

Yaryna Turchyn

„Lviv Politechnik” National University
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9114-1911>

Olha Ivasechko

„Lviv Politechnik” National University
ORCID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2141-3309>

Serhij Shelukhin’s Theory of the Celtic Origin of Ukraine-Rus’

Streszczenie: W artykule została przeanalizowana idea państwowości Ukrainy, sposoby i środki walki o jej realizację, poszukiwanie optymalnych form rozwoju państwa, przyczyny utraty niepodległości państwowej Ukrainy w pracach naukowych S. Szeluchina. Określono osobliwości i kluczowe cechy współczesnej neoimperialnej polityki Federacji Rosyjskiej. Określono normańską teorię pochodzenia narodów słowiańskich i miejsce Ukrainy w niej. Opisano podejście rosyjskich unitarian do interpretacji teorii normańskiej. Przeanalizowane zostały podstawowe podejścia do pochodzenia Rusi Kijowskiej, między innymi uzasadniono celtycką teorię pochodzenia narodu ukraińskiego. Opisana została teoria etnogenezy narodu ukraińskiego S. Szeluchina. Uzasadnione zostało stanowisko, zgodnie z którym naród ukraiński jest narodem słowiańskim, do którego przystąpiła pewna liczba przesiedleńców greckich i celtyckich, a także podano fakty świadczące o pokrewieństwie celtycko-ukraińskim. Określono pochodzenie i znaczenie terminów „Rus”, „Ukraina”, „Małorosja”. W podsumowaniu autorki zwracają uwagę, że na obecnym etapie poglądy S. Szeluchina nabierają szczególnego znaczenia, gdyż sam fakt istnienia narodu przesądza o jego prawach do własnej historii politycznej i niezależnej państwowości.

Słowa kluczowe: teoria celtycka, teoria normańska, Serhij Szeluchin, kierunek narodowo-demokratyczny, „Rus”, „Ukraina”, „Małorosja”

Introduction

Ukrainian researchers have always been interested in the origin and formation of the Ukrainian ethnohistorical nation as a prerequisite to the formation of the sovereign political statehood in Ukraine. The well-known Ukrainian scholar I.Lysyak-Rudnytsky refers to the Ukrainian nation as “non-historical” not because it had no historical past at all, but because it experienced deep and long breaks in its development. On the geographical and

political maps of Europe, Ukraine has emerged, then temporarily disappeared from them, and later reappeared in certain modifications of names and borders. I. Lysyak-Rudnytsky designates the issue of the development of the Ukrainian nation as a scientific problem, which gives grounds to claim that the process of restoration and revival of the Ukrainian statehood is quite legitimate¹.

For centuries the Norman theory of the origin of the Slavic peoples has been imposed with political connotation on Ukrainians. Even today, modern Russian researchers consider the Ukrainian question to be a myth, «a diabolical homunculus from the secret laboratories of Bismarck and Moltke, Andrásy and von Götzen» denying the Ukrainian people the right to exist independently»². Some of them, O. Dugin in particular, do not view Ukraine as an independent geopolitical entity, but only as a «border region». According to O. Dugin, Ukraine's sovereignty is «such a negative phenomenon for Russian geopolitics that, in principle, it can easily provoke an armed conflict,» and Ukraine, as an independent state, «poses a great danger to the whole of Eurasia»³. Another Russian author, E. Morozov, believes that the «Ukrainian question» is neither independent nor separate; it is no more than a facet of the Russian question, which is constantly rising nowadays. The very emergence of Ukrainian statehood in the late twentieth century – is just another experiment, irrelevant because, in Morozov's opinion, people who think logically, «are not inclined to expect the resurrection of stillborn and predestined ideologies in political practice»⁴. Therefore, according to E. Morozov, the solution of the «Ukrainian question» lies in the context of resolving the general «Russian question» and eliminating «Ukrainianness» from the ideological space of Russia. In this case, one can agree with the Ukrainian scholar A. Zinchenko that the emergence of such ideas of Russian scholars (first of all, it is about O. Dugin's book) is not a case, but rather a certain synthesis of Russia's public consciousness⁵.

Today representatives of the Russian political elite and scholars directly predicate: «We are stepping forward into our imperial future, whether anyone likes it or not»⁶. In this regard, they emphasize, Russia must ensure the political and military-strategic interests of the state in the south, that is in Ukraine. Because of this, Ukraine cannot objectively be a strategic partner and ally of the Russian state⁷. Particularly striking are the statements of Russian authors that Ukraine is being used by Western powers, especially

¹ I. Lysyak-Rudnytskyi, *Istorychni ese*, "Osnovy", 1994, t. 2, s. 21.

² E. Morozov, N. Ulianov, *V zhelto-holubom tumane*, "Ukraynskyi separatyzm", 2004, s. 9–10.

³ A. Duhyn, *Osnovy heopolytyky. Heopolytycheskoe budushchee Rossyy*, "Arktoheia", 1997, s. 348–349, 463.

⁴ E. Morozov, N. Ulianov, *V zhelto-holubom tumane*, "Ukraynskyi separatyzm", 2004, s. 7.

⁵ A. Zinchenko, *Anhel intehratsii nad absolutnoiu anomalieiu*, "Polityka i chas", 1998, № 8, s. 33–34.

⁶ M. Leontev, *Hrozyl ly Rossyy "oranzhevaia" revoliutsyia?*, "Iauza, Eksmo", 2005, s. 30.

⁷ A. Travnykov, *Kosa Tuzla y stratezhicheskye ynteresy Rossyy*, "Fenyks", 2005, s. 6.

the United States, as a weapon to fight Russia⁸. As a result, Russia's current neo-imperial policy has led to a Russian-Ukrainian conflict that has killed more than 13,000 Ukrainian citizens. This is the largest armed conflict in the European region since the end of World War II. Its preconditions were the statements and positions of the Russian side about the "incomprehensibility" and "illegitimacy" of Ukrainian state independence, since in the Russian consciousness and tradition, Ukraine is only a "suburb" of Greater Russia, which illegally declared its independence in the late twentieth century.

