

**DROHICZYN BATTLE: HISTORY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE
VERSUS POLITICS (THE SOVIET HISTORICAL THOUGHT
OF 30-80'S OF THE 20TH CENTURY)**

Nazarii KHRYSTAN

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (Ukraine)

E-mail: byzantinische@gmail.com

Abstract. *The article is devoted to the representation of a unique event in the history of the Ancient Rus – direct contact of the Galicia–Volhynia Prince Daniel with the Knights Templar. The author analyses the “reading” of the heritage schemes of this conflict in pre-war period and the modelling of their political and ideological background during the Stalinist period. The image of the state control over culture in the development of Soviet historical memory played an important role. In this article, we will try to understand the Soviet historical vision of the Ukrainian history (for example, on the Drohiczyn battle). We will try to explain how, but more importantly, why this event evolved from a simple conflict in the Medieval period into the heroic victory of Daniel of Galicia.*

Keywords: *Galicia–Volhynia, Knights Templar, Daniel of Galicia, Drohiczyn, historical memory, ideological background*

Rezumat: Bătălia de la Drohiczyn: istoria între știință și politică (gândirea istorică sovietică din anii '30-'80 ai secolului al XX-lea). *Articolul este dedicat prezentării unui eveniment deosebit în istoria vechii Rusii, momentul în care Daniel Romanovici, principele cnezatului Halici-Volânia, s-a confruntat cu cavalerii Ordinului Templierilor. Autorul analizează „lectura” schemelor acestui conflict elaborate în perioada interbelică și modelarea lor în contextul politic și ideologic al perioadei staliniste. Un rol important în acest plan l-a jucat controlul statului asupra culturii, fenomen ce a afectat procesul de articulare a memoriei istorice a societății sovietice. Studiul încearcă să scoată în evidență perspectiva autorităților sovietice asupra trecutului Ucrainei (în cazul nostru, asupra bătăliei de la Drohiczyn) și să analizeze felul în care prezentarea acestui eveniment a evoluat de la menționarea unui simplu conflict din Evul Mediu la descrierea unei victorii răsunătoare a lui Daniel de Halici.*

Résumé : La Bataille de Drohiczyn: l'histoire entre science et politique (la pensée historique soviétique des années '30-'80 du XX-ème siècle). *L'article ci-joint présente un événement important de l'histoire de l'ancienne Russie, lorsque Daniel Romanovitch, le prince régnant de la principauté Galicie-Volhynie, se confronta avec les chevaliers de l'Ordre des Templiers. L'auteur y analysa la « lecture » des schémas de ce conflit*

élaborés pendant l'entre-deux-guerres et leur adaptation au contexte politique et idéologique de la période stalinienne. Un rôle important y joua le contrôle de l'Etat sur la culture, phénomène qui affecta le processus d'articulation de la mémoire historique de la société soviétique. L'étude essaya de mettre en évidence la perspective des autorités soviétiques sur le passé de l'Ukraine (en notre cas sur la bataille de Drohiczyn) et d'analyser la manière dans laquelle la présentation de cet événement évolua de la mention d'un simple conflit du Moyen Age à la description d'une célèbre victoire de Daniel de Galicie.

INTRODUCTION

The representation of the unique event in the history of the Ancient Rus – direct contact of the Galicia-Volhynia Prince Daniel with the Knights Templar remains the subject of lively debate in the scientific literature for more than a century.¹ Unfortunately, modern formulations in historical narratives of the conflict known as the “Drohiczyn battle” still preserve dubious tradition of the

¹ See the most detailed review of the historical literature: W. Nagirnyj, *Polityka zagraniczna księstw ziem Halickiej i Wołyńskiej w latach 1198 (1199) – 1264* [Foreign policy principalities lands Galicia and Volhynia in the years 1198 (1199) - 1264]], Kraków, Polska Akad. Umiejętności, 2011, s. 211-213; Among the main works we distinguish: Н. Дашкевич, *Княжение Даниила Галицкого по русским и иностранным известиям* [The Daniel of Galicia reign according to the Russian and foreign information], Киев, 1873, с. 11-13; W. Polkowska-Markowska, *Dzieje Zakonu Dobrzyńskiego. Przyczynek do kwestji krzyżackiej* [The history of the Order from Dobrzyń. Contribution to the issue of the Teutons], in "Roczniki Historyczne", – r. 2, 1926, zosz. 2, s. 145-210; О. Масан, *Добжинський орден (до історії дорогичинського інциденту 1237 року)* [Order of Dobrzyń (For history about Drohiczyn incident 1237)], in "Питання стародавньої та середьовічної історії, археології й етнографії", Чернівці, Рута, 1996, Вип. 1. – с. 41-52; О. Масан, *Добжинський орден (до історії дорогичинського інциденту 1237 року)* [Order of Dobrzyń (For history about Drohiczyn incident 1237)], in "Питання стародавньої та середьовічної історії, археології й етнографії", Чернівці, Рута, 1996, Вип. 2, с. 53-55; M. Bartnicki, *Polityka zagraniczna księcia Daniela Halickiego w latach 1217-1264* [The foreign policy of Prince Daniel of Galicia in the years 1217-1264], Lublin, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2005, s. 158; A. Jusupović, «*Domus quondam Dobrinensis*». *Przyczynek do dziejów templariuszy na ziemiach Konrada Mazowieckiego* [«Domus quondam Dobrinensis.» Contribution to the history of the Knights Templar lands of Konrad Mazowiecki], in "Zapiski Historyczne", Toruń, Wydział Nauk Historycznych, 2006, t. 71, zezs. 1, s. 14-17; А. Майоров, *Даниил Галицкий и тамплиеры* [Daniel of Galicia and Templars], in: "Русин. Международный исторический журнал", 2014, vol. 1, с. 36-51.

