

CONSTRUCTING THE SOVIET MODEL OF THE UKRAINIAN PAST: THE HISTORICAL IMAGE OF “REGNUM RUTHENORUM” DURING STALINISM

Nazarii KHRYSTAN 

Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University (Ukraine)

E-mail: n.khrystan@chnu.edu.ua

Abstract. *The paper examines how the past of Ukrainian lands was portrayed in Soviet science, culture and ideology during the Stalinist era, focusing on the “Regnum Ruthenorum” state concept. The author explores the meaning of historical heritage displays of the Kingdom of Rus in the pre-war period and the evolution of the political and ideological context during Stalinism. The Soviet Union's past recall relies heavily on the idea of state control over culture. The paper traces the ideological transformation of the term “Regnum Ruthenorum” into “Galicia-Volyn principality” and the academic and ideological omission of the former in Soviet historiography and politics.*

Keywords: *Regis Russiae, King Danylo Romanovych, Regnum Ruthenorum, historical heritage, scheme of history, Soviet model, official discourse.*

Rezumat. *Construirea modelului sovietic al trecutului ucrainian: imaginea istorică a „Regnum Ruthenorum” în epoca stalinistă. Articolul este dedicat reprezentării trecutului ținuturilor ucrainene în știința, cultura și ideologia sovietică a epocii lui Stalin, folosind exemplul modelării conceptului statal Regnum Ruthenorum. Autorul analizează „lectura” schemelor moștenirii istorice a statului Rus (tradus „Rusia kieveană”, în istoriografia română postbelică) în perioada antebelică și modelarea fondului lor politic și ideologic în perioada stalinismului. Un rol important este atribuit reprezentării controlului statului asupra culturii în crearea memoriei istorice sovietice. Articolul prezintă transformarea ideologică a expresiei „Regnum Ruthenorum” în „principatul Galicia-Volyn” și negarea/evitarea*

academică și ideologică a primei expresii în politica istorică și istoriografia sovietică.

INTRODUCTION

The historiographic process of studying the emergence and the initial stage of the Soviet version of the historical heritage of medieval Rus, specifically the analysis of the initial ideas regarding the creation of the concept “Galicia-Volyn principality” instead of the more historically accurate *Regnum Ruthenorum*, has not yet been thoroughly examined in a comprehensive scientific manner.

Prince Danylo Romanovych's crowning and his state's transformation into the Kingdom of Rus continue to generate considerable interest among scientists. Despite the extensive coverage of the Romanovych State in scientific literature, historians still have divergent opinions in assessing this event.¹ The certainty of the coronation event is indisputable in modern Ukrainian historiography. However, the Soviet stereotype of interpreting King Danylo as “Prince Daniel Galician” or his state as the “Galician-Volyn Principality” persists. The enduring nature of the concepts in the Soviet historical imagination maintains the perception in society's collective consciousness of the Soviet endeavour to include the memory of the “great ancestors”. The prevalence of a stereotyped portrayal of “prince” Danylo and his “principality” among scientists, along with the ongoing Soviet practice of distorting historical facts, obstructs scholarly discussions on fully understanding the significance of coronation and the influential medieval state on the Western Ukrainian lands in general.² The investigation aims to explore the role of

¹ The publication of a complex two-volume monographic study in Polish, authored by the Toruń historian Dariusz Dąbrowski, mark the culmination of 150 years of research on the life and reign of Prince and King Danylo Romanovych. This study has attracted significant attention from scientists from Poland, Serbia, Hungary, Ukraine and other countries. In his research, the scientist tried to conclusively differentiate pseudo-historical narratives in the history of the prince and the king while focusing entirely on the scientific aspect of the sources. See: D. Dąbrowski, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264). Biografia polityczna* [Daniel Romanovych King of Rus (1201–1264). Political biography], Kraków, Avalon, 2012, 538 p.; D. Dąbrowski, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz. O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.* [King of Rus Daniel Romanowicz. On the Russian princely family, society and culture in the 13th century], Kraków, Avalon, 2016. 412 p.

² M. Voloshchuk, *Movoïu dzherel? Terminohichni aspekty istoriohrafichnoho derzhavonaimenuvannia na prykladi Halytskoi zemli X–XIV st.* [The language of the sources? Terminological aspects of the historiographical state nominations on the example of the Galician land of

portraying King Danylo as the “Galician prince” and the various ways in which this portrayal was remembered in Soviet society. Additionally, the study seeks to determine the place of “Prince Daniel Galician” and his State in the larger context of the formation of the Soviet historical grand narrative.

Furthermore, researching the role of political-ideological factors, the dynamics between historical thought and the political-social context, the distinct contributions of historians (in particular, Ukrainian ones), and ultimately examining the genesis of the concept of the “Galicia-Volyn state”, will contribute to a deeper understanding of the development of the historiographical process in the USSR³. By providing distinct definitions of political and ideological variables, a deeper understanding of the overall ideological and intellectual context throughout the Soviet era may be achieved. During a time of powerful socio-economic changes (collectivization and industrialization) and the consolidation of Joseph Stalin’s power, the focus of Soviet rhetorical policy was to reinforce the legitimacy the regime and increase the country’s defence readiness. In terms of content, Soviet historical policy turned out to be an unusual combination of revolutionary rhetoric, the cult of Stalin’s personality, and reinterpreted elements of pre-revolutionary era “imperial patriotism”.⁴ Their reconstruction will contribute to the further understanding of the processes of interaction between power institutions and historical science in a totalitarian society⁵.

HISTORICAL SOURCES AND HISTORIOGRAPHICAL INTERPRETATIONS

The Galician-Volyn Chronicle is the primary and authentic source that provides information on the crowning of Danylo Romanovych as the legate of Pope Innocent IV at Dorohychyn, as well as the subsequent transformation of his State into the Regnum Ruthenorum. It says, “Thus he [Danilo] received his crown from God, from the Church of the Holy Apostles, from the throne of St. Peter, from his

the 10th–14th centuries], in “Colloquia Russica”, series 2, vol. 4, V. Nagirnyy, M. Voloshchuk (Ed.), *Seredn'ovichna Rus': problemy terminolohiyi* [Medieval Rus': problems of terminology], 2018, Ivano-Frankivsk; Krakow, Lileia-NV, pp. 265–295.

³ M. David-Fox, *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015, p. 27.

⁴ G. Roberts, *Stalin's Library: A Dictator and His Books*. New Haven – London, Yale University Press, 2022, p. 14.

⁵ M. Edele, *Debates on Stalinism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2020, p. 5.

[spiritual] Father Pope Nekentij [IV] and from all his bishops. For Nekentij cursed all those who abused the true Greek faith and wished to call a Council for discussing the true faith and the (autumn 1253) unification of the Church. Danilo accepted his crown from God in the city of Dorohycyn as he was setting out on a campaign with his son Lev and the Polish prince Somovit.”⁶ Given the problematic nature of the chronicle’s mention, this investigation encountered a significant lack of information in the message. As a result, it was necessary to seek additional sources to recreate these events more comprehensively. Researchers are familiar with certain well-known works, including registers of papal bulls, Plano Carpini’s relations, the Life of Innocent IV and various other documents. About the events in Dorohychyn around 1253, Rochnik Krasynskyi mentions “Anno domini 1253 Daniel dux Russie in regem coronatus”⁷. In addition, the Annals of Jan Długosz, which are a later source, tell about the coronation of Danylo Romanovych. Created between 1460 and 1480, they tell the most detailed story about the coronation of Danylo and the transformation of his State into the Kingdom: “Claritarem et preeminenciam regalis nominis atque fastigii Daniel Ruthenorum Kyoviensis et Drohicziensis dux atque Monarcha et qui pro ea tempestate devitiis terris, gentibus, factivitate et industria pollens inter Ruthenorum principes celebrior habebatur, adepturus, intelligens Opiszonem abbatem”⁸.

⁶ *The Hypatian Codex Part Two: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*, an Annotated Translation, By George A. Perfecky. With an editor’s preface, in “Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies”, vol. 16, Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973, p. 66. More about the different readings and chronology in the Galician-Volyn Chronicle see: M. Homza, N. Malinovska, *Halichsko-volynská kronika. Neznáme rozprávanie o rodine kráľov a kniežat východno-strednej Európy v 13. storočí* [The Galician-Volhynian chronicle. The unknown story about the families of the kings and the princes of the East-Central Europe in the 13th century], vol. 2, Martin, Matica slovenská, 2019, p. 214-221.