A similar situation occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the Ukrainian people fought for their independence and were forced to repeatedly prove the political and legal basis of their statehood in the international arena. An important role was played by Ukrainian scholars and political practitioners of the interwar period, who developed the concepts of Ukrainian state building. A prominent place in the history of Ukrainian political science is occupied by Serhiy Shelukhin, one of the most famous representatives of the populist-democratic trend, whose name stands next to such notable figures of the Ukrainian national revival of the late 19th – first third of 20th century as M. Hrushevsky, V. Lypynsky, V. Vynnychenko, R. Lashchenko, O. Eichelman, S. Tomashivsky and others. The idea of statehood, ways and means of struggle for its implementation, the search for optimal forms of state development, identifying the reasons that led to the loss of state independence of Ukraine, were central problems in the scientific research of S. Shelukhin.

The purpose of the proposed study is to conceptualize the views of Serhiy Shelukhin on the political and legal basis of Ukrainian state independence based on the analysis of his scientific and theoretical heritage, in particular by revealing the content of the Celtic theory of Ukraine-Rus' origin. The methodological basis of the work stands on the principles of historicism and objectivity, as well as the use of structural-functional, dialectical and concrete-historical analysis, primarily factual research of sources.

Norman theory against the right of the Ukrainians to state self-determination: the view of S. Shelukhin

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, Ukraine as a whole did not exist at all, becoming an object of the policy of neighboring states. That is why Ukrainians were destined to wander incomparably longer than other nations through the labyrinths of centuries before their state independence. It is no coincidence that S. Shelukhin devoted a significant part of his scientific work to substantiating the essence of the Ukrainian people as a separate ethnic and cultural unit.

⁸ M. Leontev, *Vnutrennyi vrah. Parazhencheskaia zlyta hubyt Rossyiu*, "Iauza, Эksmo", 2005, s. 47–49.

As a follower of V. Antonovych, Shelukhin studied the historical and political problems of Ukraine's development from a populist perspective. S. Shelukhin was well aware that the study of the historical past of the Ukrainian people is the starting point for validating the legitimacy of Ukrainian statehood. For decades, opponents of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood, defending their own position, were guided by a strong argument: Ukrainians have not proved their independent historical origin, so they do not have a national identity, history and its «interpretation», and are deprived of their own culture⁹. In this way, restoration opponents formulated and disseminated the idea that Ukrainian independence claims are unsupported, because the history of the Ukrainian people is not the history of a separate nation, but rather a certain fragment of the general historical process.

It is quite obvious, as S. Shelukhin notes, that the main task of Ukrainian scholars is to fulfill their duty to the nation, which will help to discard the anti-state position in its content «imposed ideas»¹⁰. The scholar is quite critical of the Norman theory, emphasizing that it is not of scientific but of political origin. Based on historical facts, the Norman theory distorts and falsifies them, and some of them are completely ignored¹¹. It is evident, as S. Shelukhin emphasizes, that the Norman theory was created from the chaos of political, dynastic, ethnic, geographical and other elements: «For Muscovites, where there are Normans, there is their tribal unity ..., for in the Moscow imagination Normanism even formally transforms everyone into “a single Russian nation”¹². S. Shelukhin emphasizes that the Norman theory additionally denied the right of the Ukrainian people to independent origin and independent development. According to S. Shelukhin, Russian governments impose the idea that Kyivan Rus' began its state existence only in 862, thanks to its northern neighbors. Hence the statement of Russia's domination over Ukraine was put forward, a monopoly of political power of the North over the South was established, and the historical rights of the Ukrainian people to their own statehood were rejected¹³.

For the Normanists, the researcher notes, the year 862 became a kind of barrier to which history simply did not exist. This scheme of historical development was artificially composed based on the kinship of the dynasty of princes of Rus'. S. Shelukhin states that according to this theory, «Rus' – is the princes of Scandinavia, and the history of Rus'

⁹ S. Shelukhin, *Krytyka novoho naukovoho pidruchnyka istorii Ukrainy*, s. 28.

¹⁰ *Ibidem*, s. 115.

¹¹ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 3.

¹² S. Shelukhin, *Krytyka novoho naukovoho pidruchnyka istorii Ukrainy*, s. 116.

¹³ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 4.

– is the history of those princes, but the people do not have their own history»¹⁴. According to him, by uniting the princely families, the Unitarians proclaimed not only the unity of «Kyiv» and «Moscow» history but also the fictitious existence of a single Rus' nation, the foundation for which they considered only the «Moscow people» with their monopoly on «Russianness»¹⁵. S. Shelukhin repeatedly emphasizes that the history of Ukraine is not the history of princes. He points out that Russian historians have tried to «... tie Kyiv to Moscow and melt down the history of Ukraine in its history»¹⁶. This approach to the study of history doomed the Ukrainian Slavic people «to the deprivation of their rights and the destruction of their history, culture, civilization, and freedom»¹⁷.

The Norman theory interpreted the history of each nation exclusively as an object, but not a subject of socio-political development, although each nation and the Ukrainian in particular, created its own history long before 862. Awareness of this fact, as the scholar emphasizes, is the basis for recognizing the political rights to self-determination of each nation, while for the Unitarians the history of each nation is separatism and political crime¹⁸. Using for a certain purpose the ideas of the Norman theory, the Unitarians claimed that the Ukrainian people do not exist and had never existed, and therefore there could be no grounds for their state self-determination.

The basis of Norman's theory is the domination of «Moscow-Russian political unitarism», emphasizes S. Shelukhin, according to which the only Rus' nation was considered the natural integration of one nation with one language, culture, law, history, ethnographic and cultural identities¹⁹. Russian Unitarians argued that the «Rus' people» were the only nation that included Ukrainians, Belarusians, Russians, Finns, Mongols, Jews, Greeks, Germans, and other nationalities with the prospect of including all Slavs through incorporation and assimilation. Analyzing a similar definition of the «Rus' people», S. Shelukhin states that: «All these peoples in a single Rus' nation are thought to be merged as an anthropological, natural, national, linguistic, legal, cultural, and historical integrality... All their past, even if it does not remind of any particularity, is being destroyed, ignored, and recognized as non-existent»²⁰. Therefore, the Russian Unitarians proclaimed the monopoly of the «Moscow nation», gave it the status of a single authentic, official state with unlimited right to govern the socio-political life and development of other peoples. The scholar is of the opinion that due to this, any manifestations of something autonomous,

¹⁴ Ibidem.

