

THE RESEARCH ON THE ORIGIN OF RUSSIANS AND UKRAINIANS AS THE INDICATOR OF POLITICIZATION OF RUSSIAN NATIONAL MINORITY IN UKRAINE

The article is devoted to analyzing the problem of the researches on the origin of Russians and Ukrainians as the indicator of politicization of Russian national minority in Ukraine. There are four basic schools of understanding of the proposed issues, i.e. Russophile, Sovietophile, Ukrainophile, as well as East-Slavonophile. The author motivated that scholars at each historical stage of development interpreted the problems studied in different ways, but always depending on the size of actual material, ideological positions of researchers, as well as on the prevailing political conditions at one time or another. It was confirmed that the formation of a real ethnos is impossible without the creation of a myth in the national context, although it was discovered that colonial attempt to erase historical memory is a process that leads to the loss of national identity and its assimilation in the center of imperial aspirations.

Keywords: Ukrainians, Russians, Russian national minority, Kievan Rus, Ukraine.

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ПОХОДЖЕННЯ РОСІЯН ТА УКРАЇНЦІВ ЯК ІНДИКАТОР ПОЛІТИЗАЦІЇ РОСІЙСЬКОЇ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ МЕНШИНИ В УКРАЇНІ

Проаналізовано проблематику дослідження походження росіян та українців як індикатора політизації російської національної меншини в Україні. Виокремлено чотири базові школи розуміння запропонованої проблематики – русофільська, радянфільська, українофільська, а також східно-слов'янофільська. Вмотивовано, що на кожному історичному етапі розвитку вчені тлумачили досліджувані проблеми по-різному, але завжди залежно від обсягу існуючого в них фактичного матеріалу, ідеологічних позицій дослідників, а також панівної у той або інший час політичної кон'юнктури тощо. Підтверджено, що без міфотворення на національну проблематику неможливе формування реального етносу, хоч натомість виявлено, що колонізаторські спроби стерти історичну пам'ять – це процес, який веде до втрати національної ідентичності та спричиняє її асиміляцію в центрі імперських прагнень.

Ключові слова: українці, росіяни, російська національна меншина, Київська Русь, Україна.

The origin of East Slavic peoples and their languages (Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian languages) has always been in the focus of many researchers. However, at each historical stage of development scientists interpreted these problems differently, in particular depending on the volume of available factual information, ideological positions of scholars, as well as predominant political conjuncture during any of the periods etc. Nevertheless, the problem of origin of Russians and Ukrainians as the indicator of politicization of Russian national minority in Ukraine, to a large extent has been unsolved and thus it is positioned as rather actual, especially against the background of warfare between Russia and Ukraine, started in 2014.

Correspondingly, the aim and tasks of the current research is to study out and systematize the problem of origin of Russians and Ukrainians as the indicator of politicization of Russian national minority in Ukraine. This range of problems has been described in a number of works by the following authors D. Arel¹, M. Braichevskiy², I. Burkovskiy³, A. Chernenko⁴, M. Hrushevskiy⁵, Y. Isaievych⁶, N. Karamzin⁷, V. Klyuchevskij⁸, P. Kolstoe⁹, V. Kremin i V. Tkachenko¹⁰, S. Kulchytskyi¹¹, T. Kuzio¹², P. Magocsi¹³, M. Maksimovich¹⁴, V. Mavrodin¹⁵, J. Pelenski¹⁶, H. Pivtorak¹⁷, M. Pogodin¹⁸, M. Pokrovskij¹⁹, S. Solovjov²⁰, O. Subtelny²¹, R. Szporluk²²,

¹ Arel D., A Lurking Cascade of Assimilation in Kiev?, *Post-Soviet Affairs* 1996, vol 12, nr. 1, s. 73–90.

² Braichevskiy M., *Konspekt istorii Ukrainy*, Kyiv 1993.; Braichevskiy M., *Pryiednannia chy voz'ziednannia? Krytychni zauvahy z pryvodu odnii kontseptii*, Wyd. Novi Dni 1972.

³ Burkovskiy I., Chy mala mova Kyivskoi Rusi davnomoskovsku osnovu, „*Rozbudova derzhavy*” 1996, vol 12, s. 15–18.

⁴ Chernenko A., *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia*, Wyd. DDU 1994.

⁵ Hrushevskiy M., *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1992.

⁶ Isaievych Y., Problema pokhodzhennia ukrainskoho narodu: istoriohrafichnyi i politychnyi aspekt, „*Ukraina: Kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*” 1995, vol 2.

⁷ Karamzin N., *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossijskogo: v 12 t.*, Moskva 1816–1829.

⁸ Klyuchevskij V., *Kurs ruskoj istorii*, SPb 1904.; Klyuchevskij V., *Russkaya istoriya: Polnyj kurs lekcij*, Wyd. Olma Media Group 2004.

⁹ Kolstoe P., *Political Construction Sites: Nation-Building and the Post-Soviet States*, Wyd. Westview 2000.

¹⁰ Kremin V., Tabachnyk D., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Alternatyvy postupu, krytyka istorychnoho dosvidu*, Wyd. ARC-Ukraine 1996.; Kremin V., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Sbliakh do sebe. Problemy suspilnoi transformatsii*, Wyd. Druk 1998.

¹¹ Kulchytskyi S., Davnokyivska spadshchyna u vysvitleni Mykhaila Hrushevskoho, „*Polityka i chas*” 1996, vol 9, s. 71–80.

¹² Kuzio T., Is Ukraine Part of Europe's Future, „*Washington Quarterly*” 2006, vol 29, nr. 3, s. 89–108.; Kuzio T., National Identity and History Writing in Ukraine, „*Nationalities Papers*” 2006, vol 34, nr. 4, s. 407–427.

¹³ Magocsi P., *A History of Ukraine*, Wyd. University of Toronto 1996.

¹⁴ Maksimovich M., *Otkuda idet russkaya zemlya, po skazaniyu Nestorovoj povesti i po drugim starinnyim pisaniyam russkim: Sochinenie Mihaila Maksimovicha*, Kiev 1837.

¹⁵ Mavrodin V., *Drevnyaya Rus: Proiskhozhdzenie russkogo naroda i obrazovanie Kievskogo gosudarstva*, Wyd. Gospolitizdat 1946.