Soviet historical imagination. We see fairly simplified scheme and limited scientific research vectors. This, in turn, reflects rather narrow historiographical tradition which does not fully clarify the nature of the conflict and relations of Daniel with the Knights in general. In this respect, we face with the complex issues. Firstly, how the form of the Battle “recalling” has changed in Soviet times? Secondly, how did the Drohiczyn battle evolve from the simple conflict of the medieval period into the heroic victory of Daniel of Galicia? Finally, how the memory about the Prince was integrated into the society of the Soviet era?

The innovative ideas of such eminent theorists as B. Anderson, E. Gellner, E. Hobsbawm and M. Hroch was a basis for this study.² In their view, the policy of propaganda established in promoting cultural recognition system and was playing a main role in the spread of national consciousness of the social elite to ordinary people throughout society as a whole. Investigating the mechanism of relations between political power and historical science with the means of historiography, education, media, cinema, monumental propaganda, organizing celebrations of historical events, we will use the term “politics of memory” which is accepted for global historiography. Regarding measures of the authorities towards historical studies, we will use the most suitable term “historical policy”, including an individual ideological strategy of historians (i.e. “Imperious view of history”) as a part of intellectual composition and a base component of historical policy. Actually, it should be separated from the official historiography. But we will take into consideration it as a basis for research of Soviet history. We will call this general image of history by a widespread term in historiography – “Grand Narrative” or “official historical discourse”.

THE BATTLE OF DROHICZYN: HISTORICAL SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL INTERPRETATIONS

The Galicia-Volhynian chronicle is our main source holding notification about the conflict of Daniel Romanovich with the Templar Knights. In the

² B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, New York, Vers, 1991, 124 p.; E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1983, 150 p.; E. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990, 191 p.; M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions of the National Revival in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 221 p.

chronicle of 6743 (1235) we read: “Весне же бывши, поидоста на Ятвезе и приидоста Берестью, рекам наводнившимся, и не возмогоста ити на Ятвязе. Данилови рекъшу: “Нелепо есть держати наше отчины крижевникомъ Тепличемъ, рекомым Соломоничемъ”. И поидоста на не в силе тяжьце. Приаства град месяца марта, старейшину их Бруна яша, и вои изоимаша, и възвратися Володимер”³. As we see the piece mentioned above is incomplete in terms of the content, there is not even reported about the city that Daniel has taken away from the “крижевникомъ Тепличемъ”. To understand the essence of the message it should be combined with another passage, written in 6748 (1240) about the reconquest of Drohiczyn: “И приде ко градуу Дорогычиноу, и восхоте внити во град, и вестно бысть емоу, яко не внидеши во град. Ономоу рекшоу, яко се былъ град нашъ и отецъ нашихвы же не изволисте внити вонь. И отъиде, мысля си, иже Богъ послезе отъмьстие створи держателю града того. Въдасть [Богъ] и в роуце Данилоу, и обьновивы и, созда церковь прекрасноу святое Богородици, и рече: Сеградъ мой, преже бо прияхъ и копьем”⁴. As we can see, the chronicler portrays the knights who were in Drohiczyn, showing their similarities in armor and status with the Knights Templar (“Order of the Poor Knights of Christ of the Solomon Temple (Pauperurum Commilitonum Christi Templice Solamoniaci)”⁵. Such a manner

³ Original text in: *Ипатьевская летопись: Галицко-Волынский свод* [Hypatian Codex: Galician-Volhynian Chronicle], in: *Полное Собрание Русских Летописей*, СПб, 1908, Т. 2, стб. 776; Translation: “When spring came, [Daniel and Vasilko] marched against the Jatvingians and came to Berestja. But as the rivers had become flooded, they could not wage war against them. [Thereupon] Daniel said: “It is not right for our patrimony to be in the hands of the Templar [Knights] renowned as Solomon's [warriors]”, and Daniel and Vasilko marched against them in greatforce. They took the city [of Drohiczyn] in the month of March, captured their elder Bruno and his soldiers, and returned to Volodimer”, see in: *The Hypatian Codex: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, Munchen, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973, p. 44.

⁴ *Ibidem*, стб, 788; Translation: “He came to the city of Drohiczyn and wished to enter it but was told that he could not come in. He replied that this city belonged to [the Rus'ians] and [their] forefathers [but their answer still was] that he and his men could not enter it. [Thereupon] he went away, thinking that God would later take revenge on the ruler of this city. And [indeed God] entrusted it to Daniel. He renovated [the city], built a beautiful church [dedicated to] the Blessed Virgin, and said: “This is my city, for I have taken it [by the sword]”, see in: *The Hypatian Codex: The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, München, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973, p. 49.