¹⁵ Ibidem, s.5.

¹⁶ S. Shelukhin, *Pro Rus*, «Ukrainskyi Holos», 1928, 6 chervnia.

¹⁷ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 5.

¹⁸ Ibidem.

¹⁹ TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.94, ark. 5.

²⁰ Ibidem.

national, other than «Moscow» is considered a crime and must be immediately destroyed as being anti-state, anti-social, and anti-national²¹.

The conceptual principles of S. Shelukhin's theory of Celtic origin of Rus'

S. Shelukhin repeatedly emphasizes that the issue of the origin of Rus' is important not only for Ukrainian history, but also for Slavic and world history. One of the major stages in the development of Ukrainian statehood, the formation of its culture, civilization and independence is connected with the history of the origin of Rus'. Scientific knowledge about the origin of Kyivan Rus' and its contribution to the culture and history of the Ukrainian people, the researcher emphasized, is crucial in the study of Ukrainian history, state, civil, criminal, international, and procedural law since ancient times²².

S. Shelukhin's socio-political views are based on his theory of the Celtic origin of Rus'. After analyzing the works of such famous scholars as M. Kostomarov and M. Hrushevsky, the scholar concludes that they could not bring to a logical conclusion their own theories due to lack of chronic-historical data²³. In substantiating the Celtic theory of the origin of the Ukrainian people, S. Shelukhin starts from the hypothesis of M. Hrushevsky, who in his work «On the threshold of a new Ukraine» notes that Ukrainian culture was in close connection with the «Celtic culture of the Danube», the culture of Mithridates, and the coast of Pontus. «As early as the end of the 16th century,» states M. Hrushevsky, «the papal nuncio Komulovych was told about the great and strong»Rus'»» Ruthenorum»population in the vicinity of the Lower Danube»²⁴. S. Shelukhin totally agrees with M. Hrushevsky that Ukrainian culture is a culture of a Western European type and is in close connection with Celtic and Greek culture²⁵. The influence of Celtic culture on the Ukrainian nation came directly through the Celts, not through the Germans, according to M. Hrushevsky.

Based on the work of the VIth century (Jordan, Procopius) and facts about the settlement of Slavs from the Pre-Danube region, which are discussed in the Kyiv Chronicle, S. Shelukhin upholds his own theory of the ethnogenesis of the Ukrainian nation. He considers the history of the Ukrainian people as the development of a separate ethnic and cultural unit, which has its origins in the Celts-Ruthenians who lived on the territory of modern southern France. According to the scholar, Celtic Rus' in Gaul

²¹ Ibidem, ark. 6.

²² S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 12.

²³ TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.89, ark. 9.

²⁴ M. Hrushevskiyi, *Na porozhi novoi Ukrainy*, «Naukova dumka», 1991, s. 13, 17–18.

²⁵ S. Shelukhin, *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv*, s. 94.

(modern France) existed before our era, and this territory was called Rutheni, Rusyns (Ruthenians), Rus, Rus', and in Greek pronunciation – Ros. He states that it: "... had its state from the OltaRiver, now Lot, south to the Mediterranean Sea. This is Provence in present-day France. The state was called Ruthena Civitas"²⁶.

Ruthenians are one of the Celtic tribes that lived in southern Gaul. S. Shelukhin notes that they led the same socio-political life as the Celts. Society was divided into three classes: Druids – a class of educated people who understood the matters of religion, justice, moral norms and public education; horsemen and plebs – classes of ordinary people. They had well-formed and developed religious ideas: the Celtic-Ruthenians believed in the existence of the afterlife world and the immortality of the soul, had a well-formed pantheon of deities, and made human sacrifices. By occupation, they were warriors, farmers, cattlemen, and merchants. Once a year, the tribe elected a representative with organizational and managerial functions.

S. Shelukhin deduces the location of the Celts on the basis of the Kyiv chronicle and his own hypothesis about the location of the Varangian Sea. In particular, the scholar notes, the chronicle states that the Varangian Sea surrounds the land, which was inhabited by Swedes, Normans, Goths, Rus' people, Englishmen, Galicians, Italians, Romans, etc. Therefore, S. Shelukhin concludes that the Varangian Sea is the Mediterranean Sea, since all the nationalities listed by the chronicler lived in this particular area. Thus, the chronicler calls the Gauls Galicians and identifies the territory of their stay near the Varangian Sea, that is in modern France. Here, S. Shelukhin notes, in the south of Gaul the Celtic people lived, whom Julius Caesar and others called «Rutheni, Rusyns, Rus'»²⁷. As early as the first century BC, Julius Caesar wrote that the name «Celts» in Roman sounds like «Galli», which means «rooster», which in the ancient Celts was endowed with a cult meaning.

Thus, the researcher continues, the Kyiv chronicler called the Varangian Sea not only the sea, but also the whole system of sea waters of Western Europe, including the Mediterranean Sea. He also called the Celts and Gauls as Varangians, who were located on the Mediterranean coast, engaged in maritime trade and had their own colonies on the shores of this sea in Africa. Instead, the Greeks, says S. Shelukhin, called the Celts «Galatians». Already in the VIth century B.C. the entire northern shore of the Mediterranean was sown by Greek colonies in southern Gaul. The Greeks were neighbors of the Celts, and maintained trade, military, and cultural ties with them. They also had their colonies on the territory of modern Ukraine: Olbia on the banks of the Bug River and Ofisa on the banks of the Dniester River.

²⁶ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 117.

²⁷ *Ibidem*, s. 15.

Describing the march of Kyivan Rus' to the Khazars, the Arab writer Al Mukadesi noted: "The people of Rum, which is called Rus"²⁸. In this case, the writer meant the people who lived in southern Gaul and were called Ruthenians. According to S. Shelukhin, the word "Rum" translated from Arabic is the name of the Roman Empire. Guided by the work of Al Mukadesi, one can assume that he wrote that the roots of Kievan Rus went back to the Roman Empire. Proof of this is the content of "Rus' Truth", which, according to the scholar, "more than once breathes Roman law". In addition to the undeniable influence of Roman law on Cossack culture, writes S. Shelukhin, we must also remember the existence of many rules of customary law, common to both Ukrainians and Romans.