⁷ *Rocznik Krasieńskich*, wydał A. Bielowski, in: *Monumenta Poloniae Historica. Tomus 3*, Lwów, 1878, p. 132; Also see: O. Holovko, *Koronatsiya knyazya Danyla Romanovycha v konteksti ideolohichnoho zhyttya i mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn slov’yanstva Skhidnoyi Yevropy* [The coronation of Prince Danylo Romanovych in the context of the ideological life and international relations of Eastern European Slavs], in: “Naukovi pratsi Kam”yansets’-Podil’s’koho natsional’noho universytetu imeni Ivana Ohiyenka. Istorychni nauky”, t. 23: *Na poshanu profesora S. Kopylova*, Kamyansets’-Podil’s’kyy, PP “Medobory-2006”, 2013, p. 2.

⁸ *Joannis Długosz senioris canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia*, ed. A. Przewdziecki, in *Historiae Polonicae libri XII*, vol. 2, Kraków, 1873, p. 309-310; For more about this topic, see Ya. Zatylyuk, *Povidomlennya Annaliv pro Yana Dluhosha pro koronatsiyu Danyla*

To comprehend the meaning of “king” and “kingdom” as seen by 13th century’s society, it is important to consider certain Latin sources of that time. The Livonian Chronicle, written by Henry the Latvian, mentions Prince Mstyslav Mstyslavych, who was referred to as the “King of Novgorod”. Although he never officially acquired the royal title, he later joined the struggle for the Galician land⁹. In addition, one of the Hungarian documents recounts the tale of the 1245 battle of Yaroslav, where Danylo Romanovych is referred to as “Rex Ruthenorum”, i.e. “King of Rus”.¹⁰ At the same time, Danylo’s rival, Prince Rostyslav Mykhailovych (who was also an ally of the Hungarian king Béla IV) is documented as “dux Galliciae” (prince of Galicia).¹¹ Considering the evidence of Latin-language sources, it may be inferred that the interpretation of the term “rex” did not necessarily indicate the existence of a royal title. Rather, it served as an indication of the authority of the rulers of Rus, confirming their sovereignty and power. The vice-master of the Teutonic Order, Burghard von Hornhausen, was also referred to as king. In his letter dated 1254, he describes Danylo Romanovych as “excellenti viro Danieli primo rege Ruthenorum”¹². This letter was found in the middle of the 19th century in the library of the Chortorii princes. Its authenticity is unquestioned by experts.

Researchers share the belief that if the European rulers of that era accepted the title of Danylo Romanovych, it may have indicated the transformation of the Galician and Volyn lands into an actual Kingdom of Rus. Such a conclusion can be reached on the basis of the title of Yuriy Lvovych, which is recorded in his seal: “S[igilum] Domini Georgii regis Russiae” and “S[igilum] Domini Georgii principis Ladimiriae”. Yuriy’s seal testifies to the possible revival of the united King Danylo Romanovych state under his rule. However, only the Galician land is the kingdom of Rus¹³. At one time, the Hungarian king Béla III and his son Andriy II aspired to this.

Romanovycha ta yikh pokhodzhennya [The Annals of Jan Dlugos report about the coronation of Danylo Romanovych and their origin], in: “Ruthenica”, t. 13, Kyiv, Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny, p. 108.

⁹ *Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae*, rec. L. Arbusow et A. Bauer, in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum et Monumentis Germaniae Historicis. Separatim editi*, Hannoverae, impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1955, p. 141-142.

¹⁰ *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, Studio et opera G. Fejer, vol. 2, Budae, 1829, p. 247.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Codex diplomaticus Poloniae*, wyd. Bobowski Mikołaj, t. 3, Varsaviae, 1858, p. 30.

¹³ Translate: “Seal of Yuri – King of Galicia” and “Seal of Yuri – Prince of Lodomeria”. See: Ya. Ysaevych, “*Korolevstvo Halytsyy y Volodymyryy*” y “*Korolevstvo Rusy*” [“Kingdom of

Thus, this status was confirmed by the coronation of Danylo in 1253. The title of the king of Rus is likely not indicative of Yuri's coronation, as the European tradition dictates that acknowledgement of a kingdom's status is determined by the state rather than specific representatives of the ruling dynasty¹⁴. Later, the Austrian emperor Joseph II assumed the title of Yuri and, as a result, in 1772, during the first division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he acquired this kingdom¹⁵.

The scientific community has not yet fully comprehended the significance of Danylo Romanovych's coronation and subsequent partial transformation of his State into the Kingdom of Rus. Various approaches have been taken in covering this event, ranging from ardent defenders of Danylo's title to partially ignoring it by placing the royal title in quotation marks. Some have also attempted to minimize the significance of the coronation in Dorohychyna, arguing that Danylo himself did not use the title. However, such conclusions are completely opposite to truly authentic and scientifically reliable sources.

Upon examining the source reports, it becomes evident that both European and Old Rus evidence depict Danylo Romanovych as a king, which is a valid indication of a Ruler. In connection with this, the use of the nickname "Galician" or the state's name, "Gallicia-Volyn state" in relation to Danylo, disregarding the royal title and ignoring the transformation of the state into the Kingdom of Rus. This appears to be quite confusing. When examining the historical sources of the first half of the 19th century, it becomes apparent that terms like "Suzdalian", "Smolenian" and "Kyivan" were frequently employed to refer to the princes of Old Rus.

However, upon a detailed study of the historiographical texts of that time, particularly focusing on N. Karamzin, it becomes evident that these adjectives were not nicknames for princes. Instead, they served to describe the land controlled by each prince. In this context, scientists further referred to Volodymyrko Volodarevych and Yaroslav Volodymyrovych, classifying them as "Galicians"¹⁶. It is important to remember that these princes exercised genuine authority over Ga-

Galicia and Lodomeria" and "Kingdom of Rus"'], in: "Drevneyshye hosudarstva na teritoryy SRSR. Materyaly y yssledovanyya", Moskva, Nauka, 1986, p. 62-63.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 63.

¹⁵ V. Kaye, *The Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, 1772*, in "Canadian Slavonic Papers", vol. 14, 1972, p. 454-464.

¹⁶ N. Kotlyar, *Formirovaniye territorii i vozniknoveniye gorodov Galitsko-Volynskoy Rusi X – XIII vv.* [The formation of the territory and the emergence of towns in Galicia-Volyn Rus in the 10th - 13th centuries], Kiev, Naukova dumka, 1985, p. 80.

licia in the 12th century. The 19th-century logic of historical investigation is inadequate in describing Danilo. The use of the term “Daniel Galician” or “Prince Danylo of Galicia” in reference to Danylo Romanovych is scientifically incorrect, and, therefore, contradicts the attributes of the king as described in the sources. The city of Halych was the capital of Danylo Romanovych’s state for a very short time: from the fall of 1238 when Halych was included in Danylo’s possessions and was designated as his capital until the winter of 1240-1241 when the Mongol troops destroyed the city.

According to the Galician-Volyn chronic, Danylo disliked Halych due to the ongoing conflicts with the local boyar elite. Therefore, at the first good opportunity, the Ruler moved the capital of his state to the city of Kholm, which he sought to turn into one of the great centres of Eastern Europe at the time. The period of development of the town of Kholm saw the highest rise of the Romanovych State: “According to God’s will Danilo built (1237) a city called Xolm~ but we will relate [the story of] its creation later. [Then] Bishop Ivan was chosen by the will of God and placed [in Xolm] by Prince Danilo. [He was selected] from the clergy of the great Church of the Blessed Virgin in Volodimer’. Before this occurred, there was a bishop Asaf in Ugrovesk who seized the metropolitan chair and because of this was dethroned, and the bishopric was transferred to Xolm”¹⁷.

Based on the available sources, there is no mention of “Daniel Galician” or his State, known as “Galician-Volyn principality”. At the same time, historical records documented Prince and King Danylo Romanovych, and his state was referred to as *Regnum Ruthenorum* since 1253¹⁸.

¹⁷ *The Hypatian Codex Part Two: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*, p. 28; More about this problematic see: V. Aleksandrovych, *Mystetstvo Kholma doby knyazya Danyla Romanovycha* [The art of Holm in the era of Prince Danylo Romanovych], in: “Knyazha doba. Istorija i kul’tura”, L’viv, Instytut ukrajinoznavstva imeni I. Kryp’yakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 2007, p. 136-153.

¹⁸ *Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae*, rec. L. Arbusow et A. Bauer, in: *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum et Monumentis Germaniae Historicis. Separatim editi*, Hannoverae, impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1955, p. 141; *Joannis Długosz senioris canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia*, ed. A. Przezdziecki, in *Historiae Polonicae libri XII*, Kraków, vol. 2, 1873, p. 310; More representative studies: V. Kaye, *The Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, 1772*, in “Canadian Slavonic Papers”, vol. 14, 1972, p. 456; Ya. Ysaevych, “*Korolevstvo Halycy y Volodymyryy*” y “*Korolevstvo Rusy*” [“Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria” and “Kingdom of Rus”], in: “Drevneyshye hosudarstva na terrytoryy SRSR. Materyaly y yssledovanyya”, Moskva, Nauka, 1986, p. 62-63.