¹⁶ Pelenski J., *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus*, Wyd. East European Monographs 1998.

¹⁷ Pivtorak H., *Pokhodzhennia ukrainsiv, rosijan, bilorusiv ta yikhnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademia 2001.

¹⁸ Pogodin M., K voprosu o slavyanofilah, „*Grazhdanin*” 1873, vol 11.

¹⁹ Pokrovskij M., *Russkaya istoriya v samom szhatom ocherke*, Wyd. Izdatel'stvo CK VKP(b) Partizdat 1933.

²⁰ Solovjov S., *Istoriya Rossii s drevnejshih vremen*, Moskva 1959.

²¹ Subtelny O., *Ukraine: A History*, Wyd. University of Toronto Press 2000.

²² Szporluk R., Kiev as the Ukraine's Primate City, „*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*” 1979–1980, vol 3, nr. 4, s. 843–849.

O. Tolochko and P. Tolochko²³, V. Tolz²⁴, N. Trubeckoj²⁵, S. Velychenko²⁶, A. Wilson²⁷, L. Zaluzniak²⁸ and many others.

Having familiarized with them, it is possible to argue that scientific research on ethnogenesis of eastern Slavs in fact has a bicentennial tradition, as a result of which there have been made up two main conceptions. Thus, in tsarist and imperial Russia, ideologists who were supported by that time historians, interpreted all eastern Slavs as a single Rus nation and descended its history from the Kyivska Rus, assuming it the oldest Rus (very often ideology-driven and mistakenly – Russian) state. In its turn, the Soviet historiography acknowledged not only the right of Russian, but also Ukrainian and Belarus people on their language and history, however, party ideologists could not get rid of imperial claims for historical heritage of the Kyivska Rus. Therefore, having declared it a common-Slavic state, the USSR ideologists promulgated a doctrine, approved by the highest institutions of the communist party, according to which the origins of Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples and correspondingly their languages had to be descended to the Late Middle Ages (14th-15th centuries). The point is that official authorities turned a blind eye to all attempts made by Russian historians and philologists to start the history of Russia and its language from the 9th-10th centuries, whereas the same aspirations in Ukraine and Belarus were considered as hostile and were roughly prosecuted. As a result of this, during a long course of time only being a part of expatriate community Ukrainian (and Belarusian) researchers could freely articulate their views and develop conceptions of ethnogenesis of Ukrainians on the bases of historical facts. Eventually, during the period of reconstruction of Ukrainian sovereignty and revival of Ukrainian nation's spirituality (late 20th century) there was a considerable increase of interest among the public in the origin of the Ukrainian nation and its language, as well as similar data concerning Russians, which are quite useful from the point of view of the problems of Russian minority in Ukraine.

It is proved by numerous publications, written not only by researchers-historians, philologists and ethnologists, but journalists-amateurs, writers etc. But the absence of necessary knowledge in Slavonic studies, lack of research experience, incomprehension of the necessity to ground on verified sources of information and operate accurate historical facts and inability (or unwillingness) to take into account acknowledged scientific postulates have often led to the fact that amateurs' intentions turned into unrestrainable fantasies, a kind of wishful thinking.

²³ Tolochko O., Tolochko P., *Kyivska Rus*, Wyd. Alternatyvy 1998.; Tolochko P., *Vid Rusi do Ukrainy*, Wyd. Abrys 1997.

²⁴ Tolz V., Rethinking Russian-Ukrainian relations: a New Trend in Nation-Building in Post-Communist Russia, „*Nations and Nationalism*“ 2002, vol 8, nr. 2, s. 235–253.

²⁵ Trubeckoj N., *K probleme russkogo samopoznaniya*, Parizh 1927.

²⁶ Velychenko S., *National History as Cultural Process: a Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*, Wyd. University of Alberta 1992.; Velychenko S., *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914–1991*, Wyd. St Martin's Press 1993.

²⁷ Wilson A., *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, Wyd. Yale University Press 2009.; Wilson A., *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s: A Minority Faith*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1997.

²⁸ Zaluzniak L., *Vid sklavyvnyv do ukraïnskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukraïntsia 1997.; Zaluzniak L., *Etnohenez ukraïntsv, „Geneza”* 1995, vol 1, nr. 3.; Zaluzniak L., *Kyivska Rus – proukraïnska derzhava, „Istorychnyi kalendar”* 1997, vol 98, s. 180–183.

That is why together with scientific conclusions, supported by documents and facts, earlier and today there are a lot of mythological visions of the history of Ukrainian and Russian peoples and their languages. On the other hand, authors, following out-of-date foundations and views, intentionally “broaden” the history of Russians and their language, “shifting away” the origins of Ukrainians’ independent history and formation of the Ukrainian language, in particular up to the 17th-18th centuries, and connect the previous periods only with the existence of Russian sovereignty. That is the way why many researchers and amateurs mistakenly believe that Ukrainians have no connection to the Kyivska Rus.

Correspondingly, a “fight for the heritage” of the Kyivska Rus evidently has a “great impact” on various aspects of cultural comprehension, historical perception, modern national consciousness and national mythology of Ukraine and Russia. From this perspective, it is notable, in particular, that there are at least four basic schools of understanding of the proposed issues, i.e. Russophile, Sovietophile, Ukrainophile and East-Slavonophile. The first three, as an American scientist J. Pelenski believes, testify that the Kyivska Rus was a single state: though, in fact it was “weakly connected, ill-determined and heterogeneous union, in the basis of which was loyalty of tribes to their local territories”²⁹. Nevertheless, it in no way prevented from mythologization of the history of the Kyivska Rus by each of the three schools. On the other hand, the fourth East-Slavonophile school was a representation of eclectic reactions to supposedly “nationalistic” and “anti-Russian” trends of the Ukrainophile School and unwillingness of Russophiles and Sovietophiles to recognize Ukrainians as an independent ethnic group³⁰. From this perspective, it is rather important to analyze genesis of research concerning origins of Russians and Ukrainians as the indicator of politicization of Russian national minority in Ukraine, including the period over last years and decades.