⁵ *Codex diplomaticus et commemorationum Masoviae generalis*, in “Zbiór ogólny przywilejów i spominków Mazowieckich”, Warszawa, Drukiem W. Lazarskiego, 1919, Nr 366, s. 421; Russian translation see in.: В. Матузова, Е. Назарова, *Крестоносцы и Русь. Конец*

has become widespread in the scientific and popular science literature of modern times. Researchers, without analysing deeply the details of historiographical tradition, use the passage of "Drohiczyn battle", turning it into a grand event, thereby popularizing it in the masses.⁶ But we can see another side of this problem. The leading medievalists are sceptical on the historical background of this event. Thus, we remark a certain conflict of memory about Daniel Romanovich. However, we can ask rhetorically ourselves: whether this traditional characterization was correct?

In the nineteenth century M. Dashkevych was the first historian who in detail reviewed the events of the conflict between Daniel Romanovich and the Crusaders. The scholar was inclined to believe that the enemies of the Prince were unknown Templars who before the arrival to Drohiczyn lived in Poland. Later, at the beginning of the twentieth century, M. Hrushevskiy wrote about the conflict between Daniel and the unknown "crusading knights", who obeyed the Prince Konrad Mazowiecki⁷. But two decades later the Polish historians came to the unequivocal conclusion that Prince Daniel fought with the Knights of the Dobrzyń Order⁸. The reason for such conclusions was the charter of March 8, 1237, concerning the transfer of Drohiczyn by Konrad Mazowiecki as the inheritance law to Master Bruno and his knights of the "Order of Christ Dobrzyń house". In this charter, we read: "Donamus magistro B(runoni) et fratribus suis, ordinis militum christi. domus quondam Dobrinensis, castrum Drochicin et totum territorium. quod ex eadem parte castrum continetur a mediate fluminum Bug et Nur. usque ad methas ruthenorum, saluo iure ecclesie Mazouiensis et nobilium, si quid in predictis fluminibus hactenus habuerunt. cum omni districtu et honore,

XII в. – 1270 г.: *тексты, перевод, комментарии* [Crusaders and Russia. The end of the twelfth century - 1270.: text, translation, commentary], Москва, Индрик, 2002, с. 354–355.

⁶ Т. Каляндрук, *Дорогичинська битва 1238 року: таємниці однієї перемоги* [Drohiczyn Battle of 1238: The Secrets of One Victory], Львів, Піраміда, 2014, 100 с.; В. Ідзьо, *Руське королівство та Тевтонський Орден: політичні, економічні та релігійні взаємовідносини у XIII- XIV століттях* [Russian Kingdom and Teutonic Order: Political, Economic and Religious Relations in the XIII-XIV Centuries], Івано-Франківськ, «СІМІК», 2015, 60 с.; О. Гуржій, О. Реєнт, *Славетні битви на теренах України: від князівської доби до початку XX століття* [Glory Battles in Ukraine: From the Prince's Age to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century], ред. Р. Стасюк, Київ, Арії, 2012, 336 с.; М. Котляр, *Нариси воєнного мистецтва Давньої Русі* [Essays on the Military Art of Ancient Rus], Київ, Наш час, 2010, 280 с.

⁷ М. Грушевський, *Історія України-Руси* [History of Ukraine-Rus], Львов, 1905, с. 55.

⁸ W. Polkowska-Markowska, *Dzieje Zakonu Dobrzyńskiego. Przyczynek do kwestji krzyżackiej* [The history of the Order Dobrzyński. Contribution to the issue of the Teutonic], in "Roczniki Historyczne", r. 2, 1926, zosz. 2, s. 145-210;

castoribus. fluminibus. lacubus, saltubus, theloneo in ipso Drohicin de nauibus. siue de curribus, et cum omni iure, quod supradictum castrum noscitur hactenus habuisse. iure hereditario perpetuo possidendum, ut christo sub ordinis sui debito militantes. ab instantia paganorum defendant populum christianum...”⁹. As we can see from the text, the city was devolved together with the territory that was adjacent to the city and limited by the rivers of Bug and Nur. The Knights had to recognize the right of patronage from Conrad and also pledged not to obey the other sovereigns. The given above interpretation has become generally accepted in the literature of that time. There was no doubt about the thesis of a minor local conflict, as the organization of the Dobrzyń knights was itself subjected to considerable criticism as being the “state formation”. At that time, the German historian M. Toppen criticized the knights of the Order. While writing about the Dobrzyń knights (due to their stay in Drohiczyn in 1237), scientist claimed that they “after all never played an important role”. The Order of the “Christ knights from Prussia” was a marginal phenomenon and from the very beginning of its establishment it was doomed to disappear. The Dobrzyń Knights belonged to such local entities to which the local missionaries and the Prince of Mazovia assigned the role of the regional policy instrument¹⁰. The lively discussion and stormy debate about the contact of Daniel Romanovich with the religious Orders still left many questions in the literature: causes, nature and consequences of Daniel Romanovich contact with the Knight Order remained unrevealed.

THE BATTLE OF DROHICZYN: THE REFLECTION OF EVENTS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF A CLASS IDEOLOGY

The need for the new studies of texts concerning the Drohiczyn Battle encountered a strange period of “silence.” At the time of the Soviet historical science establishment the topic of the conflict between Daniel and the Knights disappeared from the pages of the scientific papers. How can we explain this apparent lack of interest of the academic community to this event? In our view, the answer must be sought in the context of the new concept formation of the historical narrative of the Soviet Union. The fundamental ideological revolution of perception and representation of Daniel of Galicia in the Soviet Union took place in the 30s’ of the 20th century. During the general transformation of the political and ideological system of coordinates the existing historical doctrine was rejected.