THE REFLECTION OF SCIENTIFIC CONCEPTS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF A CLASS IDEOLOGY

The Soviet perspective on the history of medieval Rus and the establishment of its historical heritage were determined by political and ideological factors. The topic concerns the context of social and political changes in the USSR that occurred alongside the emergence of the Stalinist form of dictatorship. The establishment of a totalitarian regime rendered the notions of Ukrainian national historiography historically unacceptable. This is particularly relevant to M. Hrushevskyi's perspective of Ukrainian history.

The renowned Ukrainian historian radically separated the history of the Ukrainian nation from the Russian one, beginning from prehistoric times. A significant component of his approach was how he assessed the Kyivan Rus (10th – first half of 13th centuries) in the history of the Eastern Slavs. The scientist's view may be summarised as follows: "Kyiv state, law, and culture were the product of one nationality, Ukrainian-Rus; Volodymyr-Moscow period – the second, Great Russian..."¹⁹. M. Hrushevsky determines a connection between the period of Kyivan Rus and the subsequent period of Ukrainian history: "The Kyiv period did not pass into the Volodymyr-Moscow period, but was pass into the "Galicia-Volyn period" of the 13th century...". Therefore, the scientist concludes: "There can be no All-Rus history, just as there is no All-Rus nationality"²⁰. The process of transitioning from one historical period to another, by cause and effect, determined the continuity of the history of Ukrainians. The Kyevan Rus, which is the fundamental concept in Ukrainian history, transitioned into the "Galicia-Volyn state" according to the scientific theory of M. Hrushevskyi.

Pre-revolutionary historical science evaluated critically the interpretation of the historical heritage of Rus. It was important for imperial science to "prove" that the centre of Rus had moved from Kyiv to Volodymyr-Suzdal even before the "Mongolian-Tatar yoke", and later, during the "Mongolian-Tatar" era, to Moscow.

¹⁹ M. Hrushevskyi, *Zvychainska shkema ruskoi istorii y sprava ratsionalnoho ukladu istorii Skhidnoho Sloviaanstva* [The usual scheme of Russian history and the matter of a rational arrangement of the history of the Eastern Slavs], in "Stat'y po slavyanovedenyu", Sankt-Peterburh, 1904, vyp. 1., p. 291.

²⁰ *Ibid.* Also see another Hrushevskyi's interpretation from A. Presnyakov, *Kniazhoe pravo v Drevnei Rusy. Ocherky po ystoriyy X- XII stoletiy. Lektsyy po russkoi ystoriyy. Kyevskaia Rus'* [Princely law in Ancient Rus. Essays on the history of the X-XII centuries. Lectures on Russian history. Kievan Rus], Moskva, 1993, p. 580.

Instead, Volyn and Galicia remained a kind of periphery of Rus, which did not play a significant role in the state-building processes on Rus lands. In general, the concept of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” was not solely or primarily a cabinet term invented to explain historical processes. It was a political term that aimed to “prove” the involvement of Volyn and Galicia in Russian history, as well as to emphasize their peripheral status in comparison to Volodymyr-Suzdal, and then the Moscow principalities²¹.

Soviet historical science, which emerged after the October Revolution, in search of a “Marxist-Leninist concept” of the Ukrainian historical process, had to overcome both the “old schemes” of Ukrainian and Russian historiography, as well as new, so-called “pseudo-Marxist schemes”. At the turn of the 1920s – 1930s, Soviet historiography, shaped by debates held by the Society of Marxist Historians, generated the opinion that on the one side, the history of the USSR cannot be replaced by the history of Russia, and on the other side, that the history of these nations should not be separated from history the Russian nation²². The process of revising old concepts of Ukrainian and Russian historiography and forming the Soviet version of Ukrainian history stretched on for decades.

The continuation of the policy of “korenization” (“Ukrainization”) at the beginning of the 30s of the 20th century acquired more and more “all-Soviet patri-

²¹ S. Piontkovskiy, *Velykoderzhavni tendentsiyi v istoriografii Rosiyi* [Great power trends in the historiography of Russia], in “Istoriik-marksist”, t. 17, 1930, p. 22-23; M. Pokrovskiy, *Ocherky ystoriyy russkoy kul'tury* [Essays on the history of Russian culture], Moskva – Leningrad, 1925, p. 48.

²² The early Slavic and Slavic periods of Ukrainian history were taught according to the pattern established by Soviet historiography. Its essence was subordination to the dominant concept of the formation of the ancient Russian nation, as the common root of the Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples. The Kyiv state was assessed as their joint early feudal state. Characteristically, works on the ancient and medieval history of Ukraine were approached using the union scheme, which required analyzing history according to social classes and interpreting it as a part of Russian history, while disregarding nation-building processes. For a more detailed analysis, see: V. Holovko, *Istoriografiya kryzy istorychnoyi nauky. Ukrayins'kyi kontekst* [Historiography of the crisis of historical science. Ukrainian context], Kyiv, 2003, p. 110; Ya. Isayevych, *Problema pokhodzhennya ukrayins'koho narodu: istoriografichnyy i politychnyy aspekt* [The problem of the origin of the Ukrainian people: historiographical and political aspect], in “Ukrayina davnya i nova. Narod, relihiya, kul'tura”, L'viv, 1996, p. 22-42; M. Koval', O. Rubl'ov, *Peredmovva* [Preface] in *U leshtakh totalitaryzmu: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny (1936–1956 rr.): Zb. dokumenty i materialy: U 2-kh chastynakh*, upor-yad.: R. Pyrih (kerivnyk), T. Hrytsenko, V. Mazur, O. Rubl'ov, Kyiv, 1996, ch. 1, p. 25.

otic features". Leaders of the ideological "front" tried to model compromise provisions and schemes that would harmonise the traditions of the Russian "great state" and the individualism of other nations of the USSR. In particular, this tendency found its embodiment in the creation of the Soviet concept of the place of the "Galicia-Volyn principality" in the general model of the history of medieval Rus. The new visions of USSR historians relied on the concepts of East Slavic researchers of earlier times, particularly those predating the 1930s.

The initial attempts to change the role of "Galician-Volyn Rus" in the general medieval Rus narrative may be attributed to Marxist historians. In his studies "History of Ukraine", the Ukrainian historian M. Yavorskyi, famous in the 1920s, provides a distinct framework that explains the unique Ukrainian historical process. This is demonstrated by the periodization of the history of Ukraine, where "Galicia-Volyn Rus" occupies a prominent place²³. According to the historian, at the end of the 12th century "three new centres grew: the Novgorod land, the Suzdal principality, which gave rise to the Muscovite state, and the Galician kingdom. The northern tribes, mixed with the Finns, gave rise to the Great Russian nation and the south-western ones to the Ukrainian nation". Yavorskyi's scheme concept was perceived very ambiguously and was condemned as "pseudo-Marxist" in the early 1930s²⁴.

Other leading Russian historians of that time (O. Presnyakov, M. Pokrovsky, M. Lyubavsky, etc.) tried to combine M. Hrushevsky's approach with the traditional Russian one.²⁵ The researchers joined Hrushevskyi's scheme. They distinguished the uniqueness of the historical process of the "Galicia-Volyn state"²⁶ from

²³ M. Yavors'kyy, *Korotka istoriya Ukrayiny* [Short history of Ukraine], Kharkiv, Derzh. vydavnytstvo Ukrayiny, 1926, p. 27; More about this interpretation: *Dyskusiya z pryvodu skhemy istoriyi Ukrayiny M. Yavors'koho* [Discussion about the scheme of the history of Ukraine by M. Yavorskyi], in "Litopys revolyutsiyi", 1930, № 2, p. 270-271.

²⁴ A. Santsevych, *M. Yavors'kyy: narys zhyttya ta tvorchosti* [M. Yavorskyi: Essey of life and creativity], Kyiv, 1995, s. 388; S. Piontkovskiy, *Velikoderzhavnyye tendentsii v istoriografii Rossii* [Great-power tendencies in the historiography of Russia], in "Istoriemarksis", t. 17, 1930, p. 22-23.

²⁵ M. Pokrovskiy, *Ocherki istorii ruskoy kul'tury* [Essays on the history of Russian culture], Moskva – Leningrad, 1925, p. 48; M. Lyubavskiy, *Obrazovaniye osnovnoy gosudarstvennoy territorii velikoruskoy narodnosti. Zaseleniye i ob'yedineniye tsentra* [Formation of the main state territory of the Great Russian nation. Settlement and unification of the center], Moskva, 1929, p. 3-5; A. Presnyakov, *Obrazovaniye velikoruskogo gosudarstva. Ocherki po istorii XII - XVI stoletiy* [Formation of the Great Russian state. Essays on the history of the 12th-16th centuries], Petrograd, 1918, p. 1-26.

