps also the *Dulebs*, that Byzantine chronographers united under the name of *Sklavins*. Most of them then were at the initial stage of military democracy, judging by the archaeological data. And all of them were affected by both the onset of cold weather and the subsequent Avar wave of the Great Migration, aimed at Byzantium in the first place, which will be discussed below.

But here it is time to look more closely at this Eastern Roman Empire — the *Byzantine Empire*, which we have touched above only briefly, and it is worth noting at once that current historians and publicists have different opinions about it, and its relations with the Slavs, in particular. It is presented either as the most formidable enemy of the Slavs, or the opposite — that it had no influence on him... And recently we (accidentally!) found in the collection "Poland and Rus'" (M., 1974), in the article of the famous historian V. Pashuto even such an opinion — say, "*Byzantine, Mongolian and other empires... were fragile!*" First of all, as already mentioned, the Byzantine Empire existed for more than a thousand years, until 1453 — such "fragility"! On the other hand, it is surprising how it and the Mongol "empire" can be put in the same row — after all, these formations are fundamentally different! This was discussed in [1b], and in this series we will touch upon this issue.

First of all, the Byzantine Empire should be considered not just as an empire, but as a *separate local civilization* (which was discussed in [1a]), and in general, it is worth looking at it more closely, especially since even during the discussion of the book [1a] there were questions to this topic. The main source on the history of Byzantium for us initially served as "World History" [5, vol. III, ch. V], where the author — Prof. Z. Udaltsova, has presented this material quite well, and here we will only demonstrate how our method allows us to clarify some points from there, especially those related to the Slavs.

And then to demonstrate the role of the latter in the history of Byzantine civilization, and thus in the world history. First of all, the rapidity and easiness with which the separation of the Eastern Roman Empire from the greater Roman Empire took place is striking — it immediately suggests that the line of division between them existed from the very beginning (!), and was, in fact, a civilizational one.

This is confirmed by the outlines of the territory of this new formation, which unites both the territories of the ancient Hellenic civilization, i. e. the southern Balkans, the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands in the Aegean Sea, and the coastal areas of the north-eastern Mediterranean in general (as well as some strongholds of the Black Sea). And also the "post-Macedonian" Hellenistic world (to put it cautiously) — all of Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Egypt and the eastern part of North Africa [1; 5]. But they all existed in unity for centuries before Roman occupation, so it turned out that the Eastern Roman Empire had a much greater (namely, *civilizational!*)

stability, than the "patchwork" Western Empire, which by the beginning of the V century was all located on the Apennine Peninsula, and then dissolved there!

There were also notable differences in the socio-economic structure in these parts, although the basis of it in both was **slavery** (\approx *Slaveowning*). On the one hand, in the east of the Byzantine Empire the Asiatic mode of production was still preserved to a noticeable extent, and on the other hand, in the other regions the forms of the ancient mode of production were already changing (for detailed definitions see [1a], Appendix I.1).

In [5] Prof. Udaltsova describes the situation that had developed there by the IV—VI centuries, which (supposedly) "*in the history of the Eastern Roman Empire was the time of the dissolution of the slave-holding system and the development of elements of feudalism from within the slave-holding society*" (p. 84)! But then she states: "*now the use of slave labor... began to be done mainly by giving the slave equipment and a small plot of land*" (peculium) (all selections are ours. — *Author*).

Despite the fact that the peculium (as well as the slave himself) was legally the property of the master, the situation of the "landed" slave was somewhat improved. Such a slave was allowed to have their own family, they were forbidden to be sold without land, etc. More and more slaves began to be set free, and freedmen (libertines), receiving their freedom, usually remained in personal dependence from their masters" [5, pp. 84—85]. Further describes the situation of the colons, who "*were divided into free and tributary, the so-called enapographers. A free colon, along with land received from a large landowner, could have his own plot of land and his own inventory.*"

However, over time, most of the colons found themselves in the position of enapographers, who owned no land of their own.