In Attila's time, according to S. Shelukhin, the Celts-Ruthenians were forced to migrate en masse to the Roman province of Noricum (now Salzburg in Austria). «Having settled down there, the scholar writes, in the Pre-Danube region, in Pannonia, in the Pre-Adriatic, they met Slavs in new places: Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Czechs, Slovaks. Having strengthened themselves through marriage with the Slavic tribes of the Adriatic Slavic race, to which the Antes belonged, these Celts-Ruthenians were forced to travel down the Danube for a while, until at the end of the VIIth or beginning of the VIIIth century they reached the Sea of Azov, crossed the Don River and encamped on the island of Taman, establishing the state of Tmutarakan' on the Taman Peninsula»²⁹. It was there, according to the scholar, that Black Sea Rus' was founded, which later migrated to the territory inhabited by Polyany (Glades). There were about a hundred thousand Celts-Ruthenians who settled down on the island of Taman. Based on the works of Arab writers, S. Shelukhin notes that from the end of the VIIIth century they took part in large military campaigns on Surozh and Amastra, which brought them the glory of a great nation (even the Black and Azov Seas began to be called the Rus' Seas).

Due to trade and military relations, the Celts became even more Slavic, and in the IXth century a significant part of them moved to the Polyany land in Kyiv, to the territory of modern Ukraine, inhabited by the Antes. The Celts-Ruthenians moved to Kyiv as a whole, not as a single wave, as proponents of the Norman theory claim. The scholar states: "... here the Rus' people joined the Slavic Ukrainian mass of Polyany and reformed the Kyiv state under the name of the Rus' State, giving it its name after their former Gallic state in the south of France"³⁰. Therefore, says S. Shelukhin, Ruthenians of the Vth century and the Ruthenians of Oleg, Volodymyr, and Igor are "traditionally one and

²⁸ Ibidem, s. 34.

²⁹ S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovii leksii do kursu "Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu"*, "Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho Robitnyka", s. 29.

³⁰ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 118.

the same"³¹. Documentary facts show, the researcher notes, that the Ruthenians and Rus' in Provence, Noricum and Kyiv are one and the same people of Celtic (Gallic) origin.

Thus, the Ruthenian Celts, who migrated from Provence to the territory of modern Ukraine, had already found the state of the Antes in Kyiv. S. Shelukhin writes that in the IVth century our Antes ancestors lived their own state life: Antes-Ukrainians had their own territory and power, and acted independently in international relations. Contrary to the theory of a triune Rus', he argues that the Ukrainian people are Slavic, to whom a number of Greek and Celtic migrants have joined. According to the scholar, there are many facts that prove the Celtic-Ukrainian kinship. Thus, it was the Celts who brought to Ukraine Gallic swords with the sign of the trident, which became a symbol of the Ukrainian nation; both the Celts and the Ukrainians have a cult of the rooster, etc³². The rest of the Celts-Ruthenians from the Roman province of Noricum migrated up to the Carpathians and the river Zbruch and settled down on the territory of Galychyna. After assimilating with the local Slavic population, they brought their own tribal names of the Gauls, Galychyna, and Galiciato this region³³.

The scholar also explains the origin of our ancestors – the Antes. The oldest information about Ukraine, he points out, dates back to the times of ancient Greek historians, geographers and poets. Herodotus left a lot of historical data about the past of the Ukrainian people in his work «History of Herodotus of Halicarnassus». This work states that the territory, which roughly corresponded to the modern ethnographic territory of Ukraine and had the shape of a quadrangle, was called Scythia. It stretched from west to east (approximately from the Prut River to the Don River) and south to the Black Sea. The northern boundary of this territory was not clearly defined. Herodotus pointed out that the ruling tribe in this area was the «Royal Scythians»³⁴. According to archeologists and historians, as S. Shelukhin notes, Slavs, who were ancient ancestors of the Ukrainian people, lived on the lands from the west to the Dnieper River and on its left side. According to the researcher, Greeks and Celts, as well as Slavs from the Pre-Danube region, assimilated with these nationalities.

The Byzantine historian Procopius, the researcher continues, in his works of 550–554 years notes that the Antes lived on the territory of Ukraine in the III century. This was a one-tribal nation with the Slavs. They came from the Danube and spread across the Dnieper River to the Sea of Azov. «They lived in the neighborhood of the Slavs,» says S. Shelukhin, «their language was common to them, life and beliefs were the same, the system was also the same – veche, democratic, but they were two different peoples»³⁵.

³¹ Ibidem, s. 27.

³² Ibidem, s. 70.

³³ Ibidem, s. 118.

³⁴ S. Shelukhin, *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv*, s. 97.

³⁵ Ibidem, s. 100.

Greek Mauritius in a military treatise of the late VIth century emphasized that the Slavs and Antes were freedom-loving, they were not subject to slavery and domination over them. In the VIth century a war broke out between them, in which the Slavs defeated the Antes. The works of Procopius and Jordan also refer to the campaigns of the Antes in Macedonia, Thrace, Illyria in the IVth – VIth centuries. According to S. Shelukhin, the Antes either completely merged with the Ukrainian Slavs into an anthropological whole, or merged with Rus', which was of the same Celtic origin³⁶.

Referring to the work of Professor V. Danylynych, S. Shelukhin states that the territory of Ukraine was inhabited by the Slavic people with an admixture of ancient Greek culture. This is evidenced by anthropological data and funeral ritualism. He also points out that there were no Muscovites in this area: geometric ornaments on the dishes were made only in Ukrainian style. At the same time, there were no Finnish ornaments (depicting animals) either³⁷.

The connection of the Slavic people with the Greek is clearly shown in the already mentioned writing of Herodotus, where he calls the blond, blue-eyed people "budins" ("woodins"). He also indicated the boundaries of their location: the approximate territory of modern Kharkiv, Poltava, Chernihiv, Kyiv, and Volyn regions. Most likely, the scholar continues, the Gelons (Greeks), natives of Greek cities, came here by the Dniester River. Here they founded a city called Gelon. Professor O. Nadezhdin, emphasizes S. Shelukhin, even notes that this city could be Kyiv. Based on the documentary evidence of Herodotus, he states: "... the Gelons were denationalized because they merged with the native population. They spoke two languages – Scythian and Greek, but mixed ..." ³⁸.