A starting point of current research is the fact that the conclusion of a multi-dimensional historical influence on formation of the Ukrainian nation is justified and substantiated. In this process during different periods of time participated different tribes, which inhabited the territory of modern Ukraine, in particular: non-autochthonous Trypillia tribes; autochthonous tribes of Dnipro-Donetsk and Srednistog culture; non-autochthonous Yamnaia culture, autochthonous and multiethnic Zarubentsi, Cherniakhivtsi, Volyntsiivska and Romenska cultures, cultures of Penkiv type and Luka Raikiv type etc. Namely due to them we can start trace ethnic inheritance of population in the territory of modern Ukraine, as a result of a succession of inter-tribal events started their formation of new territorial ethno-political unities on the basis of mutual language i.e. white Croats, Poliany, Drevliany, Duliby, Buzhany, Tyvertsi, Ulychi and others. In the process of further economic, cultural and language consolidation we observe transformation of separate ethno-political unities (the so-called “tribal confederations”) into feudal dukedoms, as a result of their unification at the edge of the 7th – 9th century appeared

²⁹ Pelenski J., *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus*, Wyd. East European Monographs 1998, s. 1.

³⁰ Kuzio T., National Identity and History Writing in Ukraine, „*Nationalities Papers*” 2006, vol 34, nr. 4, s. 407–427.

the Kyivska Rus. At first (before the 10th century) it did not go beyond the proto-Ukrainian ethnic and language territory, however later (over the 10th – 15th centuries) it spread its influence over all lands of eastern Slavs and many non-Slavic tribes. That is why, at the beginning of the 10th century the Kyivska Rus was an unstable confederation of tribal dukedoms, representing entwinement of centripetal and centrifugal ethnic-language and political tendencies³¹.

Namely due to this the question of ethnic arrangement and heterogeneity of the Kyivska Rus has been causing heated arguments, which are not only a scientific, but also a political problem. In particular, historians at the times of tsarist and imperial Russia and a great number of their followers stated and still argue that the Kyivska Rus as a state was founded by ethnic Russians. Allegedly, they were the oldest Slavic ethnoses, whereas Ukrainians and Belarusians, according to their logic, derived from them later. Thus, in the “Synopsis” by I. Gizel (published in 1674) and which till the beginning of the 19th century was the main historical textbook in the Russian Empire, the Kyivska Rus (it was often insisted on naming it just “Rus”) was declared the first stage of Russian sovereignty. The Kyivska Rus was also called the first “Russian state” by a Russian historian M. Karamzin (1776–1826), who in his book “The History of the Russian State” called Kyiv the mother of all cities, interpreting this phrase as the mother of all “Russian cities”³². In the mid-19th century the concept was continued by M. Pogodin (1800–1875), who stated that in Kyiv since the times of establishing Russian sovereignty and up to the Mongol-Tatar invasion in 1240 lived Russians and their ancestors, but when the Rus was conquered by Mongol-Tatars, Russians presumably left for Serednia Oka and Verkhnia Volga³³. This anti-scientific conception was refuted by Ukrainian philologists, historians and folklorists M. Maksymovych (1804–1873)³⁴ and A. Krymskyi (1871–1942)³⁵. However, nowadays, especially since 1991, but predominantly after 2014 some political circles in Russia and Ukraine, as well as chauvinistic representatives of Russian minority in Ukraine have been trying to revive it. Nevertheless, against the background of up-to-date achievements in the sphere of linguistics, archeology, anthropology and history such attempts are more and more interpreted as scientific ignorance or political fraud.

The result of the influence made by the Russophile approach towards the answer concerning the origin of peoples in the Russian Empire and the USSR was that in English speaking/western translations of Russian historiography the medieval state the Kyivska Rus was traditionally (though not always) defined as “Kyiv Russia”, which is a part of historical past of Russia. According to this idea after the collapse of the Kyivska Rus in the 8th century its heritage came to Volodymyro-Suzdal dukedom and from there to Moskoviiia and only in the 18th century to

³¹ Braichevskiy M., *Konspekt istorii Ukrainy*, Kyiv 1993.

³² Karamzin N., *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossijskogo: v 12 t.*, Moskva 1816–1829.

³³ Pogodin M., K voprosu o slavyanofilah, „*Grazhdanin*” 1873, vol 11.

³⁴ Maksimovich M., *Otkuda idet russkaya zemlya, po skazaniyu Nestorovoj povesti i po drugim starinnyim pisanijam russkim: Sochinenie Mihaila Maksimovicha*, Kiev 1837.

³⁵ *Abatanbel Krymskyi – uchenyi, pysmennyk, ukrainets*, Wyd. Volynska knyha 2007.

the Russian Empire. On the contrary, Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples supposedly appeared already after the collapse of the Kyivska Rus or when eastern Slavs lost their unity. For example, in traditional Russophile history of Russia Ukrainians as ethnos appeared only in the mid-17th century, when their task was to search ways for integration with Russia³⁶. Of great danger in this context is the fact that the Russophile-imperial vector in the 19th century was used by the majority of western historians, due to what such interpretation of “Russia” became standardized in western historiography. Though, in fact applying this paradigm rejects any claims concerning the Ukrainian nature of the Kyivska Rus, ignores real origin of Russians and suggests studying east-Slavonic history as an organic unity.

During the USSR times, in particular within the scope of the Sovietophile range of problems, great-power and chauvinistic feeling was smoothed by Soviet ideologists, making up a concept of “an individual Old Russian ethnos” i.e. a peculiar Old Russian nationality, which supposedly became an ethnic base for Russians, Ukrainians and Belarusians. In opposition to this since the 18th century, starting with the “History of the Rus People”³⁷, Ukrainian scientists started unscrupulously stated that the state Kyivska Rus was established by Ukrainians and Kyiv from everlasting was a proto-Ukrainian city. On the other hand, according to the statements made by Soviet historians, which until quite recently were an irreversible postulate, over the period of the Kyivska Rus, namely in the course of the 9th – 10th century, in particular as a result of rapprochements and merging of many east-Slavic tribes, was formed an ethnic and language unity – an Old Rus nationality. It as well as any other nationality, in accordance with Stalinist definition, had a common territory, language, economic life and psychological composition, which revealed in cultural entity. Namely this Old Rus nationality probably existed some time after the collapse of the Kyivska Rus and only later after the Mongol-Tatar invasion, started its division into three related parts, which in the 14th-15th century transformed into east-Slavic nationalities – Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian. Correspondingly, as Sovietophile assume, a common old Rus language split into three east-Slavic languages. Thus, according to the official USSR doctrine the history of Ukrainians and their language started not earlier than 14th – 15th century, and any attempts to search for deeper roots were harshly prosecuted. However, especially after the collapse of the USSR and development of science, it appeared that teachings about an Old Russian nationality are nothing more than an ideological myth.