Tributary colons in the IV—VI centuries were already attached to land. The children of the enapographers also had no opportunity to leave the estates" (ibid.). So it is asked: does this look like *extinction of the slave system?*!

However, Z. Udaltsova further notes that there are also "more radical points of view" — that allegedly already "as a result of the revolutionary events of the III age becoming leading"! But then she still honestly notes that "the question of the socio-economic structure of sixth-century Byzantium still needs to be thoroughly investigated"! [5].

Of course, it is indisputable that the slave system at that time had already entered the stage of crisis — this is confirmed by a number of popular

movements and uprisings in Byzantium at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, which shook the empire. In addition, let us not forget the invasion of the Ostrogoths, but, nevertheless, all this does not necessarily imply the establishment of the feudal system!

References

1. a) Kravchuk N. V. The Meta- history as a key to comprehension of Human history. Kiev : Stal'. 2022. 132 c.; b) Kravchuk N. V. The birth, rise and fall of the "civilization of the Rossi". Kiev : FS-Center, 2012.
2. The Khazar state and its role in the history of Eastern Europe and the Caucasus : [monograph]. Moscow : Nauka, 1990. 261, [2] p.
3. Sakharov A. N. a) Russia, people, rulers. Moscow : IRI RAN, 2004; b) Diplomacy of Ancient Rus'. Moscow : Mysl, 1980. 383 p.
4. Gogol N. V. Arabesques. Moscow : Molodaya Gvardiya, 1990. 431 p.
5. The World history: in 10 volumes / Ch. ed. Zhukov E. M. Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1957. Vol. 3. 896 p.
6. 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.
7. Essays on the history of Russia / ed. Academie RAS in Ukr. Kyiv : Nika-Center, 2007.
8. From pre-class societies to early class societies : [coll. of articles] / Rybakov B. A. [retd. ed.]. Moscow : Nauka, 1987. 242 p.
9. Sedov V. V. The Old Rus'sian nationality: historical and archaeological research. Moscow : Languages of Russian Culture, 1999. 316 p.
10. Danilevsky N. Ya. Russia and Europe. Moscow : Book, 1991. 577 p.
11. 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.

(Далі буде)

Надійшла до редакції 4.02.2025

ЗА РУБЕЖЕМ



[https://doi.org/10.36273/2076-9555.2025.6\(347\).45-51](https://doi.org/10.36273/2076-9555.2025.6(347).45-51)
УДК 364:07]:314.151.3-054.73(=161.2:437.6)](045)

Вікторія Маркова,

докторка наук із соціальних комунікацій,
професорка кафедри культурології
та медіакомунікацій ХДАК
vicmark777@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9574-6247>

Олександр Суховій,

кандидат філософських наук, доцент,
старший викладач кафедри культурології
та мистецьких дисциплін ХГПА
mirusifter@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7086-8575>

Соціально-гуманітарні аспекти інформаційної допомоги українським біженцям у Словаччині

У статті досліджено систему інформаційної допомоги українським біженцям у Словаччині у вирішенні питань соціально-гуманітарного характеру, яка охоплює діяльність державних структур, комерційних установ, міжнародних і громадських організацій, медіа та соціальних мереж. Розглянуто особливості роботи з надання інформаційної допомоги в офлайн- та онлайн-режимах. Увагу зосереджено на різноманітних інформаційних ресурсах організацій та їх ролі у розв'язанні соціальних і гуманітарних проблем українських біженців.

Констатовано, що інформаційні ресурси організацій і медіа пропонують достовірні відомості, здобуті з офіційних чи перевірених джерел, але, як свідчить дослідження, українські біженці у Словаччині, як і в інших країнах, у пошуку інформації соціально-гуманітарного характеру віддають перевагу соціальним мережам.

Моніторинг соціальних мереж продемонстрував, що найпопулярнішими платформами є Telegram і Facebook, в інформаційному просторі яких функціонують численні групи, канали, чати, що дають українцям змогу долучитися до інформаційної взаємодопомоги.