⁹ *Codex Diplomaticus et Commemorationum Masoviae Generalis* [Codex General and Commemorationum Masoviae], Varsoviae, 1919, T. I, No. 366, p. 421.

¹⁰ M. Toepfen, *Historia Mazur: Przyczynek do dziejów krainy i kultury pruskiej* [Contribution to the history and culture of the land of the Prussian], Olsztyn, 1988, s. 52.

The functions of history as the political and legitimizing science were subjected to revision and defined in a new way. Having rejected the historiography of M. Pokrovsky, that was directly oriented on the economic and historical categories, the Bolsheviks after 1934 rehabilitated the individual and the Ruthenian people as the objects of historical narrative¹¹. Socio-political reorientation of the Ukrainian history took place in 1936 and this process was rather ambiguous¹². That was the year when on the basis of related agencies, a special institution studying the history of Ukraine – Institute of the History of Ukraine at the Academy of Sciences USSR has been established. The emergence of this specialized research institution (though Marxist in its deformed shape) has given space to preserve the historical memory of the Ukrainian people.

With the appearance of the Institute of the History the scientists again “recall” the Daniel of Galicia incident in Drohiczyn. In 1937, S. Belousov, the successor of A. Saradzhayeva, being a director of the Institute, issued under his own editorship the first volume of the *Essays on the History of Ukraine*. The authors of the texts became the members of the Institute – K. Huslysty and F. Yastrebov. The mention of the confrontation is placed in the context of the overall story of

¹¹ A fast rejection of perpetuating the memory of the prominent personalities can be explained by the fact that Marxist historical science school rejected the importance of the individual in the course of historical events. The historical personality played a subordinate role in this theory. This view is confirmed by work of Mikhail Nikolayevich Pokrovsky (1868-1932) without doubt one of the most important representatives of early Marxist historical school in the Soviet Russia. Pokrovsky served as a Deputy Commissioner of Education of the RSFSR (Commissariat) and numerous positions in the science. Thus, he was able to influence the Soviet historical science. At the zenith of his fame Pokrovsky controlled the scientific study of history, teacher education, research and publishing. Review of the Russian history titled "Russian history in the most concise essay" (1920), won a personal praise from Lenin and recommendations as a textbook. By the mid of 30s' the book, that became an official picture of the history, was introduced in the Soviet schools and served as a model for many other books. For details, see.: П. Рындзюнский, *Социально-экономическая история России XIX в. в работах советских историков* [The socio-economic history of the 19th century of Russia in the works of Soviet historians], in: “Очерки истории исторической науки в СССР”, Москва, Издательство АН СССР, 1966, Т. 4, с. 508; А. Сидоров. *Марксистская историографическая мысль 20-х годов* [Marxist historiography thought 20s’], Москва, Изд-во “Университетский гуманитарный лицей”, 1998, с. 56-58.

¹² About the formation of new memory politics of the Ukrainian past (for example Galicia-Volhynia state) during Stalinism, see: Н. Христан, *Моделювання прийняттого минулого: образ Галицько-Волинської Русі в часи сталінізму* [Modelling of acceptable past: image of Galicia-Volhynian Rus’ in the time of Stalin], in: “Питання історії України”, Чернівці, Чернівецький національний університет, 2016, Т. 18, с. 85-92.

the threat of German knights-crusaders against Hungary, Poland and the Galicia-Volhynia principality. Germanic political and religious formations in Livonia and Prussia in *Essays...* were presented as “feudal colonies” of the German knights as the Livonian and Teutonic Order. The long-time confrontation of the Christian Poles against the pagan Prussians was entirely rejected. Post factum one can see that the tensions of the eastern Slavs against the spiritual and knightly orders in the Baltics show only aggressive policy. The monastic orders under the banner of the Christianization of the pagan population actually pursued a policy of expansion and grabbing the lands of pagans¹³.

The reading of the Chronicle about the Drohiczyn conflict in *Essay...* marks significant differences and in some cases non-acceptance of the previous studies concerning this problem in the literature. All the previous attempts to identify the chronicle “крижевникомъ Тепlichemъ, рекомымъ Соломоничемъ” and the Latin “Pauperurum Commilitonum Christi Templique Solamoniaci” are limited to the note that K. Marx called the Crusaders the “Dogs-Knights”. Further in the text, despite all messages of the sources, the knights are described again according to the Marxist term “crusading bastards”¹⁴. The Policy of the Order is presented as an act of brutal violence. The conflict in Drohiczyn was shown as the great war, which is in its scale almost the same as a dubious “Ice Battle by Alexander Nevsky”. After the defeat of the Knights, they were finally expelled from the borders of the Galicia-Volhynia principality¹⁵. These findings in text show the ignorance or deliberate rejection of the known at that time bull of Pope Innocent IV on August 26, 1247 to king Daniel Romanovich and his brother Vasilko. According to it the Crusaders or the other Orders were strictly forbidden to assign ownership that were captured by these princes, or those yet to be captured by them¹⁶. How to explain this indifference to the sources while writing a text about Drohiczyn battle?