It is notable, that the peculiarity of the Sovietophile approach in opposition to the Russophile approach is the fact that it is based on a supposedly more objective approach to studying the Kyivska Rus. In fact Russophile imperial scopes were still dominating in the history of the USSR due to a mixture of Russian imperial nationalism with communism. Herewith, merging of Russian nationalism and Soviet communism irreversibly marked formation of the Soviet

³⁶ Velnychenko S., *National History as Cultural Process: a Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*, Wyd. University of Alberta 1992.; Velnychenko S., *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914–1991*, Wyd. St Martin's Press 1993.

³⁷ *Istoriia rusiv*, Wyd. Rad. pismennyk 1991.

policy concerning nationalities, as well as historiography. That is why, in the USSR times only Russian historians³⁸ wrote about the Kyivska Rus and any other distinctive approach was treated as “nationalistic” and such which could be criminalized for the use of the terms “Ukrainian” and “Ukrainians” as referring to the period of the Kyivska Rus. On the contrary, the official USSR position was narrowed down to a simple use of the notion “Rus” synonymously for the term “old Russia”, on the grounds of which was postulated ancient identification with Russia³⁹.

On the other hand, it should be mentioned that not all Russian historians and not always followed such unscientific position. Thus, a historian V. Kliuchevkyi (1841-1911) assumed that Russians appeared on the historical arena after the collapse of the Kyivska Rus i.e. not earlier than the 2nd part of the 12th century. Besides, taking into account the position of M. Hrushevskyi, described in the work “An ordinary scheme of Rus history and the state of rational patterns of history of eastern Slavs” (1904)⁴⁰, M. Pokrovskij⁴¹ interpreted ethnic processes in Rus as a part of official Soviet historical science. However, it was only before his school was bashed in 1936, after what Russian history stopped being connected with the Volodymyr-Suzdal dukedom and it stopped being appealed to the history of the Kyivska Rus. The situation dramatically changed in 1946 when in Leningrad was published the work by V. Mavrodin “Old Russia”⁴². In it without any scientific grounding was stated that the Kyivska Rus is an initial stage in the history of three fraternal Slavic peoples of Eastern Europe, “which have one ancestor – Russian people of Kyiv times”. Such statements caught fancy of Soviet ideologists and were supported on behalf of the Soviet authorities, though at first were not understood by historians and philologists. The point is that in the concept offered by V. Mavrodin ideologists found artificial grounding for national policy of the Soviet leaders, which was disguised by demagogical phraseology and in fact continued the great-power vision of the tsarist and imperial Russia. Direct explanation was found in the fact that recognition of a real process of Russian nationality formation since the 12th century (in particular within the boundaries of the Volodymyr-Suzdal dukedom) made rather problematic all those claims Russia and the USSR had not only for territorial, but also cultural heritage of the Kyivska Rus, whereas return of Ukraine into the empire looked like not a fair readmission of old “Russian lands” by Moscow, but as a seizure of lands which belonged to a neighboring nation. All this means that the conception of an old Rus community started serving the political interests aimed at restoring the Russian empire at least within the frames of east-Slavic territories, as a result of which it was approved by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and officially stated in the “CPSU Central Committee’s thesis dated to 300th

³⁸ Tolz V., Rethinking Russian-Ukrainian relations: a New Trend in Nation-Building in Post-Communist Russia, „*Nations and Nationalism*” 2002, vol 8, nr. 2, s. 235–253.

³⁹ Isaevych Y., Problema pokhodzhennia ukrainskoho narodu: istoriohrafichnyi i politychnyi aspekt, „*Ukraina: Kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*” 1995, vol 2, s. 7.

⁴⁰ Hrushevskyi M., *Zvychnaia skhema „russkoi” istorii y sprava ratsionalnogo ukladu istorii skhidnogo slovianstva*, [w:] Kravtsiv B. (ed.), *Vyvid prav Ukrainy: Dokumenty i materialy do istorii ukrainskoi politychnoi dumky*, N-Y 1964, s. 11–24.

⁴¹ Pokrovskij M., *Russkaya istoriya v samom szhatom ocherke*, Wyd. Izdatel'stvo CK VKP(b) Partizdat 1933.

⁴² Mavrodin V., *Drevnyaya Rus: Proiskhozhdienie russkogo naroda i obrazovanie Kievskogo gosudarstva*, Wyd. Gospolitizdat 1946.

anniversary of reunification of Ukraine and Russia”⁴³. In fact they stopped all scientific discussions concerning old Rus nationality and non-recognition of the proposed doctrine was treated as political immaturity and a crime against the state. Taking this into account, criticism of the hypothesis were provided only by historians from abroad and dissidents⁴⁴, what was not enough to refute such mean historical myth of the national unification of the Russian Empire, which included Ukrainians as a branch of the Russian nation, in the eyes of leading politicians and researchers in the West. A direct representation of that was the fact that even after collapse of the USSR and rationalization of historical science numerous researchers (including western) continued ascribing Russians the historical past they have no connection to⁴⁵.

Only when the period of openness and restructuring started in the USSR, but mainly after the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, the Ukrainophile approach to explanation and conceptualization of the history of Ukraine as a direct successor of the Kyivska Rus⁴⁶ was revived, as well as the idea of Ukrainians as a nation, which can exist “beyond the boundaries of the Russian state”⁴⁷. The initial task that was solved by Ukrainophiles was a successful rejection of the Sovietophile conception, in particular validation of the out-of-date nature of the “old Russian nationality” concept, refutation of monolith nature of the old language, culture and social-economic life in the Kyivska Rus as the idea required by Russia and its ideology⁴⁸ etc. Therefore, in the frames of the Ukrainophile approach it was proved that there was not any Old Russian nationality, even despite the fact that various tribal unions and proto-states at different times used the very name “Rus”. The point is that it is still unknown what sense was intended by using this name by people in different regions of the state Kyivska Rus, i.e. ethnic essence or territorial affiliation to the state and so on. Confirmation for this is represented in the concept offered by H. Pivtorak⁴⁹, according to which one should not confuse the notion of old Rus sovereignty, which actualized in the form of the Kyivska Rus and the corresponding nationality, which should inevitably have been formed in the country, though in fact could not have a chance to be formed and even could not be formed a priori. This, in its turn, led to acknowledgement of the fake ideology-driven concept of the Kyivska Rus as a “cradle for the three fraternal peoples – Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian. It is supplemented by the fact that the representatives of the Ukrainophile approach (O. Subtelny⁵⁰, M. Braichevskyi⁵¹, Y.