²⁶ L. Zaliznyak, *De, yak i koly vynykla davn'orus'ka narodnist' (Do 50-richchya problemy)*

the history of the Russian Empire. It is significant that O. Presnyakov was a supporter of the concept of the “three-unit Rus people”, but he believed that “Ukrainian nationhood was formed in the deep foundations of its national and cultural individuality during the brilliant, albeit short, flowering of the independent political life of Roman Mstislavovych Galicia-Volyn Rus – “autocrat of all Rus” and his famous son “King of Galicia Danylo”.²⁷

M. Rubinstein made a significant contribution to the formation of the Soviet concept of the history of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” in the early 1930s of the 20th century. Relying on the position of O. Presnyakov, the scientist interprets the line of traction from Kyivan Rus to the “Galicia-Volyn principality”²⁸. Kyiv Rus “historically unites the territories of the South Rus Slavs, the North-Eastern Slavs, and the Novgorod Slavs”. After the decline of the “single Kyiv centre”, individual tribes “form new groups around new centres, in this case: Galicia-Volyn, Rostov-Suzdal, Novgorod Principalities”.²⁹

The Polotsk or Smolensk cells are not mentioned. In this regard, M. Rubinstein follows M. Yavorskyi, solely in the unpublished Russian version³⁰. Afterwards, M. Rubinstein acknowledges the individual historical progress of these “new groups”, including the Novgorod one, stating that “each of these groups follows its own personal historical path” from “the same place where the history of Kyivan Rus ends”.³¹

[Where, how and when did the ancient Russian nation arise (To the 50th anniversary of the problem)], in “Pam"yat' stolit'”, 1998, № 6, p. 4-5.

²⁷ S. Brachov, *Russkiy istorik A. Presnyakov (1870 – 1929)* [Russian historian A. Presnyakov (1870 – 1929)], Sankt-Peterburg, 2002, p. 35.

²⁸ M. Rubinshtein, *Narys istoriyi Kyivs'koyi Rusi* [Essay on the history of Kyivan Rus], Kharkiv – Odesa, 1930, p. 7. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, M. Rubinshtein conceived the idea of creating a general course of Ukrainian history that would meet the demands set by Marxist historians. In the early 1930s, he prepared it for printing, but his attempt eventually failed. Not being able to publish the entire narrative as a whole, the scientist tried to publish individual parts. For more details, see: N. Yusova, *Vnesok M. Rubinshteyna u formuvannya radyans'koyi kontseptsiyi istoriyi Ukrayiny* [The role of M. Rubinstein in the formation of the Soviet concept of the history of Ukraine], in *Probl. istoriyi Ukrayiny: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: Mizhvid. zb. nauk. pr.*, 2004, vyp. 11, s. 236.

²⁹ M. Rubinshtein, *Narys istoriyi Kyivs'koyi Rusi* [Essay on the history of Kyivan Rus], Kharkiv – Odesa, 1930, p. 5.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

According to M. Rubinstein, a distinct historical process, similar to the Russian one, begins in Ukraine at the end of the 12th century. Specifically, in the Ukrainian case, with the strengthening of the “Galicia-Volyn centre”³². According to the researcher, the history of Ukraine commences with the consolidation of the “Galicia-Volyn state”. The period spanning from the 12th to the 14th century in Ukraine was marked by the existence of the “Galicia-Volyn state”. However, M. Rubinstein further notes that the history of this state is only the history of one of the Ukrainian lands, which “reflects the course of the Ukrainian historical process within the boundaries of this land”; however, it does not exhaust “the entire content of this process”. This era is not characterised by the fact that the political centre moved from Kyiv to Halych, but by the absence of such a centre at all, because of “political disintegration”. This disintegration itself was only a consequence of the “process of feudalism, *seigneurisation* of social relations”. M. Rubinstein defines this period in the history of Ukraine as “the period of early feudalism”³³.

USES OF MEDIEVAL IMAGE OF RUS IN SOVIET HISTORICAL POLITICS DURING WORLD WAR II

The revived scientific interest in the history of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” was caused by the so-called “reunification of the Ukrainian nation” after the USSR attack on Poland in 1939. To avoid any risks and bring the intellectual situation under party control, the state leadership emphasised the importance of the national factor of Ukrainians in the struggle for “reunification” as part of a single state. The scientific construct of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” focusing on the Ukrainian factor suddenly became very profitable for Soviet historical science. After all, remembering the ancient medieval Western Ukrainian state took place exclusively in the context of the “local principality” (which did not contradict the Great Russian vision of Rus past). In addition, such a scientific vision made it possible to justify the inclusion of Western Ukrainian lands into Soviet Ukraine.

Of course, the historians of the USSR were connected to the ideological campaign of 1939–1940 – the “advanced forces of the ideological front”. They pre-

³² M. Rubinshtein, *Zapadnyye puti trgovli Ukrainy-Rusi* [Western trade routes between Ukraine and Rus’], in “Visnyk Odes’koyi Komisiyi Krayeznavstva pry Ukrayins’kiy akademiyi Nauk”, Odesa, 1925, ch. 2-3. p. 120-134.

³³ M. Rubinshtein, *Narys istoriyi Kyivs’koyi Rusi* [Essay on the history of Kyivan Rus’], Kharkiv – Odesa, 1930, p. 8.

sented both scientific and journalistic works published in periodicals and scientific anthologies. Among the historians of the Union Centre, Academician B. Grekov, the official leader of historical science, wrote on the “reunification” of Ukraine. Using his authority, the scientist established a consensus in Soviet science and the public regarding the position of Kyivan Rus and the significance of the “Galicia-Volyn state” as the precursor of the Ukrainian nation³⁴.

Ukrainian historians also took an active part in the new ideological campaign regarding the propaganda “reunification” of Western Ukraine with the Ukrainian SSR. The Institute of the History of Ukraine of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR published a scientific article named “Western Ukraine”³⁵. Kyiv scientists S. Belousov and O. Ogloblin built their history on the thesis of “primitive Ukrainian lands”, which meant the ethnic unity of Western and Eastern Ukrainians³⁶. Upon analysing the collection mentioned above, it becomes evident that there is a certain contrast in the views of all USSR historians in the Soviet centre and those in the capital of Ukraine. This shows that at that time academic circles had different understandings of the new politics of memory, as well as the fact that official Soviet declarations left some room for debate over their interpretations.

The continuation of the thesis about the antiquity of Ukrainian lands, where special attention was paid to the “Galicia-Volyn principality”, was reflected in the large-scale collective study “History of Ukraine: A Short Course” published by the Institute of the History of Ukraine.

This work, released simultaneously in Ukrainian and Russian, initiated the rehabilitation of the national narrative³⁷. For a better understanding of this concept, it is important to consider the position of K. Guslysty, an employee of the Institute of History and Archeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. In the collective work “Essay on the History of Ukraine”, the scientist writes

³⁴ As we can see, this position was put forward to him by Ukrainian Soviet historians, the concepts of which we considered above: B. Grekov, *Drevneyshiye sud'by Zapadnoy Ukrainy* [The most ancient destinies of Western Ukraine], in “Novyy mir”, 1939, № 10-11, p. 248-256.

³⁵ S. Byelousov, *Krakh pol's'koyi derzhavy i z'yednannya velykoho ukrayins'koho narodu v yedyniy Ukrayins'kiy derzhavi – URSR* [The collapse of the Polish state and the unification of the great Ukrainian people in a single Ukrainian state – Ukrainian SSR], in *Zakhidna Ukrayina. Zbirnyk pid red. S.M. Byelousova i O.P. Ohloblina*, Kyiv, 1940, p. 97-109.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

³⁷ I. Hapusenko, *Istoriya Ukrayiny periodu feodalizmu* [History of Ukraine during the period of feudalism], in *Rozvytok istorychnoyi nauky na Ukrayini za roky Radyans'koyi vlady*, Kyiv, 1973, p. 76.

that Danylo Romanovych led the struggle of the Ukrainian people against the “German and Hungarian invaders”, defeating the former at Dorohychyn in 1238, and the latter under Yaroslav in 1245³⁸.

K. Guslysty stated about the unification into a single state of Galician and Volyn lands by Roman Mstyslavych at the end of the XII century: “This is how the mighty Galicia-Volyn principality arose, which for a long time played the main role in the history of Ukraine and sought to unite the fragmented Ukrainian lands into a single centralised state”. Moreover, K. Guslysty used the term “Ukraine”, “Ukrainian lands” to denote South Rus lands even in the 13th century. For example, he writes that under the reign of Prince Yaroslav Osmomysl “Galicia” “became the strongest principality on the territory of Ukraine”. However, K. Guslysty immediately notes that the Ukrainian, Russian, and Belarusian peoples “finally formed around the 14th – 15th centuries”.