Thus, the Celts-Ruthenians, migrating from the territory of Provence, have already found the state of the Antes in Kyiv. They made significant changes in their social organization, which gave a significant impetus to the development of Kyiv civilization. After removing the local Slavic princes from power, the Ruthenians seized both the Polyany land and Kyiv. At the same time, the scholar notes that they brought social, legal and military-organizational changes to the structure of that time Ukrainian statehood, and raised it to a new level: "Rus' raised Ukrainian statehood to the heights of one of the most influential in Europe. Sweden, England, France, Byzantium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary etc. were dynastically related to Kyiv" ³⁹.

According to S. Shelukhin, already in the Xth – XIth centuries Ukraine became a powerful European country, occupying the territory from the Caucasus to the Car-

³⁶ Ibidem.

³⁷ Ibidem.

³⁸ Ibidem, s. 97.

³⁹ S. Shelukhin, *Istorychno-pravovi pidstavy ukrainskoi derzhavnosti*, "Studentskyi visnyk", 1929, ch. 1–2, s. 2–11.

pathians. During this period, it had several names: the popular name «Ukraine» and the princely names – «Kyiv state», «Rus'», «Russia», «Sarmatia», and «Roksolyania». The Ukrainian state had close relations with European countries. The researcher reinforces his hypotheses with factual material: Prince Yaroslav's daughters were married to the kings of France, Norway, and Hungary, and his wife was a Swedish princess; Prince Yaroslav's sister was married to the Polish king. The scholar believes that the status of that time, Ukraine as a highly developed European country, is evidenced by its relations with Byzantium, with which it concluded trade agreements in 912 and 945⁴⁰.

At the same time, S. Shelukhin argues that the Moscow state, which appropriated the name Russia only in the XVIIth century, did not exist at that time. In particular, he notes that «the Ukrainian people are of prehistoric origin and history has found it at a fairly high level of culture», while «the Moscow people are a product of the historical era of late origin, a new phenomenon in the eyes of history»⁴¹. Historical facts indicate that the people who lived to the north and east of Ukraine and today are called Russian, at that time did not have a common name. Tribal areas gave the name to the population, which became inhabitants of Rostov, Murom, Suzdal, Volodymyr etc. It was a population of Finnish-Mongol tribes who mixed with the Slavs and formed a nation what is now called Russian. In contrast, the scholar emphasizes, the Ukrainian people do not contain admixtures of Finnish-Mongol tribes⁴². Rebutting the Norman theory, he repeatedly underscores that the history of each nation is interesting only when it is independent⁴³. Therefore, S. Shelukhin pays special attention to the study of psychological characteristics of Ukrainians and Russians.

According to the researcher, the data of anthropological science show that on these grounds the Ukrainian people belong to the Adriatic (Dinaric) Slavic race. Referring to the research of his predecessors – V. Antonovych and M. Volodymyrsky-Budanov, S. Shelukhin proves that “Russian Truth” has much in common with the law of the Slavs of the Adriatic or Dinaric race⁴⁴. The scholar closely connects the origin of the Ukrainian people with the history of other Slavs of the Adriatic group – Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Slovaks, Czechs, on whose territory, “Celtic peoples have been constantly moving, living and mixing since ancient times. The Slavs of the Adriatic race occupied the lands of the Adriatic Sea along the Danube to the northeast, ending in the Dnieper on both sides and spreading to the Vistula»⁴⁵. He cites other evidence of the Ukrainian nation's belonging

⁴⁰ S. Shelukhin, *Vyznannia Ukrainskoi Respubliki Rosiieiu*, “Na perelomi”, 1920, ch. 1, s. 23.

⁴¹ TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.89, ark. 14.

⁴² S. Shelukhin, *Vyznannia Ukrainskoi Respubliki Rosiieiu*, “Na perelomi”, 1920, ch. 1, s. 23.

⁴³ S. Shelukhin, *Krytyka novoho naukovoho pidruchnyka istorii Ukrainy*, s. 20.

⁴⁴ V. Potulnytskyi, *Istoriia ukrainskoi politolohii (Kontseptsii derzhavnosti v ukrainskii zarubizhni istoriko-politychnii nausti)*, “Lybid”, 1992, s. 71–72.

⁴⁵ S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovi leksii do kursu “Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu”*, “Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho Robitnyka”, s. 57.

to the Adriatic group of peoples. For example, in Serbia, a region which is located in its northeastern part near the Danube River, is called Krajina, Vkrājina; in Bosnia, the district near the Vrbas River with the town of Bigach is also called Vkrājina. These names unite the Ukrainian people with the Pre-Adriatic and the Pre-Danube regions, where the lands acquired by the sword and for which it was necessary to wage wars are called «Krajinas»⁴⁶.

Addressing the issue of the origin of the Russian people, S. Shelukhin refers them to the Vistula Slavic group. In his statements, the scholar refers to similar opinions of French anthropologists Deniker, Ali, geographer Reclus, as well as chronicles. In the chronicle of Nestor it is mentioned how the brothers Vyatko and Radym went with their families from the Poles along the Oka River and formed the Radymychi and Vyatychi. In addition to this Polish connection, the northern Slavs mingled with the Finns and the Ural Mongols. However, the Ukrainian people do not have these impurities of foreign blood, which divides Russians and Ukrainians into two different nations⁴⁷. It is this view that the researcher defends in a polemic with Academician S. Rudnytsky, who attributes the Russians not to the Vistula anthropological race, where he places the Poles, but to the Oriental⁴⁸.

At the same time, S. Shelukhin admits that Ukrainians, Russians, Czechs, Poles, Serbs and other peoples are of Slavic origin, and that there is also much in common between Ukrainians and Russians. The difference between them is a consequence of assimilation with other peoples: the Great Russian nation – with the Finnish-Mongols, and the Ukrainian nation – with the Celts. However, S. Shelukhin emphasizes, each nation introduced in this process its own language, its own psychological features, which influenced the formation of a new nation, its psychology, language, and culture⁴⁹. In a similar way, from one root, two different peoples were formed – Russian and Ukrainian, but they, as S. Shelukhin emphasizes, «parted ways in prehistoric times and through a long historical process formed a separate nation, as a national identity with its own language»⁵⁰.