⁴³ *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej: Dokumenty i materialy v trekh tt.: T. 3*, Moskva 1954.

⁴⁴ Zaluzniak L., *Vid sklavyntiv do ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukrainsia 1997.; Badzio Y., An Open Letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU „*Journal of Ukrainian Studies*” 1984, vol 9, nr. 1, s. 74–94.

⁴⁵ Krypiakevych I., Tsolnytskyi M., *Istoriia Ukrainy*, Niu-York 1990, s. 223.

⁴⁶ Chernenko A., *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia*, Wyd. DDU 1994, s. 4.

⁴⁷ Badzio Y., An Open Letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU „*Journal of Ukrainian Studies*” 1984, vol 9, nr. 1, s. 74–94.

⁴⁸ Pivtorak H., *Pokhodzbennia ukrainsiv, rosiian, bilorusiv ta yikbnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademiia 2001.

⁴⁹ Pivtorak H., *Pokhodzbennia ukrainsiv, rosiian, bilorusiv ta yikbnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademiia 2001.

⁵⁰ Subtelny O., *Ukraine: A History*, Wyd. University of Toronto Press 2000.

⁵¹ Braichevskyi M., *Prytyednannia chy vozvzednannia? Krytychni z'auvaby z pryvodu odnii kontseptii*, Wyd. Novi Dni 1972.

Kanyhin, Z. Tkachuk⁵² and other⁵³) state that the Kyivska Rus was the first Ukrainian state, which in the course of a long period of time spread its power over neighboring Slavic peoples (by own history, language, culture etc.). Herewith, as the scientists assume the Kyivska Rus was the first Ukrainian kingdom, whereas Danylo Halytskyi state and Halytsko-Volynsk dukedom were the second.

However, even despite this the Sovietophile approach in Russian and Ukrainian historiography is still preserved and was not completely “refuted and disproved”, whereas became the source for politicization of Russian minority in independent Ukraine (over different period of its existence, but especially at dawn of its sovereignty and since 2014) and became a question on the agenda concerning the ideas of reviving the USSR. To a great extent this approach was preserved as individual, but simultaneously it was parallelized within the scope of the approach focused on eastern Slavs (the East-Slavonophile approach), as it is a mixture of pan-Slavism and Soviet internationalism. This approach refutes the Kyivska Rus as a proto-Ukrainian state (such idea came into the focus of western scholars, for example A. Wilson⁵⁴ and P. Magocsi⁵⁵), but, at the same time, it rejects the Russophile approach as well (in particular in the questions of the primary origin of Russian people) as a product of antagonism in the regional scope of western and eastern Ukraine. In the context of such ideas at different times appeared concepts, according to which Ukraine is a “buffer” (L. Kravchuk) or a “bridge” (L. Kuchma) between Europe and Russia. The main representatives of this approach are O. Tolochko and P. Tolochko⁵⁶, V. Kremin, D. Tabachnyk, V. Tkachenko⁵⁷ and other. Similar views are expressed by S. Kulchytskyi, who states that the Kyivska Rus is the idea of three nationalities, but initially it had the impact on formation of the Ukrainian nation⁵⁸. Herewith, the explanation is focused on the remark, according to which the Slavs in Eastern Europe first of all inhabited the territory within the boundaries of modern Polissia and Lisostep. And this is an eastern part of the ancient ancestral Slavic territory, within the boundaries of which since the mid of the 1st century started its formation Ukrainian ethnos. As this territory after the disintegration of the proto-Slavic ethnic and language unity was inhabited by relatively close, but different groups of Slavic tribes, the proto-Ukrainian territory was not homogeneous, but on the contrary was distinctively divided into different ethnographic and probably variable groups – northern and southern. The former became the basis for the northern dialect of the Ukrainian and other languages; the latter was the ground for the majority of phonetic features, indicative only of

⁵² Kanyhin Y., Tkachuk Z., *Ukrainska mritia*, Wyd. Leksykon 1996.

⁵³ Zalizniak L., Kyivska Rus – proukrajinska derzhava, „Istorychnyi kalendar” 1997, vol 98, s. 180–183.; Zalizniak L., Etnohenez ukraintsiiv, „Geneza» 1995, vol 1, nr. 3.

⁵⁴ Wilson A., *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s: A Minority Faith*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1997.; Wilson A., *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, Wyd. Yale University Press 2009.

⁵⁵ Magocsi P., *A History of Ukraine*, Wyd. University of Toronto 1996.

⁵⁶ Tolochko O., Tolochko P., *Kyivska Rus*, Wyd. Alternatyvy 1998.; Tolochko P., *Vid Rusi do Ukrainy*, Wyd. Abrys 1997.

⁵⁷ Kremin V., Tabachnyk D., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Alternatyvy postupu, krytyka istorychnoho dosvidu*, Wyd. ARC-Ukraine 1996.; Kremin V., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Shliakh do sebe. Problemy suspilnoi transformatsii*, Wyd. Druk 1998.

⁵⁸ Kulchytskyi S., Davnokyivska spadshchyna u vysvitleni Mykhaila Hrushevskoho, „Polityka i chas” 1996, vol 9, s. 71–80.

the Ukrainian language. It means, as the representatives of the approach state, that origin of some east-Slavic nationalities, in particular Ukrainian, took place not as a result of the division of the so-called Old Russian nationality into parts, but by means of consolidation of several adjacent and closely related groups of east-Slavic territorial tribes into certain compact cultural and ethnographic unities, which in the course of further consolidation gradually, but not synchronously developed into Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian nationalities.