After 1940, references to the great Ukrainian nation in official discourse decreased. Soviet ideologues understood the importance of the past as a means of shaping the collective mentality. Therefore, they sought to find outstanding heroes of the past of the Western Ukrainian lands to strengthen the role of party discourse. Based on this state of affairs, the attempt to make Prince and King Danylo Romanovych an “outstanding hero of the past” seems quite understandable. A new canon of historical heroes of the Republic was created based on and in addition to the Russian list of great ancestors. At that time, no one claimed that this great medieval Eastern Slavic state belonged exclusively to Ukrainian historical memory, but Prince Danylo and the “Galicia-Volyn principality” could already be publicly called the heritage of the Ukrainian nation³⁹. Given the importance of ancestry in nationalist theories, which traced a direct line of heredity from Kyivan Rus to the “Galicia-Volyn principality”, it was dangerous to hold Danylo Romanovych in such high regard. Could Ukrainians glorify the southwestern “Galicia-Volyn princes” if the Russians glorified the northeastern Volodymyr-Suzdal princes as the heirs of the grand princes of Kyiv according to soviet party discourse? If Kyiv Rus served as a shared “cradle” for both Russians and Ukrainians,

³⁸ K. Guslysty, *Danylo Halyts'kyi* [Daniel Galician], Saratov, Ukrvydav pry TsK KP(b)U, 1942, p. 3.; *Narys istoriyi Ukrayiny* [Essay on the history of Ukraine], za red. K. Guslysty, Ufa, Vyd-vo AN URSR, 1942, p. 46-47.

³⁹ „Komunist” [Communist], 24 chervnya 1941, p. 3; Also see.: S. Yekel'chyk, *Imperiya pam'yati. Rosiys'ko-ukrayins'ki stosunky v radyans'kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, p. 55.

when did their separation begin? However, at that moment, in the context of the military conflict, no one protested against the “Ukrainization” of Prince Danylo.

Danylo’s “Ukrainization” found his visual reflection in M. Bazhan’s 1942 patriotic poem “Danylo Halytskyi”. A famous Ukrainian poet portrayed Danylo Romanovych as an outstanding commander, a fighter against “a rush of German knights”. Despite the risks, the author of the poem called Danylo’s state “Ukraine” twice. Although in the rest of the cases, he used the more neutral names “Rus”, “slavs”, “ruses”⁴⁰. It is obvious that at the peak of the Second World War, the ideological supervisors considered this appropriation of the “Galicia-Volyn Principality” to Ukrainian historical memory acceptable. Subsequently, M. Bazhan received the 2nd class Stalin Prize for “Daniel Galician” and poems of wartime⁴¹.

The apparent acceptability of the image of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” reflects how history gave the Soviet authorities a chance to complete the collection of “all Rus lands”. In March 1944, M. Khrushchev gave a speech at the first wartime session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR⁴². The Soviet Union prepared historical arguments to substantiate his intentions. It declared that the Ukrainian people would strive to include eternal Ukrainian lands, such as Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Zamostya, Tomashiv and Yaroslav into the Ukrainian Soviet state. The lands mentioned by Khrushchev were once part of the “Galicia-Volyn principality” and, with the exception of Yaroslav, belonged to the Russian Empire between 1832 and 1917. However, after the revolution, they returned to Poland. Before the war, the USSR refrained from asserting its territorial claims over the regions along the Curzon line and did not seek to occupy them in 1939⁴³. Trying to scientifically substantiate this thesis, M. Petrovsky hastily prepared the

⁴⁰ M. Bazhan, *Danylo Halyts'kyi, in "Tvory v 4-kh tomakh: T. 1. Poeziyi ta poemy 1923–1983"*, Kyiv, Dnipro, 1984, p 11-12.

⁴¹ S. Tsalyk, P. Selihey, *Pro shcho zmovchaly biohrafy Mykoly Bazhana* [What the biographers of Mykola Bazhan kept silent about], in “Tayemnytsi pys'mennyts'kykh shukhlyad: Detektyvna istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury”, Kyiv, Nash chas, 2010, p. 32-35; S. Yekel'chuk, *Imperiya pam'yati. Rosiys'ko-ukrayins'ki stosunky v radyans'kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, p. 56.

⁴² More about M. Khrushchev speech see in: M. Tkachenko, *Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav – odvichni ukrayins'ki zemli* [Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav – eternal Ukrainian lands], in “Ukrayins'ka literatura”, 1944, № 5-6, p. 123.

⁴³ S. Yekel'chuk, *Imperiya pam'yati. Rosiys'ko-ukrayins'ki stosunky v radyans'kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, p. 81.

article “Eternal Ukrainian Lands”, which appeared in “Soviet Ukraine”. He noted that “Danylo Halytsky” died and was buried in Kholm, Bohdan Khmelnytsky claimed this territory, and according to the 1897 census data, the majority of the local population was of Ukrainian descent⁴⁴. However, after lengthy negotiations with the Western allies and the Polish government in exile, Stalin decided that the border between Ukraine and Poland would run along the Curzon line. The Kholm remained in the hands of the Poles⁴⁵.

The invasion of Poland by the USSR in September 1939 became an important factor in shaping the new Soviet Ukrainian historical memory. Similar to past imperial conquests, this one served to strengthen the distinct ethnic identity of the local population and further reinforce ethnicity as a fundamental category of Stalin’s ideological discourse. An important concern arises regarding the stability of the concept of Ukrainization in the “Galicia-Volyn Principality” and its impact on the emergence of ethnic separateness.

After gaining a strategic advantage in the war at the end of 1943, the party leadership made it clear that it did not like the spread of non-Russian national narratives. In turn, this interesting example of Stalinist semantics demonstrates the government’s attempt to use Ukrainian patriotism for military mobilisation. Accordingly, the change in the political paradigm led to the condemnation of national identity⁴⁶. Starting from 1944, the party leadership began to pay attention to a certain slide towards “bourgeois-nationalist” ideology. Finally, in 1946–1947, the “national factor” was categorically condemned⁴⁷. The struggle of the Ukrainian people for “unification” with the Russian people came to the fore as the main factor in history. An important role in this context is occupied by the “correct” coverage of the history of Rus as the “common cradle” of two peoples (Belarusians are

⁴⁴ M. Petrovs’kyi, *Zakhidna Ukrayina* (Istorychna dovidka) [Western Ukraine (Historical reference)], in “Biblioteka ahitatora”, Kyiv, 1945, p. 1. More about M Petrovs’kyi’s scheme see in: M. Tkachenko, *Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav – odvichni ukrayins’ki zemli* [Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav – eternal Ukrainian lands], in “Ukrayins’ka literatura”, 1944, № 5-6, p. 122-129.

⁴⁵ V. Boyechko, O. Hanzha, B. Zakharchuk, *Kordony Ukrayiny: Istorychna retrospektyva ta suchasnyy stan* [Borders of Ukraine: Historical retrospective and current state], Kyiv, Osnovy, 1994, p. 80-85.

⁴⁶ V. Pashuto, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], in “Istoricheskiy zhurnal”, 1943, № 3-4, p. 41.

⁴⁷ More in historical analysis from: S. Yekel’chik, *Imperiya pam’yati. Rosiys’ko-ukrayins’ki stosunky v radyans’kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, p. 82.

also mentioned, but in the works of Ukrainian historians it is mostly about Ukrainians and Russians), as well as their ethnic unity during that period.

REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING THE PAST OF REGNUM RUTHERNORUM AFTER WORLD WAR II

The Soviet authorities actively sought to suppress alternative “nationalist” versions of national memory, and Danylo Romanovych’s attempt at “russification” is particularly revealing. Thus, in the 1943 “Historical Journal”, the Russian historian V. Pashuto called Danylo Romanovych a “Russian prince” who ruled the “Russian” people in the “Southern Russian” lands.⁴⁸ Following him, the writer O. Yugov in his 1944 brochure also considered the prince and his subjects to be “Russian” and declared, “the people of Galicia, Bukovyna and Volhynia endured many historical challenges, defended the Russian language, parents’ faith and preserved an unquenchable love for Great Russia”⁴⁹. This version, endorsed by B. Grekov, focuses on the Polish period of Galician history while neglecting to address the formation of Ukrainian or at least proto-Ukrainian nationality⁵⁰.

