



<https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2026.04.050>

UDC 94(477.83/.86)“11/12”+930.2

Vadym ARISTOV

Candidate of Historical Sciences (PhD in History), Senior Research Fellow,

Department of Medieval and Early Modern History of Ukraine,

Institute of History of Ukraine of the NAS of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine)

aristov3000@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3094-8850>

CHRONOLOGY OF ROMAN MSTYSLAVYCH'S CONQUEST OF HALYCH: SOURCES AND ARGUMENTS*

The exact year of the conquest of Halych by prince Roman Mstyslavych of Volodymyr is not recorded in the sources, although it is clear that it occurred no earlier than 1198 and no later than 1202. Since the 19th century, academic historiography has generally accepted the chronology of this event as found only in later texts — namely, the *Annals* of Jan Długosz (1198) and the *Hustynia Chronicle* (1199). The **aim** of this article is to determine whether 13th-century sources provide any grounds for dating Roman's conquest of Halych to 1198 or 1199 and, on the basis of such an analysis, to propose a more substantiated dating. To this end, a range of standard **methods** and **approaches** of source criticism have been employed. **Scholarly novelty**: For the first time, the chronology of Roman's conquest of Halych is examined exclusively on the basis of early (13th century) sources, without relying on the fictitious

* The results of this study were presented on 2 October 2025 at the international conference “From the Autocrat of Rus' Land Roman Mstyslavovych to the King of Rus' Danylo and his Descendants: Human, Community, State of the 12th—14th Centuries in Ukrainian Medieval History” (held at Vasyl Stefanyk Carpathian National University and National Reserve “Ancient Halych,” 2—3 October 2025), and on 14 April 2026 at the Seminar of the Department of History, National University of “Kyiv-Mohyla academy”.

Цитування: Aristov V. Chronology of Roman Mstyslavych's Conquest of Halych: Sources and Arguments. *Український історичний журнал*. 2026. № 4 (589). С. 50—65. <https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2026.04.050>

© Видавець ВД «Академперіодика» НАН України, 2026. Стаття опублікована на умовах відкритого доступу за ліцензією CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

dates of Jan Długosz or the *Hustynia Chronicle*, which depends on his text (via 16th-century Polish historiography). **Conclusions:** An analysis of early sources (Byzantine, Ruthenian, and Polish) shows that none of them gives preference to either 1198 or 1199 as the date of Roman's conquest of Halych. Instead, arguments are presented in favor of dating this event three or two years later, respectively.

Keywords: *Kyivan Rus, Galician Principality, medieval studies, medieval sources, historical chronology.*

The dates of the death of the Galician prince Volodymyr Yaroslavych and the subsequent conquest of Halych by Prince Roman Mstyslavych from Volhynia are not explicitly recorded in sources contemporary with these events. They first appear in late medieval and early modern texts. Jan Długosz dated them to 1198 [1, p. 168—171], and his account influenced subsequent Polish historiography. Later, drawing on Polish historical works, but diverging from them in certain respects, the Ukrainian *Hustynia Chronicle* dated Volodymyr's death and Roman's establishment in Halych to 1199 [2, p. 268]¹. Thus, Długosz's *Annals of Poland* and the *Hustynia Chronicle* were the first texts to assign specific annual dates to these events.

This state of the sources pose difficulties for scholarly historiography and stimulate a discussion that have continued since the mid-19th century. An overview of this debate in the 19th and 20th centuries is provided by Vitalii Nahirnyi in a dedicated article and in the relevant section of his monograph [4, p. 512—513; 5, p. 83—87], relieving me of the need to review the historiography in detail.

However, the general historiographical landscape is not difficult to survey. In the overwhelming majority of studies, the death of Volodymyr Yaroslavych and Roman's conquest of Halych are dated to 1198—1199, that is, the same dates proposed by Jan Długosz and the *Hustynia Chronicle*². It should be noted, however, that from the late 19th century onward, scholars did not simply choose between these two sources or combine their da-

¹ At the same time, the date in the *Hustynia Chronicle* depends on Długosz, albeit not directly, but mediated through Maciej Strykowski's *Chronicle*. It reports the death of Volodymyr and Roman's conquest of Halych in the year entry for 1198 [3, p. 236—237]. For the use of Strykowski's text in the *Hustynia Chronicle*, see [2, p. XLV, LXI, LXXXV—LXXXVII].