To protect their ideas the representatives of the Ukrainophile approach assume that ethnic and linguistic processes in the south or in the “core” of the Kyivska Rus, i.e. closer to the Byzantium centers of civilization, developed more rapidly than in the north. Due to this, formation of Ukrainian ethnos, to the point of view of L. Zalizniak, happened earlier than in Russian and Belarusian nationalities⁵⁹. As a result, at the moment of collapse of the Kyivska Rus over the territories, which are nowadays described as Ukraine, the Ukrainian nationality was mainly formed and divided into two branches: Halytsko-Volynskiy (which preserved the traditional name “Rus”) and Naddniprianskiy (which since the end of the 12th century has been called Ukraine, for the first time this name was used in 1185). In parallel with that, as the scholars suppose, quite complicated and very controversial was formation of the youngest, but the most numerous east-Slavic ethnos – Russian, which is advisable to be divided into several ethnic groups.

On this account in the work “The History of Ukraine Rus” M. Hrushevskiy stated a position according to which the origin of Russian ethnos started by Novhorodsko-Kryvetska and Kryvetsko-Viatska settlements, which assimilating Finns nationality and being modified by its influence, disguised in it its Slavic national type⁶⁰. Mentioned by M. Hrushevskiy historical process of origin of Russians as a nation in due time was supported by Russian historians S. Solovjov⁶¹ and V. Klyuchevskij⁶², and later by a Soviet historian M. Pokrovskij⁶³, in particular in his thesis as to a great percentage of Finno-Ugric element in the origin of Russian nationality. However, in the mid-1st century the territory of the would-be Russians (in particular Novgorod territories) was inhabited namely by Finno-Ugrian and partially Baltic tribes⁶⁴, which, before these territories were conquered by the Kyivska Rus, were assimilated by eastern Slavs, and after the collapse of the Kyivska Rus started positioning themselves as the Novgorod feudal republic. It witnessed ethnogenetic processes towards formation of an individual ethnos, but in the mid-15th century they were artificially ceased, as Novgorod was an obstacle for unification of “Russian territories” around Moscow, due to which it was conquered and by force was integrated to the Moscow state. The very Moscow state, and thus Russian nationality, was forming in the course of the 12th-15th centuries, but already in the region between Srednia Oka and Verkhnia

⁵⁹ Zalizniak L., *Vid sklavyriv do ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukrainsia 1997, s. 101.

⁶⁰ Hrushevskiy M., *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1992.

⁶¹ Solovjov S., *Istoriya Rossii s drevnejshih vremen*, Moskva 1959.

⁶² Klyuchevskij V., *Sochineniya: v 9 t.*, Moskva 1956.

⁶³ Pokrovskij M., *Russkaya istoriya v samom szhatom ocherke*, Wyd. Izdatel'stvo CK VKP(b) Partizdat 1933.

⁶⁴ Pivtorak H., *Pokhodzhenia ukrainsiv, rostian, bilorusiv ta yikbnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademia 2001.

Volga, which in the mid-1st century was inhabited by native Finno-Ugrian and Baltic tribes. Similar processes took place in case with Rostov-Suzdal, Ryazan and Murom lands. Till that time (in particular over the 10th-13th centuries) the territory of modern central European Russia was a far province of the state Kyivska Rus, though it was characterized by integration and disintegration political processes, as well as the process of ethnogenesis⁶⁵. To the greatest extent it was observed during the rule of duke A. Boholyubsky from Volodymyr-Suzdal land, who performed an open and demonstrative breach of relations with the Kyivska Rus, gave a start to individual policy of the would-be Moscowii and Russian nationality and even wanted to break relations at the church level and establish new metropole⁶⁶, what testified not an internecine but inter-ethnic nature of political struggle at that time. Thus, in the 13th century, in particular due to the abovementioned political processes appeared the Grand Duchy of Moscow the first Russian state⁶⁷, what significantly distance “Russian element” from the proto-Ukrainian state Kyivska Rus. Even despite the fact that the Moscow state played an important role in further strengthening among Russian and Ukrainian dukedoms and their unification/centralization within the frames of an “artificial” single nationality.

The analysis is supplemented by the fact that on the contrary to proto-Ukrainian/Ukrainian nationality, Russian nationality was mentally constructed as “Christianized Tatar tsarstvo”, as with disintegration of the Golden Horde, whose north-east settlement (ulus) was former Kyivska Rus and Moscowii, namely Moscow tsar was perceived as a legitimate successor of the Mongol-Tatar state⁶⁸. It corresponds with the remarks made by N. Trubeckoj, according to which “Moscow state appeared due to the Tatar yoke, as the Russian tsar was the successor of the Mongol Khan. The overthrow of the Tatar yoke led to the change of the Tatar khan for the orthodox tsar and move of the capital to Moscow. Even a great percent of boyars (nobility) and other people of Moscow tsar were representatives of Tatar nobility. Russian nationality derived from the Tatar and it is unlikely that those historians, who close their eyes on this circumstance or try to diminish its significance, are right⁶⁹. Especially in the context of the fact that other east-Slavic lands under the rule of the Golden Horde had been Christianized long before the Tatar-Mongol influence. All in all, it allows arguing that development of Russian nationality predominantly took place far from Kyiv and whole proto-Ukrainian state of the Kyivska Rus, due to what this ethnos was initially very specific in comparison with the worldview of proto-Ukrainians.

All this in general and in particular as a result of applying factual and historiographical material let us determine that “the Russian brother” as to its age in fact is not “older”, but is the

⁶⁵ Zalizniak L., *Vid sklavyvnyv do ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukrainsia 1997, s. 114.

⁶⁶ Klyuchevskij V., *Sochineniya: v 9 t.*, Moskva 1956, s. 324–325.

⁶⁷ Pivtorak H., *Pokhodzhennia ukrainsiv, rosiian, bilorusiv ta yikbnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademiia 2001.

⁶⁸ Berdyacv N., *Istoki i smysl russkogo kommunitizma*, Wyd. Nauka 1990.; Berdyacv N., Hristianstvo i antisemitizm, „*Druzhbba narodov*“ 1989, vol 10, s. 205–213.