During a conference of historians and local party ideologues in early 1945, Professor K. Guslysty tried to raise the problem of the “russification” of Danylo Romanovych in the central press. He especially criticized V. Pashuto’s article⁵¹ and O. Yugov’s pamphlet⁵², which interpreted the “Galicia-Volyn principality” exclusively from the point of view of the “united Russian people”, without directly connecting it with the history of Ukraine. Neither party functionaries nor fellow historians disputed Guslysty’s statement that “Daniel Galician is one of the great ancestors of the Ukrainian people, just as Aleksandr Nevsky is one of the great ancestors of the great Russian people”⁵³.

⁴⁸ V. Pashuto, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], in “Istoricheskiy zhurnal”, 1943, № 3-4, p. 41.

⁴⁹ A. Yugov, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], Moskva, Gospolitizdat, 1944, p. 55.

⁵⁰ B. Grekov, *Sud’by naseleniya galitskikh knyazheskikh votchin pod vlast’yu Pol’shi* [The fate of the population of the Galician princely estates under the rule of Poland], in “Istoricheskiy zhurnal”, 1944, № 12, p. 37-43.

⁵¹ V. Pashuto, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], in “Istoricheskiy zhurnal”, 1943, № 3-4, p. 42.

⁵² A. Yugov, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], Moskva, Gospolitizdat, 1944, p. 55

⁵³ S. Yekel’chyk, *Imperiya pam’yati. Rosiys’ko-ukrayins’ki stosunky v radyans’kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, p. 81.

The historiographical discussion continued, leading to criticism of K. Guslysty's previously accepted studies.⁵⁴ The Russian expert M. Tikhomirov, a specialist in the field of Eastern Slavic Middle Ages, voiced a very critical assessment of K. Guslysty's view in his unpublished "Essay on the History of Ukraine". The Ukrainian historian's views on the beginning of the formation of the Ukrainian nation were particularly criticised. Furthermore, M. Tikhomirov claimed that "Galician-Volyn Rus could not be a unifying centre for Ukraine, because the Belarusian and Ukrainian people in the 13th century have not yet developed"⁵⁵. Therefore, based on this statement, it may be inferred that the Russians have already formed as a people. The tendency to identify the Old Rus population with the later great Russian nationality, and to consider Ukrainians and Belarusians as those who separated from the single Russian (actually Russian) people in the 13th – 14th centuries was characteristic of certain authoritative Russian medievalists, even during the reign of the compromise concept of the "common cradle"⁵⁶.

Stalinist ideologues eliminated the remnants of nationalist historical narratives from the public discourse of Western Ukraine. They commissioned "reliable" historians to write sample lectures on the history of the region. The first to respond was M. Petrovskiy, who composed a brief outline of the history of Western Ukraine in an operative manner. Sensing where the new ideological wind of the last years of the war was blowing, he attributed to the people of Galicia an age-old desire to unite not only with Eastern Ukrainians but also with the "fraternal one-

⁵⁴ *Istoriya Ukrayiny: Korotkyy kurs* [History of Ukraine: A Short Course], Pid red. S. Byelousova, K. Guslysty, O. Ohloblina, M. Petrovsk'okho, M. Suprunenka, F. Yastrebova. AN URSS. Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny, Kyiv, Vyd-vo AN URSS, 1940, 412 p.

⁵⁵ M. Tikhomirov, *Drevnerusskiye goroda. Izdaniye vtoroye, dopolnennoye i pererabotannoye* [Old Russian Cities. Second edition, supplemented and revised], Moskva, Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1956, p. 209; More about M. Tikhomirov vision see: N. Yusova, *Vozz'yednannya ukrayins'kykh zemel' i aktualizatsiya problemy pokhodzhennya ukrayins'koyi narodnosti v radyans'kiy istoriografiyi: 1939-1947 rr. (v svitli novykh arkhivnykh dzherel)* [The reunification of Ukrainian lands and the actualization of the problem of the origin of the Ukrainian nation in Soviet historiography: 1939-1947 (in the light of new archival sources)], in *Spetsial'ni istorichni dystsypliny: pytannya teoriyi ta metodyky: zbirka naukovykh prats. NAN Ukrayiny, In-t istoriyi Ukrayiny*, Kyiv, 2004, Chysl. 11, ch. 2: *Do 10-richchya zasniv. viddilu spets. ist. dystsyplin In-tu istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny*, p. 183.

⁵⁶ M. Koval', O. Rubl'ov, *Peredmovva* [Preface], in *U leshtakh totalitaryzmu: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny (1936–1956 rr.): Zb. dokumenty i materialy: U 2-kh chastynakh, uporyad.:* R. Pyrih (kerivnyk), T. Hrytsenko, V. Mazur, O. Rubl'ov, Kyiv, 1996, ch. 1, p. 25.

blooded Russian people". He went even further to destroy the patriotic concepts of wartime, criticising the Galician historians M. Hrushevskyy and S. Tomashivskyy for tracing "Ukrainian" statehood from ancient Kyiv to the "Galicia-Volyn principality". Petrovsky wrote that by the 14th century, there were no Ukrainian, Russian, or Belarusian nationalities, only a "single Rus nation". Moreover, even before 1917, eastern and western Ukrainians apparently wanted to unite within the boundaries of a single "Ukrainian state that would be a part of Russia". According to this scheme, little changed after 1917: the Soviet Union replaced the Russian Empire in the process of the final "historical unification" of the Eastern Slavs⁵⁷.

A different understanding of national memory gave rise to new attempts to interpret the past. The concept of the "Galicia-Volyn principality" and its history did not align with the rationale behind the concept of "the unity of the Russian and Ukrainian people". The Soviet ideologues could no longer return to the chauvinistic idea of a single Russian people, which consists of four parts – Great Russians, Ukrainians, Belarusians and Galicians. Because of that, research on the history of the "Galicia-Volyn principality" and its "promotion" in artistic works became something peripheral in the system of Soviet agitprop⁵⁸. It is significant that the monograph "Galician-Volyn Principality" prepared by I. Krypyakevych, director of the Institute of Social Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, was never published during the author's lifetime, but was published after his death in 1984⁵⁹.

After the war, Ukrainian party functionaries showed extreme sensitivity to any scientific works about the "Galicia-Volyn state". In 1951, the censors did not accept the article of the historian F. Shevchenko "On some questions of the history of Ukraine", written for the "Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR", because its author believed that "the beginning of Ukrainian statehood lies in certain South Russian principalities and especially Galicia-Volyn"⁶⁰. A telling

⁵⁷ M. Petrov's'kyy, *Zakhidna Ukrayina (Istorychna dovidka)* [Western Ukraine (Historical reference)], in "Biblioteka ahitatora", Kyiv, 1945, p. 3-4, 17.

⁵⁸ N. Yusova, *Pohlyady istorykiv URSR 30-kh – pochatku 40-kh rr. na etnichni protsesy v istoriyi skhidnykh slov"yan doby Kyivs'koyi Rusi* [Views of historians of the Ukrainian SSR in the 30s – early 40s on ethnic processes in the history of the Eastern Slavs of the Kyivan Rus period], in *Problemy istoriyi Ukrayiny: Fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: Mizhvidomchyy zb. nauk. pr.*, Kyiv, 2002, vyp. 6, p.101-111.

⁵⁹ I. Kryp'yakevych, *Halyts'ko-Volyns'ke knyazivstvo* [Galicia-Volyn principality], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1984, 176 p.

⁶⁰ F. Shevchenko, *Pro deyaki pytannya istoriyi Ukrayiny* [About some questions of the history of Ukraine], in *Istorychni studiyi: Zbirka vybranykh prats' i materialiv (Do 100-*

fact: in the first post-war decade, historian V. Pashuto published the only book about “Galicia-Volyn principality”. Reviewers hailed it as “the first independent and serious monograph in Soviet historical literature devoted to the study of the history of Western Ukrainian lands during the period of feudal fragmentation”⁶¹.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of specific information, it is certain that political influences had a significant impact on Soviet historical research throughout the Stalinist era. A new “Soviet-Marxist” vision of the role of the State of the Romanovychs in history occurred in response to the re-evaluation of M. Hrushevskyi’s historical concept from the second half of the 1930s. At the time when Soviet historical science adopted a new position on “Galicia-Volyn Rus” as an integral part of the “three-united Russian people”, in 1939-40 the Ukrainian lands were “reunified” as part of the Ukrainian SSR. Demonstrating the historical unity and the unity of Ukrainian people, the history of their struggle for independence, and reunification in a single Ukrainian state, is gaining considerable relevance. During the Second World War, the history of Galicia is examined in connection with its ethnic isolation, highlighting the primordial struggle of the Ukrainian people against invaders and exploiters. With the beginning of the “liberation” of Ukraine after the War, the national factor was condemned. All subsequent studies on the history of the “Galicia-Volyn Principality” were conducted in the context of the struggle of the Ukrainian people for “unification” with the Russians.