² As Vitalii Nahirnyi rightly noted, the historiographical success of 1199 is linked to the authority of Mykhailo Hrushevskiy. Doubting the “Długoszian” chronology, the historian wrote: “The Kyiv Chronicle at this point elaborates a great deal on Galician events and would certainly mention Volodymyr's death. Its chronology with regard to these years depict an accurate course of events up until 1198 [...] but Volodymyr's death is not mentioned. Thus, it is more likely that he died not in 1198 but in 1199, for example” [6, p. 366—367 (footnote 142)]. Cf. the original Ukrainian version: “Київська літопись, що тут досить інтересуєть ся галицькими подіями і повинна б згадати про смерть Володимира, а знов у хронології сих років акуратно кінчить ся 1198 р. [...] про смерть його не згадує; через те правдоподібніше, що він умер не 1198 р., а 1199 наприклад” [7, p. 454 (footnote 1)]. It should be emphasized that the scholar convincingly rejected 1198, while 1199 was merely a supposition — one of several possible options — on which Hrushevskiy did not insist. Following his reasoning, it could just as well have been, “for example”, 1200 or 1201. Yet, as often happens in historiography, the assumption of an authoritative historian has gradually been transformed into a hypothesis, and eventually, for some, treated as an established fact, even as the “founding date of the Galician-Volhynian state.”

tings [8, p. 549; 9, p. 14]³. Increasingly, they relied on indirect evidence from “early” sources — that is, those dating no later than the mid-13th century. It gradually became clearer (and today is quite evident) that none of the late texts can serve as a basis for establishing the actual chronology of events at the turn of the 12th and 13th centuries⁴. At the same time, it is worth noting that the “traditional” dates derived from the late texts were in fact not revised, but simply “accreted” with arguments based on “early” sources — Byzantine, Polish, and Ruthenian — which were accepted as having “confirmed” them.

A standard requirement for historians is to include the broadest possible range of sources in their analysis. This is commonly believed to guarantee greater objectivity and reliability of the conclusions. Yet what often escapes attention is the need to establish whether a given source is actually suitable for answering the specific research question. Even if a text originates from the relevant time and space and mentions the events and persons in question, it may still provide no grounds for preferring a particular explanation or argument. Consequently, it may turn out that the number of sources genuinely relevant to the problem under discussion is far smaller than it appears at first glance. Such seems to be the case in the present instance.

A pressing task, therefore, is to reconsider both the qualification of the sources and the logic of the arguments used to substantiate the “traditional” dates of Roman’s establishment in Halych. Three texts are at issue: The *History* of Niketas Choniates, Dobrynia Yadreikovich’s description of the shrines of Constantinople (the *Pilgrim’s Book*), and the *Chronicle* of Wincenty Kadłubek.

History of Niketas Choniates

The early 13th-century Byzantine historian, Niketas Choniates, mentions Roman in the context of a raid by the Vlachs and the Cumans against the Byzantine provinces. In the author’s view, this attack might have developed into a larger-scale future invasion (“even to the gates of the capital”) but was prevented by Roman Mstyslavych’s victory

³ Isydor Sharanevych attempted to split the events between the two dates: the death of Volodymyr in 1198 and Roman’s conquest of Halych in 1199 [10, p. 62, 64].

⁴ There is no need to dwell at length on the fact that the “unique” dates and events from Old Ruthenian history in Długosz’s work are products of his own invention, rather than relics of “lost” or “unknown,” yet supposedly “true” and “ancient” sources. For a recent discussion, see [11]. From the latest Polish historiography, see [12; 13, p. 245—247]. The author accepts (citing the research of Vitalii Nahirnyi) Długosz’s date for these events as 1198. A separate question is why Długosz chose 1198 as the year of Volodymyr’s death and Roman’s Galician campaign. One can offer a plausible hypothesis. The Polish historian — or more likely his assistants — may have had access to a manuscript of the *Hypatian Chronicle* resembling the form of the extant *Khlebnikov* copy, in which the *Kyivan Chronicle* ends with the entry for 1198. By contrast, the subsequent text of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* lacks an annual dating system. In such a manuscript, after the lengthy entry for 1198, the following text opened with the words “After the death of Roman...” (“По смерті же Романа...”), so that, as Długosz or his assistant would have easily noticed, there was a chronological gap. Knowing that Roman died in 1205, the Polish historian may have assigned the beginning of this prince’s rule in Halych to the lower boundary of this gap (i.e., 1198).

over the Cumans, with Roman described as the “ruler of Halych” (Καλιτζης ἡγεμών) [14, p. 691—692; 15, p. 287]. Such an attribution of the prince has long led scholars to assume that at the time of this campaign into the steppe, he already possessed Halych. Accordingly, the passage in Niketas Choniates would indicate a *terminus ante quem* for Roman's establishment on the Galician throne.

After mentioning Roman's military success, Niketas Choniates adds that the Galician ruler defeated the Cumans many times (πολλὰκις διαπραξάμενος). Choniates then proceeds to describe Roman's victorious conflict with the Kyivan ruler Rurik Rostyslavych, in whose army the Cumans constituted the main force (κρατίστη καὶ γενναϊοτάτη φάλαγξ περὶ αὐτὸν ὑφειμένη).