⁶⁹ Trubeckoj N., *K probleme russkogo samopoznaniya*, Parizh 1927, s. 49.

youngest. Besides, it had never been in the common cradle, because when “it was born” the cradle had already disintegrated. On the contrary, Russians bear little connection to the Kyivska Rus only because for some time their lands half-formally were a part of the state and would-be Russians adopted Christian culture of the Kyivka Rus together with many Ukrainian features, in particular taking the initial name Rus. In due time it made L. Zalizniak states that “the rights of Moscow for the historical and cultural heritage of princely Kyiv are not more justified than the rights of Madrid, Lisbon, Paris and Bucharest for the history and cultural heritage of Latin Rome... However, how latter were not direct creators of the Latin culture of Rome, the former has just mediated connection to formation of the culture of the Kyivska Rus”⁷⁰. That is why scientists in their objective research must clearly comprehend that the state Kyivska Rus is not Russia and the Rus (from Kyivska Rus) language is not the Russian language.

It is especially evident in the context of the fact that all researchers in the frames of Ukrainophile and Slavonophile approaches came to certain common conclusions: 1) according to the western history of territorial divisions the history of the Kyivska Rus and other early settlements is the history of Ukraine, due to which Ukrainian people are the main successor of the Kyivska Rus (though on different bases: according to the Ukrainophile approach – on the grounds of ethnic and territorial features; according to the Slavonophile approach – only on the territorial grounds); 2) objective absence of the hierarchy among all east-Slavic peoples (at the academic level, as at the political one there are some manipulations); 3) the predominant successor of the language of the Kyivska Rus is the Ukrainian language and Ukraine. It had significant impact on both Ukrainian but mainly western historiography⁷¹. However, at the same time it is necessary to pay attention to the ideas of J. Friedman, who proves the fact of “mistaken intellectual objectivism”, as the history (especially political history) in no way can be objective⁷². The reason is hidden in a rather simple fact, according to which the identity policy is always based on the ideas of nowadays through the perspective of the past. As a result the past is frequently formed according to the wishes and visions of those who are authors of historical textbooks and monographs. Therefore, the whole history, including modern historiography, is mythologized, as history is just a print of nowadays as to the past⁷³. This point of view is supported by D. Miller, who remarks that formation of new national identity, which would unite people, is impossible without turning attention to mythologization⁷⁴. The point is that myths call to comprehend the common faith in the group, determining individual solidarity and opposition

⁷⁰ Zalizniak L., *Vid sklavyntiv do ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukrainsia 1997, s. 123.

⁷¹ Szporluk R., Kiev as the Ukraine's Primate City, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1979–1980, vol 3, nr. 4, s. 843–849.; Pritsak O., Za kulisy proholoshennia 1500-littia Kyieva, *Suchasnist* 1981, vol 9, s. 46–54.; Pyrohov S., Do pytannia pro „ukrainizatsiiu”, *Suchasnist* 1980, vol 6, s. 61–64.; Arel D., A Lurking Cascade of Assimilation in Kiev?, *Post-Soviet Affairs* 1996, vol 12, nr. 1, s. 73–90.; Kuzio T., Is Ukraine Part of Europe's Future, *Washington Quarterly* 2006, vol 29, nr. 3, s. 89–108.; Burkovskiy I., Chy mala mova Kyivskoi Rusi davnomoskovsku osnovu, *Rozbudova derzhavy* 1996, vol 12, s. 15–18.

⁷² Friedman J., Myth, History and Political Identity, *Cultural Anthropology* 1992, vol 7, nr. 2, s. 207.

⁷³ Friedman J., The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity, *American Anthropologist* 1992, vol 94, nr. 4, s. 837.

⁷⁴ Miller D., *On Nationality*, Wyd. Clarendon Press 1995.

to alien forces, i.e. by means of increasing peculiar features of boundaries of perception⁷⁵. It is generalized by E. Smith who believes that “without myths, recollections and symbols, on the basis of which it is possible to differentiate between the members of the group and “foreigners””, without the ability of cultural elite to interpret and develop them, there cannot be any real ethnos⁷⁶. And on the contrary, all colonialist attempts to wipe historical memory are the processes, which lead to the loss of national identity and causes its assimilation in the center of imperial strivings. Correspondingly, revival of memory and national historiography are closely connected with revival of identity as to the notion of former imperial “others”. That is the way how is formed the position of those who “take credit for” the issues of the past and are able to identify oneself and others at any moment of time and place⁷⁷. That is why it is not surprising that such interpretation of the past in the attempts to satisfy the needs of the state of postcolonial type (in our case – Ukraine) are welcomed by the majority, but can generate a feeling of betrayal among national minorities (in our case, first of all, Russian minority in Ukraine)⁷⁸.

References

1. *Abatanhel Krymskyi – uchenyi, pismennyk, ukrainets*, Wyd. Volynska knyha 2007.
2. Arel D., A Lurking Cascade of Assimilation in Kiev?, *“Post-Soviet Affairs”* 1996, vol 12, nr. 1, s. 73–90.
3. Armstrong J., *Nations Before Nationalism*, [w:] Hutchinson J., Smith A. (eds.), *Nationalism*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1994.
4. Badzio Y., An Open Letter to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU *„Journal of Ukrainian Studies”* 1984, vol 9, nr. 1, s. 74–94.
5. Berdyaev N., *Istoki i smysl russkogo kommunizma*, Wyd. Nauka 1990.
6. Berdyaev N., Hristianstvo i antisemitizm, *„Druzhbba narodov“* 1989, vol 10, s. 205–213.
7. *Braichevskiy M., Konspekt istorii Ukrainy, Kyiv* 1993.
8. Braichevskiy M., *Pryiednannia chy vozziednannia? Krytychni zauvaby z pryvodu odniei kontseptsii*, Wyd. Novi Dni 1972.
9. Burkovskiy I., Chy mala mova Kyivskoi Rusi davnomoskovsku osnovu, *„Rozbudova derzhavy»* 1996, vol 12, s. 15–18.
10. Chernenko A., *Ukrainska natsionalna ideia*, Wyd. DDU 1994.
11. Friedman J., Myth, History and Political Identity, *„Cultural Anthropology“* 1992, vol 7, nr. 2, s. 194–210.

⁷⁵ Armstrong J., *Nations Before Nationalism*, [w:] Hutchinson J., Smith A. (eds.), *Nationalism*, Wyd. Oxford University Press 1994, s. 145.

⁷⁶ Smith A., Ethnic Myths and Ethnic Revivals, *„Journal of European Sociology“* 1984, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 288.

⁷⁷ Kohl P., Nationalism and Archeology: On the Reconstruction of the Remote Past, *„Annual Review of Anthropology”* 1998, vol 27, s. 223–246.