¹³ *Нариси з історії України. Київська Русь і феодалні князівства XII-XIII ст.* [Essays of the History of Ukraine. Kievan Rus' and the feudal principalities in 12th-13th centuries.], ред. С. Белоусова, Київ, Видавництво академії наук СРСР, 1937, Вип. 1, с. 137.

¹⁴ К. Маркс, Ф. Энгельс, *Сочинения* [Writings], Москва, Государственное издательство политической литературы, 1957, с. 53-54; У тексті див.: *Нариси з історії України. Київська Русь і феодалні князівства XII-XIII ст.* [Essays of the History of Ukraine. Kievan Rus' and the feudal principalities XII-XIII centuries.], ред. С. Белоусова, Київ, Видавництво академії наук СРСР, 1937, Вип. 1, с. 137-138.

¹⁵ *Нариси з історії України. Київська Русь і феодалні князівства XII-XIII ст.* [Essays of the History of Ukraine. Kievan Rus' and the feudal principalities XII-XIII centuries.], ред. С. Белоусова, Київ, Видавництво академії наук СРСР, 1937, Вип. 1, с. 138.

¹⁶ *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia, Romae, Ucrainorum*, 1953, Vol. 1, p. 36.

The draft of *Essays...* was presented by the Institute not as an academic publication, as it actually was, but as a didactic one, that means the series of “handbooks for teachers of the middle and high schools”¹⁷. In the preface to the first issue of *Essays...* the edition positioned as a series designed for the “students of the universities, colleges, school teachers and in general to any Soviet reader”¹⁸. As we can see, in the conceptual sense, this serial publication reflected the interim, transitional state of that Soviet grand narrative that acquired the traits of centralized, Great Russian Canon with the teleological, or more exactly, the rigid formational and class presentation with the characteristic features of the “ritual” Marxism-Leninism. Although there still remains some space for the national stories, including the Ukrainian past. Therefore, the ideological principles at the turn of 1930-1940-ies became a catalyst for the major theses and ideas around which the conceptualization of the factual material was unfolded, but have not yet acquired a total regulatory direction.

The image of Daniel conflict in Drohiczyn with the “crusading bastards” and “dogs-knights”, launched in the *Essay...* penetrates into all the scientific works of that time. The idea of the destruction war, the total invasion of the Galicia-Volhynia principality by German religious orders reflected the general view of the Ukrainian history in works of the leading scientists – *History of Ukraine. Short Course* (1940), edited by S. Belousov, K. Huslysty, M. Petrovsky, M. Suprunenko F. Yastrebov¹⁹, *Essay on the history of Ukraine* (1942), edited by K. Huslysty, L. Slavin, F. Yastrebov²⁰, the first volume of *History of Ukraine* (1943), edited by M. Petrovsky²¹.

In our view, we should pay attention to the activities of K. Huslysty, an employee of the Institute of History of the USSR. The scientist except of the publications of *Essays...* continued to work on the patriotic series of “Our great ancestors” in the magazine “Slavs”. In 1942, the author issued an essay *Daniel of*

¹⁷ В. Смолій, *Історія інститутська, історія українська (ювілейні роздуми з академічної проблематики)* [Institute History, Ukrainian history (Jubilee reflection on academic issues)], in: “Український історичний журнал”, 2012, Вип. 1, с. 7.

¹⁸ *Нариси з історії України. Київська Русь і феодалні князівства XII-XIII ст.* [Essays of the History of Ukraine. Kievan Rus' and the feudal principalities in 12th-13th centuries.], ред. С. Белоусова, Київ, Видавництво академії наук СРСР, 1937, Вип. 1, с. 3-4.

¹⁹ *Історія України: Короткий курс* [History of Ukraine: Short course], ред. С. Белоусова, К. Гуслистого, О. Оглобліна, Київ, Видавництво АН УРСР, 1940, 412 с.

²⁰ *Нарис історії України* [Essays of the History of Ukraine], ред. К. Гуслистого, Уфа: Видавництво АН УРСР, 1942, с. 46-47.

²¹ *Історія України* [History of Ukraine], ред. М. Петровського, Київ, Видавництво АН УРСР, 1943, Т. 1, 330 с.

Galicia, which was published not only in some periodicals but also as a pamphlet²². In this essay, the author emphasizes the importance of the Galicia and Volhynia Principality, that "for a long time played a major role in the history of the Ukrainian land", and the image of Galicia-Volhynian Prince Daniel was "one of the highlights among the great ancestors of the Ukrainian people". The idea of "combining disparate Ukrainian lands into one centralized state was embodied in the history of the Galicia-Volhynia principality". In the essay, the stages of the Principality from Roman Mstislavovitch to Daniel of Galicia were described, the attention is focused on the fight of the Galicia and Volhynia people against the Hungarians, Poles, and on the battles of the princes with the Tatars and especially with the German "dogs-knights". K. Huslysty completely ignores all the messages of the sources. The mentions of "крижевникомъ Тепличемъ, рекомым Соломоничемъ" absolutely had no place. Instead, the conflict in Drohiczyn was portrayed as the liberation campaign of Daniel against his eternal enemy – the "German-crusading bastards"²³.