The choice against the *Regnum Ruthenorum* state name can be attributed to the potential disruption it would cause to the Soviet grand narrative about the Principality of Moscow as the rightful successor of medieval Rus. The State of the Romanovychs, commonly known as the Kingdom of Rus in historical texts, was the legitimate successor of the Kyivan state and had a considerably superior position. However, kings could not rule over the Ukrainian territories since Moscow territories only had princes, as dictated by the Soviet historical policy. The title “rex” or “regis” in the Latin West contradicted the original “Rus culture” and could give

richchya vid dnya narodzhennya), za red. V. Smoliya ta H. Boryaka; uporyad. i kom.: S. Baturina, S. Blashchuk, I. Korchemna, O. Yas', Kyiv, NAN Ukrayiny. In-t istoriyi Ukrayiny, 2014, p. 367-371.

⁶¹ V. Pashuto, *Ocherki po istorii Galitsko-Volynskoy Rusi* [Essays on the history of Galicia-Volyn Rus'], Moskva, Izd-vo Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1950, 331 p.

birth to an incorrect, “pro-Western” interpretation of the past. This state of historical studies of Danylo’s image gave birth to a rather limited and biased historiographical tradition. The military-political and trade-economic relations of the king with the countries of Europe at that time remained forgotten. Through their distorted ways of recalling events, the party leadership attempted to erase the notions of “rex” and “regnum” from the memory of Ukrainian society of the Soviet era.

The Soviet government’s vision of the Ukrainian past was completely placed at the service of the regime’s ideological needs. Research into the Regnum Ruthenorum as a “Galicia-Volyn principality” under Stalin’s time resembled flirting with Ukrainian history. The latter revered and explored their past as long as it complemented, rather than competed with Russian imperial history.

REFERENCES:

1. Aleksandrovych Volodymyr, *Mystetstvo Kholma doby knyazya Danyla Romanovycha* [The art of Holm in the era of Prince Danylo Romanovych], in: “Knyazha doba. Istoryia i kul’tura”, L’viv, Instytut ukrayinoznavstva imeni I. Kryp’yak-evycha NAN Ukrayiny, 2007, p. 136-153.
2. Bazhan Mykola, *Danylo Halyts’kyi*, in “Tvory v 4-kh tomakh: T. 1. Poeziyi ta poemu 1923–1983”, Kyiv, Dnipro, 1984, 637 p.
3. Boyechko Vasyl, Hanzha Oleksandr, Zakharchuk Bohdan, *Kordony Ukrayiny: Istorychna retrospektyva ta suchasnyy stan* [Borders of Ukraine: Historical retrospective and current state], Kyiv, Osnovy, 1994, 168 p.
4. Brachov Sergey, *Russkiy istorik A. Presnyakov (1870 – 1929)* [Russian historian A. Presnyakov (1870 – 1929)], Sankt-Peterburg, 2002, 84 p.
5. Byelousov Sergey, *Krakh pol’skoyi derzhavy i z’yednannya velykoho ukrayins’koho narodu v yedyniy Ukrayins’kiy derzhavi – URSS* [The collapse of the Polish state and the unification of the great Ukrainian people in a single Ukrainian state - Ukrainian SSR], in “Zakhidna Ukrayina. Zbirnyk pid red. S.M.Byelousova i O.P. Ohloblina”, Kyiv, 1940, p. 97-109.
6. *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis*, Studio et opera G. Fejer, Budaae, 1829, vol. 2, 490 p.
7. *Codex diplomaticus Poloniae*, wyd. Bobowski Mikołaj, Varsaviae, 1858, t. 3, 254 p.

8. Dąbrowski Dariusz, *Daniel Romanowicz król Rusi (ok. 1201–1264). Biografia polityczna* [Daniel Romanovich King of Rus (1201–1264). Political biography], Kraków, Avalon, 2012, 538 p.
9. Dąbrowski Dariusz, *Król Rusi Daniel Romanowicz. O ruskiej rodzinie książęcej, społeczeństwie i kulturze w XIII w.* [King of Rus Daniel Romanowicz. On the Russian princely family, society and culture in the 13th century], Kraków, Avalon, 2016. 412 p.
10. David-Fox Michael, *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015, 336p.
11. Dashkevych Yaroslav, *Problema derzhavnosti na Halyts'ko-Volyns'kykh zemlyakh (kinets' X – seredyna XIV st.)* [The problem of statehood in the Galicia-Volyn lands (end of the 10th - middle of the 14th century)], in: "Korol' Danylo Romanovich i yoho mistse v ukrayins'kiy istoriyi", L'viv, 2003, p. 19-46.
12. *Dyskusiya z pryvodu skhemy istoriyi Ukrayiny M. Yavors'koho* [Discussion about the scheme of the history of Ukraine by M. Yavorskyi], in "Litopys revolyutsiyi", 1930, № 2, p. 270-271.
13. Edele Mark, *Debates on Stalinism*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2020, 312 p.
14. Grekov Boris, *Drevneyshiye sud'by Zapadnoy Ukrainy* [The most ancient destinies of Western Ukraine], in "Novyy mir", 1939, № 10-11, p. 248-256.
15. Grekov Boris, *Sud'by naseleniya galitskikh knyazheskikh votchin pod vlast'yu Pol'shi* [The fate of the population of the Galician princely estates under the rule of Poland], in "Istoricheskiy zhurnal", 1944, № 12, p. 37-43.
16. Guslysty Kostyantyn, *Danylo Halyts'kyi* [Daniel Galician], Saratov, Ukrvydav pry TsK KP(b)U, 1942, 12 p.
17. Hapusenko Ivan, *Istoriya Ukrayiny periodu feodalizmu* [History of Ukraine during the period of feudalism], in "Rozvytok istorychnoyi nauky na Ukrayini za roky Radyans'koyi vlady", Kyiv, 1973, p. 76-101.
18. *Heinrici Chronicon Livoniae*, rec. L. Arbusow et A. Bauer, in: *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum et Monumentis Germaniae Historicis. Separatim editi*, Hannoverae, impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1955, 255 p.
19. Holovko Volodymyr, *Istoriografiya kryzy istorychnoyi nauky. Ukrayins'ky kontekst* [Historiography of the crisis of historical science. Ukrainian context], Kyiv, 2003, 228 p.
20. Homza Martin, Malinovska Nora, *Halichsko-volynská kronika. Neznáme rozprávanie o rodine kráľov a kniežat východno-strednej Európy v 13. storočí* [The Galician-Volhynian chronicle. The unknown story about the families of the kings

and the princes of the East-Central Europe in the 13th century], Martin, Matica slovenská, 2019, vol. 2, 412 p.

21. Hrushevskiy Mykhailo, *Zvychaina skhema ruskoi istorii y sprava ratsionalnogo ukladu istorii Skhidnogo Sloviaanstva* [The usual scheme of Russian history and the matter of a rational arrangement of the history of the Eastern Slavs], in "Stat'y po slavyanovedenyu", Sankt-Peterburh, 1904, vyp. 1., p. 291-304.

22. Isayevych Yaroslav, *Problema pokhodzhennya ukrayins'koho narodu: istoriohrafichnyy i politychnyy aspekt* [The problem of the origin of the Ukrainian people: historiographical and political aspect], in "Ukrayina davnya i nova. Narod, relihiya, kul'tura", L'viv, 1996, p. 22-42;

23. *Istoriya Ukrayiny: Korotkyy kurs* [History of Ukraine: A Short Course], Pid red. S. Byelousova, K. Huslystoho, O. Ohloblina, M. Petrovs'koho, M. Suprunenka, F. Yastrebova. AN URSS. Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny, Kyiv, Vyd-vo AN URSS, 1940, 412 p.

24. *Joannis Długosz senioris canonici Cracoviensis Opera omnia*, ed. A. Przewdziecki, in *Historiae Polonicae libri XII*, Kraków, 1873, vol. 2, 565 p.

25. Kaye Volodymyr, *The Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, 1772*, in "Canadian Slavonic Papers", 1972, vol. 14, p. 454-464.

26. Kryp'yakevych Ivan, *Halyts'ko-Volyns'ke knyazivstvo* [Galicia-Volyn principality], Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 1984, 176 p.

27. Kotlyar Nikolay, *Formirovaniye territorii i vozniknoveniye gorodov Galitsko-Volynskoy Rusi X – XIII vv.*, Kiev, Naukova dumka, 1985, 184 p.

28. Koval' Mykola, O. Rubl'ov, *Peredmov* [Preface] in "U leshtakh totalitaryzmu: Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny (1936–1956 rr.): Zb. dokumenty i materialy: U 2-kh chastynakh", uporyad.: R. Pyrih (kerivnyk), T. Hrytsenko, V. Mazur, O. Rubl'ov, Kyiv, 1996, ch. 1, 147 p.