In the theory of the Celtic origin of Rus', the researcher proves that the Ukrainian nation belongs to the Adriatic Slavic group, and its history begins before 862. Rus' occupied the territory in southern Gaul in Provence; therefore, states S. Shelukhin: «The history of the Ukrainian people up to 800 years can not be called the history of Rus', as well as

⁴⁶ Ibidem, s. 37.

⁴⁷ S. Shelukhin, *Lyst do redaktsii (Z pryvodu lysta S. Rudnytskoho "Chomu tse tak?")*, "Volia", 1920, ch. 3, s. 15.

⁴⁸ V. Potulnytskyi, *Istoriia ukrainskoi politolohii (Kontseptsii derzhavnosti v ukrainskii zarubizhnii istoriiko-politychnii nauksi)*, "Lybid", 1992, s. 72.

⁴⁹ TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.46, ark. 197.

⁵⁰ Ibidem, ark. 205.

Moscow history until the XVIIIth century can not be called the history of Rus'»⁵¹. The Norman theory, in his opinion, has no scientific basis, because it does not show the life of the Slavic tribes before the arrival of the Varangians. This is advantageous to Russian imperial historiography, because at that time only savage Finno-Ugric tribes with admixture of Slavs roamed the expanses of the Moscow state⁵².

An analysis of S. Shelukhin's scientific works, which reveal the content of the Celtic theory of the origin of Rus' and are based on documentary sources, as well as numerous works of historians, philologists, linguists, showed that the Ukrainian people are Slavic people to whom a number of Greek and Celtic migrants infused. At the same time, according to S. Shelukhin, the history of the Ukrainian people is not the history of Celtic Rus' and princes of Rus'. Undoubtedly, the Celts made significant state changes, expanding the cultural achievements of the Ukrainian people. However, the scholar states, the Ukrainian people "had enough spiritual strength and culture to take the best from this Rus', and to pass on their best to it, and to merge with the Ruthenians and assimilate them freely so that those Ruthenians became the mass of the Ukrainian people, making appropriate changes to them"⁵³.

S. Shelukhin on the origin of the terms "Russia", "Ukraine", Malorisia ("Little Russia") in substantiation of political and legal bases of Ukrainian statehood

S. Shelukhin devoted a significant part of his scientific work to study the origin and meaning of the terms «Rus'», «Ukraine», and «Malorisia» («Little Russia»). Emphasizing the topicality of the problem, he emphasizes that in order to destroy a nation, its national name must be completely destroyed⁵⁴. The historical name of each nation is its political passport among other nations; it is what distinguishes it in the world.

The origin of the name «Rus'» is the greatest mystery in the history of Ukraine, which so far cannot be considered completely solved. For a long time scholars have been trying to single out several main hypotheses that explain its meaning: the word «Rus'» is of Finnish origin (V. Tatishchev, 1739), Hungarian (P. Yurkevych, 1867), Lithuanian (M. Kostomarov, 1860)⁵⁵. This list also includes S. Shelukhin's theory of the origin of the national name, which is based on the idea of the Celtic origin of Ukraine-Rus'.

⁵¹ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s.12.

⁵² V. Potulnytskyi, *Istoriia ukrainskoi politolohii (Kontseptsii derzhavnosti v ukrainskii zarubizhnii istoriko-politychnii nauksi)*, "Lybid", 1992, s. 71.

⁵³ S. Shelukhin, *Pro Rus*, "Ukrainskyi Holos", 1928, 6 chervnia.

⁵⁴ S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovi leksii do kursu "Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu"*, "Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho Robitnyka", s. 6.

⁵⁵ M. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Istoriia Ukrainy*, "Ukrainske vydavnytstvo", 1972, t. 1, s. 79–80.

After the conquest of Gaul by Julius Caesar, S. Shelukhin notes, «in their metropolis, in their homeland, in southern Gaul, the Ruthenians were a nation of three cultures: Celtic, Greek and Roman. Roman culture prevailed over all others in language, law, and science»⁵⁶. According to the researcher, having come to Kyiv, Celtic Rus' had already found Ukrainian statehood and founded a new one according to its own model. The «Celts-Ruthenians» assigned the Kyiv state the state name of the old metropolis – Rus', and the name Ruthenian they assigned to the Rus' people. Behind the Zbruch River, S. Shelukhin continues, they assigned the Ukrainian people their tribal common name of the Celtic territory – Galicia, Galychyna, Galici, Galicians⁵⁷.

In contrast, according to S. Shelukhin, the Moscow people adopted the name “Rus” from the Ukrainian people only in the XVIIIth century owing to the title of their tsar. This fact, like many others, is a clear proof of “how the ruling people appropriate the name of defeated people with insidious political goals of exploiter, assimilator, and oppressor”⁵⁸. To satisfy their political ambitions, the Moscow people renounced their own historical name and adopted the name of the Rus' people. Referring to the common name, the policy of the Moscow government was to destroy everything Ukrainian. It is the confusion in the perception of the name Rus'ky (that belongs to Rus') as Moskovsky (that belongs to Moscow), points out S. Shelukhin, gave rise to the political myth of the existence of a “single Rus' nation”, which allegedly represents the “unity of Ukrainians, Russians and Belarusians”⁵⁹.

Moscow's policy, according to S. Shelukhin, was aimed at the deliberate use of someone else's name “Rus”. Thus, in 1713, Prince Menshikov, by order of Tsar Peter I, wrote to A. Dolgorukov, the Russian ambassador to Copenhagen: “In all the records, our state is mentioned as Moscow state, and not Russian state, and for the sake of that, if you please, you should prevent this, so that they must write Russian state, and about this it has already been announced to the rest”⁶⁰. Later, because of this policy of the Russian government, the “Finnish-Mongol people of Russia” became known as the Slavic people.

At the same time, they tried to view Ukraine not as a separate state, but only as a suburb of Russia. According to S. Shelukhin, Prince O. Volkonsky published a large number of publications in different languages, where he tried to convince everyone that the name “Ukraine” means the outskirts of Russia, a certain part of it. Such literature spread doubts in society about the right of the Ukrainian people to their own name, political statehood,

⁵⁶ S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovii leksii do kursu “Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu”*, “Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho Robitnyka”, s. 12.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, s. 30–31.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, s. 4.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁰ S. Shelukhin, *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv*, s. 145.

and ethnocultural independence, and highlighted the Ukrainian liberation movement as a manifestation of separatism directed against the “rights of the Moscow people”⁶¹.