The story of K. Huslysty about the "Germans" invasion of the Galicia-Volhynia principality land was taken up by the historians of the Federal Center – "progressive forces of the ideological front". One of the leaders of the historical science, at that time a director of the Institute of Slavic Studies of the USSR, V. Pichette outlined his vision of the Battle in Drohiczyn. The author understood the message of the chronicles about "крижевникомъ Тепличемъ" as the invasion of the Volhynia land by the Teutonic Order and the Prince of Mazovia (in text Polish) Conrad²⁴. The image of the eternal enemy of the Rus' lands that was so well created by the historians relied on the complete disregard of the historical reality. All the relationships of the Galicia-Volhynia principality with the Order were "forgotten". Thus, the charter of February 11, 1334 was forgotten. In the charter by the Galicia-Volhynian Prince George-Boleslav Troydenovych to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order Lyudera von Braunschweig, we find a confirmation of the union agreement, which stated: "Nos et pi[i]e memo(r)aminis n(ost)ri pr(a)edecessores c(a)ri(ssi)mi, scilicet Romanus, Daniel, Leo, Georgius et

²² К. Гуслистый, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], in "Славяне», 1942, Вип. 2, с. 42-46; К. Гуслистый, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], Саратов, Укрвидав при ЦК КП(б)У, 1942; К. Гуслистый, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], in: "Література і мистецтво", 1942, 31 березня.

²³ К. Гуслистый, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], in "Славяне», 1942, Вип. 2, с. 44.

²⁴ В. Пичета, *Основные моменты в исторических судьбах народов Западной Украины и Западной Белоруссии* [Highlights in the historical destiny of the peoples of the Western Ukraine and Western Belarus], Москва, Государственное социально-экономическое издательство, 1940, с. 13.

Andreas [...] aut incolis, p(er)petu[a]e omnimodeq(ue) pasis et concordia]e unionem fac(er)e c(on)suevim(us) et f(ir)mavim(us), s(ecundu)m quod in eor(um)dem pr[a]edecessor(um) n(ost)ror(um) et litt(er)es n(ost)ris alias sup(er) dictate c(on)cordial habenta p(rae)fectis patet, evident(er)”²⁵. We have no doubt in the authenticity of this document, and therefore we can affirm that the prince's office (orderly room) in 1334 preserved relevant agreements with the Order signed by the preliminary princes since Roman Mstislavich. In 13th–14th centuries the Galicia-Volhynia principality was in close military and political, trade and economic alliance with the Teutonic Order. The order served as a natural ally of the Galicia-Volhynia state until the time of Boleslaw-Yuri and Dmitry Troydenovich Dedko. The union alliance, due to the political conjuncture at that time, existed and was beneficial for both sides.

Stability of the provisions of the new concept of relationship between Daniel Romanovich and the knights resembles some kind of a theatre of the absurd. As we can see, the Soviet historians having read in the chronicle about “Pauperurum Commilitonum Christi Templiqne Solamoniaci” namely the Order Templar Crusaders, concluded that in Drohiczyn Daniel fought with an unknown formation on the territory of modern Latvia and Estonia of the German Livonian knights (“swordsmen” – wearing red sword painted on billboards and cloaks), the charter of which was supported by the statute of the Knights Templar that arose during the Crusades in Jerusalem and had a seat at the temple (templum) of Solomon or they took out a concept of the Teutonic Order invasion in the Volhynia land. Others believed that Drohiczyn was captured by another Order of the German knights that was often-called the “crusaders” (wearing mostly black crosses on the shields and cloaks), which were settled with the assistance of Konrad Mazowiecki the near the Polish-Prussian border (in 1237 “swordsmen” and “crusaders” were united)²⁶. A very important question arises – how to explain such a straightforward and

²⁵ Translation: “We and for our blessed memory the dearest predecessors, namely Roman, Daniel, Lev, Yury and Andriy are accustomed to sign and fasten the union of the permanent and all possible peace and consent, this is evident from the same documents of our predecessors, and the same yours compiled in the case of comprehension and observance of these agreements”, See.: О. Купчинський, *Акти та документи Галицько-Волинського князівства XIII – першої половини XIV століть. Дослідження. Тексти* [Acts and Documents of the Galicia-Volhynia Principality of the 13th - first half of the 14th centuries. Research. Texts], Львів: Наукове товариство імені Шевченка, 2004, с. 178.

²⁶ М. Ждан. *Романовичі і Німецький Хрестоносний орден* [Romanovich dynasty and German crusading order], in “Український історик, 1973, Вип. 3-4, с. 56.

ultimately unscientific approach to the interpretation of the historical sources in the context of the new Soviet narrative?

USING AND ABUSING OF THE HISTORY: THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE

Searching for the answer to this question, we should mention the illusion of the “new developments” in the ideological life of the Soviet Union. In our point of view, the unexpected return of Daniel Romanovich into the Soviet historical discourse in the mid of 30s of the 20th century carried concrete political and ideological factors. The actualisation of the official Soviet model formation of the Galicia-Volhynia principality contributed to the reunification of the Ukrainian people, which took place in 1939-1940. In these years, and during the period of war in 1941-1945, the national factor, the national struggle of the Ukrainian people for independence, the reunion in a single Ukrainian state were emphasized. The concept of the Galicia-Volhynia state in its Ukrainian interpretation was acceptable for the Soviet historiography. After all, it directly contributed to the unification of the Western Ukraine with the Soviet lands. The party demanded the creation of a new patriotic history, full of facts, events and personalities, which had to take a leading and sustainable place in the ideology of “Soviet patriotism” and to contribute to the boost of love to the country by the population and political leadership represented by Stalin. Therefore, within the bounds of permitted the pages of the history of Kievan Rus’ were activated. Following the party positions, the Soviet ideologists tried to find the old Western Ukrainian heroes who would become eligible for their ideological discourse. In particular, there was an attempt to make Prince Daniel of Galicia such a hero.