29. Lyubavskiy Mikhail, *Obrazovaniye osnovnoy gosudarstvennoy territorii velikorusskoy narodnosti. Zaseleniye i ob'yedineniye tsentra* [Formation of the main state territory of the Great Russian nation. Settlement and unification of the center], Moskva, 1929, p. 3-5;

30. *Narys istoriyi Ukrayiny* [Essay on the history of Ukraine], za red. K. Huslystoho, Ufa, Vyd-vo AN URSS, 1942, 212 p.

31. Pashuto Vladimir, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], in "Istoricheskiy zhurnal", 1943, № 3-4, p. 37-44.

32. Pashuto Vladimir, *Ocherki po istorii Galitsko-Volynskoy Rusi* [Essays on the history of Galicia-Volyn Rus'], Moskva, Izd-vo Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1950, 331 p.

33. Petrovs'kyy Mykhailo, *Zakhidna Ukrayina* (Istorychna dovidka) [Western Ukraine (Historical reference)], in "Biblioteka ahitatora", Kyiv, 1945, p. 3-17.
34. Piontkovskiy Sergey, *Velykoderzhavnye tendentsiyi v istoriografii Rosii* [Great power trends in the historiography of Russia], in "Istorik-marksist", 1930, t. 17, p. 22-23.
35. Pokrovskiy Mikhail, *Ocherki istorii ruskoy kul'tury* [Essays on the history of Russian culture], Moskva – Leningrad, 1925, 202 p.
36. Presnyakov Andrey, *Kniazhoe pravo v Drevnei Rusy. Ocherky po ystoriy X- XII stoletiy. Lektsyy po russkoi ystoriy. Kyevskaia Rus'* [Princely law in Ancient Rus. Essays on the history of the X-XII centuries. Lectures on Russian history. Kievan Rus], Moskva, 1993, 316 p.
37. Presnyakov Andrey, *Obrazovaniye velikorusskogo gosudarstva. Ocherki po istorii XII - XVI stoletiy* [Formation of the Great Russian state. Essays on the history of the 12th-16th centuries], Petrograd, 1918, p. 1-26.
38. *Rocznik Krasieńskich*, wydał A. Bielowski, in: "Monumenta Poloniae Historica. Tomus 3", Lwów, 1878, 389 p.
39. Roberts Geoffrey, *Stalin's Library: A Dictator and His Books*, New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2022, 260 p.
40. Rubinshtein Mikhail, *Narys istoriyi Kyivs'koyi Rusi* [Essay on the history of Kyivan Rus], Kharkiv – Odesa, 1930, 343 p.
41. Idem, *Zapadnyye puti torgovli Ukrainy-Rusi* [Western trade routes between Ukraine and Rus'], in "Visnyk Odes'koyi Komisiyi Krayeznavstva pry Ukrayins'kiy akademiyi Nauk", Odesa, 1925, ch. 2-3. p. 120-134.
42. Santsevych Andrii, *M. Yavors'kyy: narys zhyttya ta tvorchosti* [M. Yavorskyi: Essey of life and creativity], Kyiv, 1995, s. 388; S. Piontkovskiy, *Velikoderzhavnyye tendentsii v istoriografii Rossii* [Great-power tendencies in the historiography of Russia], in "Istorik-marksist", 1930, t. 17, 61 p.
43. Shevchenko Fedir, *Pro deyaki pytannya istoriyi Ukrayiny* [About some questions of the history of Ukraine], in "Istorychni studiyi: Zbirka vybranykh prats' i materialiv (Do 100-richchya vid dnya narodzhennya)", za red. V. Smoliya ta H. Boryaka; uporyad. i kom.: S. Baturina, S. Blashchuk, I. Korchemna, O. Yas', Kyiv, NAN Ukrayiny. In-t istoriyi Ukrayiny, 2014, p. 367-371.
44. *The Hypatian Codex Part Two: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*, An Annotated Translation, By George A. Perfecky. With an editor's preface, in "Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies", Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973, vol. 16, 159 pp.

45. Tkachenko Mykola, *Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav – odvichni ukrayins'ki zemli* [Kholmshchyna, Hrubeshiv, Yaroslav - eternal Ukrainian lands], in "Ukrayins'ka literatura", 1944, № 5-6, p. 122-129.

46. Tsalyk Serhii, Selihey Petro, *Pro shcho zmovchaly biohrafy Mykoly Bazhana* [What the biographers of Mykola Bazhan kept silent about], in "Tayemnytsi pys'mennyts'kykh shukhlyad: Detektyvna istoriya ukrayins'koyi literatury", Kyiv, Nash chas, 2010, p. 32-35.

47. Tikhomirov Mikhail, *Drevnerusskiye goroda. Izdaniye vtoroye, dopolnennoye i pererabotannoye* [Old Russian Cities. Second edition, supplemented and revised], Moskva, Gosudarstvennoye izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1956, 474 p.

48. Yavors'kyy Matviy, *Korotka istoriya Ukrayiny* [Short history of Ukraine], Kharkiv, Derzh. vydavnytstvo Ukrayiny, 1926, 144 p.

49. Yekelchyk Serhy, *Stalin's empire of memory: Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 2004, 231 p.

50. Yekel'chyk Serhii, *Imperiya pam'yati. Rosiys'ko-ukrayins'ki stosunky v radyans'kiy istorychniy uyavi* [Empire of memory. Russian-Ukrainian relations in the Soviet historical imagination], Kyiv, Krytyka, 2008, 340 p.

51. Ysaevych Yaroslav, "Korolevstvo Halytsyy y Volodymyryy" y "Korolevstvo Rusy" ["Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria" and "Kingdom of Rus"], in: "Drevneyshye hosudarstva na terrytoryy SRSR. Materyaly y yssledovanyya", Moskva, Nauka, 1986, p. 62-63.

52. Yugov Aleksey, *Daniil Galitskiy* [Daniel Galician], Moskva, Gospolizdat, 1944, 562 p.

53. Yusova Natalia, *Pohlyady istorykiv URSS 30-kh – pochatku 40-kh rr. na etnichni protsesy v istoriyi skhidnykh slov'yan doby Kyivs'koyi Rusi* [Views of historians of the Ukrainian SSR in the 30s – early 40s on ethnic processes in the history of the Eastern Slavs of the Kyivan Rus period], in "Problemy istoriyi Ukrayiny: Fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: Mizhvidomchyy zb. nauk. pr.", Kyiv, 2002, vyp. 6, p. 101-111.

54. Eadem, *Vnesok M. Rubinshteyna u formuvannya radyans'koyi kontseptsiyi istoriyi Ukrayiny* [The role of M. Rubinstein in the formation of the Soviet concept of the history of Ukraine], in "Probl. istoriyi Ukrayiny: fakty, sudzhennya, poshuky: Mizhvid. zb. nauk. pr.", 2004, vyp. 11, s. 225-276.

55. Eadem, *Vozz'yednannya ukrayins'kykh zemel' i aktualizatsiya problemy pokhodzhennya ukrayins'koyi narodnosti v radyans'kiy istoriohrafyyi: 1939-1947 rr. (v*

svitli novykh arkhivnykh dzherel) [The reunification of Ukrainian lands and the actualization of the problem of the origin of the Ukrainian nation in Soviet historiography: 1939-1947 (in the light of new archival sources)], in "Spetsial'ni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannya teorii ta metodyky: zbirka naukovykh prats. NAN Ukrayiny, In-t istoriyi Ukrayiny", Kyiv, 2004, Chysl. 11, ch. 2: Do 10-richchya zasnov. viddilu spets. ist. dystsyplin In-tu istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny, p. 174-208.

56. Voloshchuk Myroslav, *Movoiu dzherel? Terminolohichni aspekty istoriografichnoho derzhavonaimen-nuvannia na prykladi Halytskoi zemli X–XIV st.* [By the language of the sources? Terminological aspects of the historiographical state nominations on the example of the Galician land of the 10th–14th centuries], in "Colloquia Russica", V. Nagirnyy, M. Voloshchuk (Ed.), Ivano-Frankivsk; Krakow, Lileia-NV, 2018, series 2, vol. 4, pp. 265–295.

57. Zaliznyak Leonid, *De, yak i koly vynykla davn'orus'ka narodnist' (Do 50-richchya problemy)* [Where, how and when did the ancient Russian nation arise (To the 50th anniversary of the problem)], in "Pam'yat' stolit'", 1998, № 6, p. 4-5.

58. Zatylyuk Yaroslav, *Povidomlennya Annaliv pro Yana Dluhosha pro korunatsiyu Danyla Romanovycha ta yikh pokhodzhennya* [The Annals of Jan Dlugos report about the coronation of Danylo Romanovych and their origin], in: "Ruthenica", Kyiv, Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny, t. 13, p. 108-136.