The name “Ukraine”, according to S. Shelukhin, is no less ancient than the name “Rus”. He notes that there is a large moral difference between the names “Ukraine”, “Rus” and “Russia”. The name “Rus” is a concept that reveals the socio-political organization of aliens, it: “... forced the Slavic states to submit, deprived of freedom, destroyed independence, did not liberate anyone and imposed its name to the forced Slavs and other peoples as a political definition of dependence on the enslaver and being under the yoke of aliens or the ruling class”⁶². According to the findings of S. Shelukhin, it took 400 years for the name “Rus” to take root and become more or less common⁶³. The name “Ukraine” is a term formed by the Ukrainian people to describe themselves and their territory, freedom, independence, and the struggle against invaders.

Russian scholars have claimed that the land that lies “at the edge” (“u” means “near”, “kraj” means “edge”) of a certain territory is “ukrajina” of this territory. However, S. Shelukhin notes, in the Ukrainian language such land is called “okrajina” (outskirts), not “ukrajina”. The Ukrainian language also does not use the term “u kraja” (“at the edge” of something), but uses “skraju”, “o kraj”, “o kraji”. Therefore, it is impossible to interpret the Ukrainian word “Ukraine” as from “at the edge”⁶⁴. Thus, he concludes, it is impossible to find an explanation of the word “Ukraine” in the Russian language from the expression “at the edge”, because in this case the form “Vkrajina” is ignored⁶⁵. Based on national folklore, the scholar claims that the name “Ukraine” was used to mean a separate land, with a separate nation, at the edge, but not as an “outskirts” of another land with its population. The words “Vkrajina” and “Ukrajina” (“Ukraine”), to the conviction of S. Shelukhin, have one and the same meaning in the Ukrainian language. The replacement of the letter “V” with “U” is done solely for the sake of the melody of the language, but the meaning of the word does not change⁶⁶.

Analyzing the cartographic material (almost 50 ancient maps of the XVIth – XIXth centuries) and using chronicle data, S. Shelukhin comes to the following conclusions: 1) on the Italian and French maps of the XVIth century (1508 – 1580) the territory of Ukraine is called Sarmatia, Rus’ (Russia) and Ukraine; 2) on the Italian, Dutch, English and French geographical maps of the XVIIth century the territory of modern Ukraine

⁶¹ Ibidem, s. 16.

⁶² Ibidem, s. 247.

⁶³ Ibidem, s. 65.

⁶⁴ Ibidem, s. 7.

⁶⁵ Ibidem, s. 95.

⁶⁶ S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929, s. 116.

is called Ukraine, and Eastern Galicia is mentioned as part of Ukraine or Rus' (Russia); 3) up to the XVIIIth century the territory of Russia on the mentioned maps is called exclusively Muscovy, and not Rus' or Russia. The name Russia instead of Muscovy is used only since the XVIIIth century; 4) the name of Little Russia or Malorosiadoes not exist on the maps of the XVIth, XVIIth, and XVIIIth centuries; 5) ancient geographers also called the territory of Ukraine Sarmatia, Rusia, Red Rusia. Muscovy did not bear any of this name. Therefore, Ukraine and Muscovy are two different states, each with its own name, socio-political life, territory, border; 6) Ukraine in the IXth century was already a formed state (in historical remembrances the name «Ukraine» was first used in 1187. At that time, Moscow statehood did not exist at all); 7) French, German, Italian, English, Dutch geographers marked the territory of Ukraine as «Ukraine» in the XVIth, XVIIth, and XVIIIth centuries and used it as a permanent, inherent in a certain area, which changed its scope depending on historical conditions. However, the name «Ukraine» for ethnographic territories remained unchanged. This name has an international application as the name of a certain territory, not the outskirts or borderline. «Ukraine», emphasizes S. Shelukhin, is its land and people in the borders from Muscovy to Poland, Hungary, etc. This name is popular and has been used in written records since 1187.

As for the term «Malorosiia», the scientist notes, it was introduced by the Greeks in 1303: the Galician, Volyn, and Kyiv lands, that is the lands of the native, main Rus' were called Little Russia (Malorosiia). And the northern territories formed as a result of the Kyivan colonization of Rus' were called Great Russia⁶⁷. In his opinion, this was the administrative division of parishes by the clergy, which were subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople. S. Shelukhin concludes that the name 'Little Russia' is borrowed, artificial, church-book. It was created and used mainly by the clergy to organize the Orthodox Church. Thus, «every Little Russian is a Ukrainian, and every Ukrainian is a Little Russian»⁶⁸.

Conclusions

Thus, the analysis of the writings of the scholar certifies that the Ukrainian people are the Slavic people, to which a certain number of Greek and Celtic migrants joined. S. Shelukhin considers the history of the Ukrainian people, in contrast to the Norman theory, as the development of a separate ethnic and cultural unit, which originates from the Celts-Ruthenians who lived on the territory of modern France. Studying historical facts, the scholar proves that the history of the Ukrainian nation begins much earlier than 862, as claimed by representatives of the Moscow historical school. He points out that Celtic

⁶⁷ S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovii leksii do kursu "Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu"*, "Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho Robitnyka", s.54.

⁶⁸ S. Shelukhin, *Ukrayntsy, russkye, malorossy. Otkrytoe pismo h. Shulhynu u ego edynomyshlennykam*, "Ukraynskaia zhyzn", 1916, ch. 7–8, s. 74.

Rus', which came to Ukraine at the end of the VIIth or the beginning of the VIIIth century, has already found Ukrainian statehood. After removing the local Slavic princes from power, the Ruthenians seized the Polyany land and Kyiv. At the same time, the scholar admits that they brought social, legal and military-organizational changes in the structure of Ukrainian statehood, raising it to a new level. According to him, Ukrainians, along with Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Slovaks and Czechs, belong to the Adriatic Slavic group. Hence, S. Shelukhin substantiates the right of Ukrainians to independent development, arguing that already in the IVth century they lived their state life: anti-Ukrainians had their own territory and power, acted independently in international relations. The right of the Ukrainian people to independent existence is substantiated by the historical name of its state – "Ukraine". According to the scholar, it does not mean the Russian outskirts, but is the name of the territory, which is inhabited by a certain nation, with clearly defined territorial boundaries.