Having been formed during 1937-1938 as part of the anti-fascist propaganda the Soviet image of Daniel Romanovich had to encourage the military mentality of the Soviet people and their willingness to attack as well as to defend. The Drohiczyn conflict perfectly fit to the new concept of the original image of “the enemy” or “the stranger” where there was told about the German “onslaught on the East” or about the centuries-old struggle of Slavonic and Baltic nations against German aggression that allegedly continued. In both phases of the remembering about the Drohiczyn battle (1937-1939 and 1941-1945) the victory of Daniel was marked as a star time of the Ukrainian history and the lessons of this historical event gave the reason to mention the self-proclaimed descendants of the Knights of the Order. The war with Germany, about which the texts of the 30s mentioned only hypothetically, in 1941, became a harsh reality. After the German invasion of the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 the main

task of Soviet propaganda was to convince the Soviet citizens in the capacity of the Red Army to resist the German troops. Such aspirations seem quite clear. However, official reports were trying to weaken the impression of news about the unexpected attack in rather a strange way. V. Molotov in his radio speech on the first day of military operations said: "It is not the first time our people have to deal with the attackers. At one time during the campaign of Napoleon to Russia, our people responded with the Patriotic War and Napoleon was defeated. The same will be with Hitler. The Red Army and all our people will hold a winning battle for their country"²⁷. By this speech, written jointly with Stalin, Molotov and the other members of the Politburo, it can be understood what kind of system images deemed to be the most effective at the mass level of consciousness during the war²⁸.

On July 7, 1941 Daniel of Galicia was officially "called to arms". In the press organ of the All-Russia Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in the newspaper "Communist" on the front page the Drohiczyn battle of Prince against the German (Teutonic) dogs-knights, known before only in some scientific communities, was politically legitimized and popularized²⁹. The Ukrainian writers wrote in an open letter to Stalin: "It is not the first time the Ukrainian people have to destroy the German brazen horde. At his time, Daniel of Galicia has defeated the German dogs-knights"³⁰. Such calls among the writers were caused by the statement of the Institute of History of Ukraine on June 28, which announced that its researchers have prepared a series of brochures about the heroic past of Ukraine. The first brochure had to glorify the battle of Daniel of Galicia, and the last one – the imminent Soviet victory in the war that had started³¹. The story of the Prince and his victory over German knights become an integral part of the Soviet military propaganda. The plan of publication works of the historians in the Academy of Sciences of USSR appears to be significant one. In a separate memorandum by Professor M. Petrovsky submitted to the Department of Propaganda and agitation All-Russia Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on 23 April 1942, has indicated the need for a separate extended edition of the article by of K. Huslysty *Daniel of Galicia*³².

²⁷ *Сто сорок бесед с Молотовым: Из дневника Феликса Чуева* [One hundred and forty interviews with Molotov: From the diary of Felix Chuev], Москва, Терра, 1991, с. 54.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 38.

²⁹ "Комуніст" [Komunist], 7 липня 1941, с. 1.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, 4 липня 1941, с. 1-2.

³¹ *Ibidem*, 28 червня 1941, с. 1

³² The article instead of one printed sheet had to be expanded and published in 2-2.5 printed sheets. For details, see: *Центральний державний архів громадських об'єднань України* [Central State Archive of Public Organizations of Ukraine], ф. 1, оп.

Soon in Saratov a separate booklet of the same name was published.³³ Thus the Soviet Union held a double legitimization interpretation of the Drohiczyn conflict as a war of Daniel against the Teutonic Order (“German dogs-knights”) – in the newspaper “Communist” as the press organ of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and in the official resolution of M. Petrovsky, who reaffirmed its importance by his academic regalia.

The thesis of the “perpetual German pressure on the East” is reflected in the art of the Soviet patriotic texts. Popularization of the “Drohiczyn battle” took place in a patriotic poem by M. Bazhan (published in 1942), *Daniel of Galicia*. The author described the prince as an outstanding military leader and a helmsman of masses. Although, in the poem the Ukrainian ancestors of the 13th century are mostly named as Rusichi or Slavs, and Bazhan twice used the word “Ukraine”: “All Ukraine hears the step of Daniel retinue” and “As the first soldier of the Ukrainian fields”³⁴. Obviously, in the climax of the war, the author’s ideological supervisors considered such assignment of Galicia and Volhynia to be appropriate for the Ukrainian historical memory. The poet studied all the historical publications and political trends of that time and actively picked up the thesis of the German “crusading bastards”. The poem fit quite well in the contemporary propaganda of the USSR leadership course. Soviet regime had to arouse patriotic feelings in the Western population, which were in no hurry to defend the communist dictatorship. In the poem, the Order of Dobrzyń became the embodiment of all the Teutonic (i.e. – German) forces. Literary image of Daniel and the Teutons was highly appreciated by the party leadership, taking him to the general concept of the Soviet patriotic history. Soon visual display of the Drohiczyn war of Daniel was represented in the theatrical play, music for which was written in 1943 by Chernivtsi composer B. Kryzhanivsky³⁵. It is noteworthy, that later Bazhan has received for his *Daniel of Galicia* the Stalin Prize of the second degree³⁶. Later, in a

70, спр. 48, арк. 6–12.