⁷⁸ Kymlicka W., *Multicultural Citizenship*, Wyd. Clarendon Press 1996, s. 189.; Kolstoe P., *Political Construction Sites: Nation-Building and the Post-Soviet States*, Wyd. Westview 2000.

12. Friedman J., The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity, „*American Anthropologist*” 1992, vol 94, nr. 4, s. 837–859.
13. Hrushevskiy M., *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, Wyd. Naukova dumka 1992.
14. Hrushevskiy M., *Zvychnaia skhema „russkoi” istorii y sprava ratsionalnogo ukladu istorii skhidnogo sloviaanstva*, [w:] Kravtsiv B. (ed.), *Vyvid prav Ukrainy: Dokumenty i materialy do istorii ukrainskoi politychnoi dumky*, N-Y 1964, s. 11–24.
15. Isaievych Y., Problema pokhodzhennia ukrainskoho narodu: istoriohrafichnyi i politychnyi aspekt, „*Ukraina: Kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*” 1995, vol 2.
16. *Istoriia rusiv*, Wyd. Rad. pismennyk 1991.
17. Kanyhin Y., Tkachuk Z., *Ukrainska mriia*, Wyd. Leksykon 1996.
18. Karamzin N., *Istoriya gosudarstva Rossijskogo: v 12 t.*, Moskva 1816–1829.
19. Klyuchevskij V., *Kurs russkoj istorii*, SPb 1904.
20. Klyuchevskij V., *Russkaya istoriya: Polnyj kurs lekcij*, Wyd. Olma Media Group 2004.
21. Klyuchevskij V., *Sochineniya: v 9 t.*, Moskva 1956.
22. Kohl P., Nationalism and Archeology: On the Reconstruction of the Remote Past, „*Annual Review of Anthropology*” 1998, vol 27, s. 223–246.
23. Kolstoe P., *Political Construction Sites: Nation-Building and the Post-Soviet States*, Wyd. Westview 2000.
24. Kremin V., Tabachnyk D., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Alternatyvy postupu, krytyka istorychnoho dosvidu*, Wyd. ARC-Ukraine 1996.
25. Kremin V., Tkachenko V., *Ukraina: Shliakh do sebe. Problemy suspilnoi transformatsii*, Wyd. Druk 1998.
26. Krypiakevych I., Tsolnytskyi M., *Istoriia Ukrainy*, Niu-York 1990.
27. Kulchytskyi S., Davnokiyivska spadshchyna u vysvitleni Mykhaila Hrushevskoho, „*Polityka i chas*” 1996, vol 9, s. 71–80.
28. Kuzio T., Is Ukraine Part of Europe’s Future, „*Washington Quarterly*” 2006, vol 29, nr. 3, s. 89–108.
29. Kuzio T., National Identity and History Writing in Ukraine, „*Nationalities Papers*” 2006, vol 34, nr. 4, s. 407–427.
30. Kymlicka W., *Multicultural Citizenship*, Wyd. Clarendon Press 1996.
31. Magocsi P., *A History of Ukraine*, Wyd. University of Toronto 1996.
32. Maksimovich M., *Otkuda idet russkaya zemlya, po skazaniyu Nestorovoj povesti i po drugim starinnyim pisanijam russkim: Sochinenie Mihaila Maksimovicha*, Kiev 1837.
33. Mavrodin V., *Drevnyaya Rus: Proiskhozhdenie russkogo naroda i obrazovanie Kievskogo gosudarstva*, Wyd. Gospolitizdat 1946.
34. Miller D., *On Nationality*, Wyd. Clarendon Press 1995.
35. Pelenski J., *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus*, Wyd. East European Monographs 1998.
36. *Pivtorak H., Pokhodzhennia ukraintsv, rosiiian, bilorusiv ta yikbnikh mov*, Wyd. Akademiia 2001.
37. Pogodin M., K voprosu o slavyanofilah, „*Grazhdanin*» 1873, vol 11.

38. Pokrovskij M., *Russkaya istoriya v samom szhatom ocherke*, Wyd. Izdatel'stvo CK VKP(b) Partizdat 1933.
39. Pritsak O., Za kulisy proholoshennia 1500-littia Kyieva, „*Suchasnist*“ 1981, vol 9, s. 46–54.
40. Pyrohov S., Do pytannia pro „ukrainizatsiiu“, „*Suchasnist*“ 1980, vol 6, s. 61–64.
41. Smith A., Ethnic Myths and Ethnic Revivals, „*Journal of European Sociology*“ 1984, vol 25, nr. 2, s. 283–305.
42. Solovjov S., *Istoriya Rossii s drevnejshih vremen*, Moskva 1959.
43. Subtelny O., *Ukraine: A History*, Wyd. University of Toronto Press 2000.
44. Szporluk R., Kiev as the Ukraine's Primate City, „*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*“ 1979–1980, vol 3, nr. 4, s. 843–849.
45. Tolochko O., Tolochko P., *Kyivska Rus*, Wyd. Alternatyvy 1998.
46. Tolochko P., *Vid Rusi do Ukrainy*, Wyd. Abrys 1997.
47. Tolz V., Rethinking Russian-Ukrainian relations: a New Trend in Nation-Building in Post-Communist Russia, „*Nations and Nationalism*“ 2002, vol 8, nr. 2, s. 235–253.
48. Trubeckoj N., *K probleme russkogo samopoznaniya*, Parizh 1927.
49. Velychenko S., *National History as Cultural Process: a Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*, Wyd. University of Alberta 1992.
50. Velychenko S., *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914–1991*, Wyd. St Martin's Press 1993.
51. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej: Dokumenty i materialy v trekh tt.: T. 3*, Moskva 1954.
52. Wilson A., *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, Wyd. Yale University Press 2009.
53. Wilson A., *Ukrainian Nationalism in the 1990s: A Minority Faith*, Wyd. Cambridge University Press 1997.
54. Zalizniak L., *Vid sklavyriv do ukrainskoi natsii*, Wyd. Biblioteka ukraintsia 1997.
55. Zalizniak L., Etnohenez ukraintsiv, „*Geneza*“ 1995, vol 1, nr. 3.
56. Zalizniak L., Kyivska Rus – proukrainska derzhava, „*Istorychnyi kalendar*“ 1997, vol 98, s. 180–183.