For decades, the Norman theory of a united Rus' has been spreading and imposing itself, denying the independent history of the Ukrainian people while destroying their rights to an independent state. That is why the idea of nationality, which drew S. Shelukhin's attention to the history of the Ukrainian people as a separate ethnocultural unit, led him to substantiate the idea of historical and legal foundations of this people for their independence and their own statehood. Substantiation by the scholar of historical and legal grounds for the restoration of Ukrainian statehood in the XXth century research was conducted in two aspects: the study of the nation-genesis of Ukrainians (the theory of the Celtic origin of Rus') and proving the legitimacy of the existence of Ukrainian statehood from a legal position. It should be acknowledged that the scientific works of S. Shelukhin provided extremely rich and valuable material for the study of the history of the Ukrainian people and its geographical neighbors.

Bibliografia

Źródła archiwalne

TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.46, ark. 197.

TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.89, ark. 14.

TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.89, ark. 9.

TsDAVOU, F. 3695, op.1, spr.94, ark. 5.

Opracowania

A. Duhyn, *Osnovy heopolytyky. Heopolytycheskoe budushchee Rossyy*, "Arktoheia", 1997, s. 348–349, 463.

- A. Zinchenko, *Anhel intebratsii nad absolutnoiu anomalieiu*, "Polityka i chas", 1998, № 8, s. 33–34.
- A. Travnykov, *Kosa Tuzla y stratehycheskye ynteresy Rossyy*, "Fenyks", 2005, s. 6.
- V. Potulnytskyi, *Istoriia ukrainskoi politolohii (Kontseptsii derzhavnosti v ukrainskii zarubizhnii istoryko-politychnii nautsi)*, "Lybid", 1992, s. 71–72.
- E. Morozov, N. Ulianov, *V zhelto-holubom tumane, "Ukraynskyi separatyzm"*, 2004, s. 7; 9–10.
- I. Lysiak-Rudnytskyi, *Istorychni ese, "Osnovy"*, 1994, T.2, s. 21.
- M. Hrushevskiy, *Na porozi novoi Ukrainy*, "Naukova dumka", 1991, s. 13, 17–18.
- M. Leontev, *Vnutrennyi vrah. Parazhencheskaia zlyta hubyt Rossyiu*, "Iauza, Эксмо", 2005, s. 47–49.
- M. Leontev, *Hrozyt ly Rossyy "oranzhevaia" revoliutsyia?*, "Iauza, Эксмо", 2005, s. 30.
- M. Polonska-Vasylenko, *Istoriia Ukrainy*, "Ukrainske vydavnytstvo", 1972, t. 1, s. 79–80.
- N. Yakovenko, *Narysy istorii Ukrainy z naidavnishykh chasiv do kintsia KhVIII st, "Henezha"*, 1997, s. 9–11; Ye. Nakonechnyi, *Ukradene imia (Chomu rusyny staly ukrainsiamy)*, "Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy", 1995, 126 s.
- S. Shelukhyn, *Ukrayntsy, russkye, malorossy. Otkrytoe pismo h. Shulhynuyeho edynomyshlennykam*, "Ukraynskaia zhyzn", 1916, ch. 7–8.
- S. Shelukhin, *Vyznannia Ukrainskoi Respubliki Rosiieiu*, "Na perelomi", 1920, ch. 1, s. 23.
- S. Shelukhin, *Dodatkovi lektsii do kursu "Istoriia ukrainskoho narodu"*, "Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho Robitnyka".
- S. Shelukhin, *Zvidkilia pokhodyt Rus: Teoriia Keltskoho pokhodzhennia Kyivskoi Rusy z Frantsii*, 1929.
- S. Shelukhin, *Istorychno-pravovi pidstavy ukrainskoi derzhavnosti*, "Studentskyi visnyk", 1929, ch. 1–2, s. 2–11.
- S. Shelukhin, *Krytyka novoho naukovoho pidruchnyka istorii Ukrainy*.
- S. Shelukhin, *Lyst do redaktsii (Z pryvodu lysta S.Rudnytskoho "Chomu tse tak?")*, "Volia", 1920, ch. 3, s.15.
- S. Shelukhin, *Nazva Ukrainy*, "Franko Syn i Spilka", 1921.
- S. Shelukhin, *Pro Rus*, "Ukrainskyi Holos", 1928, 6 chervnia.
- S. Shelukhin, *Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv*.
- S. Shelukhin, *Ukrainska derzhavnist i samovyznachennia*, "Trybuna", 1919, 28 sichnia.
- Ya. Rudnytskyi, *Slovo y nazva "Ukraina"*, "Ukrainska Vilna Akademiia Nauk", 1951, s. 4.

Serhiy Shelukhin's Theory of the Celtic Origin of Ukraine-Rus'

Summary: This article analyzes the idea of Ukrainian statehood, the means and resources deployed in its pursuit, the search for the optimum forms of state development, as well as the causes behind Ukraine's loss of independence, as presented in the academic writings of Serhiy Shelukhin. The distinctive features of the Russian Federation's contemporary neo-imperial policy were identified, and the Norman theory of the origin of the Slavic peoples and the resulting frame of reference for the Ukraine were discussed. The interpretation of the Norman theory by Russian pro-unification supporters was described. The main

approaches regarding the origin of Kievan Rus' were examined, and the Celtic theory of the origin of the Ukrainian nation was explored. Serhiy Shelukhin's theory of ethnogenesis of the Ukrainian nation was presented. The claim that the Ukrainian nation is a Slavic nation that had incorporated Greek and Celtic settlers was substantiated, and evidence for Celtic-Ukrainian kinship was provided. The origin and meaning of the terms "Rus'", "Ukraine", "Malorossiya" were expounded. The authors concluded that the views of Serhiy Shelukhin have taken on a special meaning in recent years because every independent nation has the right to shape its political history and sovereignty.

Keywords: Celtic theory, Norman theory, Serhiy Shelukhin, national-democratic trends, Rus', Ukraine, Malorossiya