³³ К. Гуслистий, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], Саратов, Укрвидав при ЦК КП(б)У, 1942.

³⁴ М. Бажан, *Данило Галицький* [Daniel of Galicia], Українська література, 1942, Вип. 3-4.

³⁵ М. Богайчук, *Література і мистецтво Буковини в іменах: словник-довідник* [Literature and art Bukovina names: Dictionary Directory], Чернівці: Видавничий дім “Букрек”, 2005, с. 141-142.

³⁶ С. Цалик, *Про що змовчали біографи Миколи Бажана* [What silent biographers about Mykola Bazhan], in “Таємниці письменницьких шухляд: Детективна історія української літератури”, Київ, Наш час, 2010, с. 32-35; С. Єкельчик, *Імперія пам’яті. Російсько-українські стосунки в радянській історичній уяві* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Київ, Критика, 2008, с. 56.

similar style, the Ukrainian writer A. Khizhnyak published a historical novel *Daniel of Galicia*. The literary image of “Drohiczyn battle” is not depicted exactly, even biased, the rivals of Daniel the Crusaders – were ethnic Germans, and Daniel himself serves as a classic unifier of the “Russian people” and a fighter against the German aggression³⁷.

The Soviet patriotic image of Daniel of Galicia conflict with the Crusaders in late 1930s’ was taken by the Soviet military propaganda after the attack of the Wehrmacht in 1941. It has not undergone major modifications in its text composition, only partially it was changed during a long period of time. However, the new foreign policy circumstances of the post-war period – the beginning of the “Cold War” and the debate around the cult of Stalin personality affected the official discourse about the coverage of events around the Drohiczyn incident. Moreover, after 1945 memory of Daniel Romanovich received the new forms. In different cities of Ukraine secular monuments in honour of him were built. The subject of Drohiczyn finds its visual display in paintings. In 1954, the artist S. Adamovich at an exhibition on the occasion of the tercentenary reunion demonstrated his painting “Daniel of Galicia”, no artist dared to work on topics from the history of Galicia and Volhynia before him. Adamovich itself came under severe criticism drawing prince on the battlefield after the victory over the Teutonic knights. The author’s picture did not develop the theme of Russian-Ukrainian friendship, and was condemned by the media as “meaningless”³⁸.

Considering the discourse about the contacts of the Galicia-Volhynia principality with the Order, the elements of differentiation can be noted. Contribution to it was made by some historians and their research projects, the results of which served as a stimulus to doubt the official version of history. The first who thoroughly questioned the Soviet vision of the events in Drohiczyn, became the Director of the Institute of Social Sciences of USSR at that time I. Krypiakevych (1886-1967). The scientist turned his attention to messages in the Chronicle and attempted to consider this episode in context of Daniel relationship with the Order³⁹. Significantly, the volume *Galicia-Volhynia principality* prepared by I. Krypyakevych was not published during the life of the author and was published after his death in 1984. Since 1960s’ the discourse about Daniel Romanovich in the Soviet Union regains the features of the stories on behalf of the state, which reproduces the main features of the historical

³⁷ See reissue: А. Хижняк, *Данило Галицький: роман* [Daniel of Galicia: novel], Львів, Каменяр, 1984, 536 с.

³⁸ “Літературна газета”, 17 червня 1954, с. 4.

³⁹ І. Крип’якевич, *Галицько-Волинське князівство* [Galicia-Volhynia principality], Київ, Наукова думка, 1984, с. 98.

picture of 1930-1940's. One of the authors of *Essays on the History of the USSR V. Dyadychenko* described the conflict as: "The invasion of enemy hordes in Rus' and the invasion of Drohiczyn that was part of the Volhynia principality". The author does not give any reason for this "invasion", the number of "hordes" and absolutely crosses out the message of the source⁴⁰.

CONCLUSION

Rehabilitation of Daniel of Galicia as a figure of the Ukrainian history in 1937 and the development of this cult after 1941 can be considered to be an evidence of a progressive nationalization of the Soviet historical discourse and the Soviet concept of collective identity. By using one of the many ordinary for the medieval era episodes of conflict – the Drohiczyn incident, the party leadership managed to create a primordial image of the "enemy", the image of a "stranger" in the Soviet Union. Texts and pictures, movies and music, ignoring the opinion of the source, were reported to the Soviet population about the Crusader knights – "medieval German occupiers". Patriotic stereotypes that represented the Teutonic Order as the main instrument of the eternal policy of the German invaders "Drang nach Osten", retained their dubious trends in the present and do not allow to examine impartially the relationship between the Galicia-Volhynia principality and the religious orders.

⁴⁰ *Нариси з історії СРСР (епоха феодалізму)* [Essays on the History of the USSR (the era of feudalism)], ред. В. Дядиченко, Київ, Видавництво академії наук СРСР, 1971, с. 51.