Exact dates are absent in Choniates's text. Consequently, the chronology of many events is established only approximately, by attempting to determine their temporal distance from other — earlier or later — events described in his text and dated on the basis of independent evidence. The same uncertain chronology also applies to the Cuman raid to which the historian “attached” his excursus about Roman Mstyslavych⁵. At the same time, the most convincing date proposed in the literature is the 1201 liturgical or “September” year (beginning on 1 September), which, when converted into the “January” year system (beginning on 1 January), corresponds to the period from 1 September 1200 to 31 August 1201 [16, p. 132, 349; 17, p. 48—49]⁶. Within this broad period, the most likely time is spring — summer 1201, since previous joint raids by the Vlachs and Cumans on imperial territories typically began in the spring (as, for example, the 1199 raid, which occurred at the end of April) [14, p. 663; 15, p. 275]⁷.

Roman's campaign against the Cumans, “saving” the Byzantines according to the logic of Choniates's narrative, took place after they raided Byzantine territory but before they could have theoretically launched a subsequent incursion. In this case, the simplest solution is to identify Roman's campaign with the first of the two winter expeditions against the Cumans in 1201—1202 and 1203—1204, as recorded in the Ruthenian source, the *Suzdalian Chronicle* [18, p. 233—234].

However, in historiography, there is a tendency to date the Cuman raid mentioned by Choniates and Roman's victory over them to the late 1190s or 1200, closer to the “traditional” dates of Roman's conquest of Halych. This implies the existence of an earlier expedition, unknown to Ruthenian sources, which Roman would have already undertaken in his capacity as prince of Halych⁸.

⁵ In Choniates's text, this raid opens with the words “The following year” (Τῷ δ' ἐφεξῆς ἔτει). However, the account of the preceding events — from which one might count this “following year” — lacks chronological clarity because the historian develops several narrative threads in parallel.

⁶ The same time frame was cautiously adopted in the 1984 English translation of the *History*.

⁷ Roman's winter campaign could indeed have forestalled a potential Cuman invasion the following spring of 1202.

⁸ Among other studies, see [5, p. 91—92; 19, p. 85—87; 20, p. 380—385]. See also the editor's addition to the relevant fragment in Hrushevskyi's *History of Ukraine-Rus* [6, p. 456—458]. In his study, M. Hrushevskyi specifically addressed this question. He believed that the Cuman raid on Byzantium had literally been interrupted by Roman's campaign, that is, that the two events occurred simultaneously. Accordingly, in his view, Choniates's text indicates that the-

However, nothing obliges us to imagine such an episode in Roman's political biography solely based on Choniates's *History*. In every detail of the excursus on Roman, one can easily recognize facts attested in Ruthenian sources. His "repeated" victories over the Cumans correspond to two (still more than one!) expeditions in 1201—1202 and 1203—1204. In the account of Roman's hostility toward Rurik, Choniates evidently generalize their conflicts over the same 1201—1204 period⁹. Moreover, the specification that the Cumans formed the core of Rurik's army corresponds most closely to the events of early January 1203, when Rurik and the Cumans attacked Kyiv.

Thus, Choniates's account of Roman corresponds well with the events that took place from late 1201 to 1204, when he was already unquestionably in possession of Halych. Accordingly, this source is of no help in dating the beginning of his rule there.

The *Pilgrim's Book* by Dobrynia Yadreikovich (Archbishop Anthony)

The author of the description of Constantinople's shrines, the Novgorodian Dobrynia (later Archbishop Anthony of Novgorod), mentions a miracle that he witnessed on Sunday, 21 May 6708 (1200). He also notes that at that time, a delegation of the "Grand Prince Roman," led by Tverdiata Ostromyrovych, was present in the Byzantine capital [21, p. 266].

Analyses of this report usually assume that Roman was already the prince of Halych since 1198 or 1199. In some studies, the *Pilgrim's Book* is cited specifically to support

se events took place in the autumn or winter of 1200—1201. However, neither did he venture to posit a separate expedition of the prince against the Cumans already in 1200—1201, otherwise unknown to the Ruthenian sources, or to date Roman's campaign to the winter of 1201—1202 by identifying it with the campaign known from the *Suzdalian Chronicle*. Hrushevskiy faced a dilemma: either the sequence of events in Choniates was confused, or the dating in the *Suzdalian Chronicle* was mistaken. "I cannot reconcile these inconsistencies, nor can I eliminate any version by assuming an error in one of them, because I have no basis on which to choose between them," wrote Hrushevskiy, demonstrating a caution unusual for many of his successors [6, p. 455]. In the Ukrainian original: "Помирити ці суперечности я не вмію, а розрубувати — припустити у котрогось помилку не можу, бо не маю підстави до вибору між ними" [7, p. 560—561]. However, the premise of these considerations appears mistaken. Choniates's text does not indicate that the Cuman raid and Roman's campaign occurred simultaneously. Nothing, therefore, prevents dating the first of these events to the first half of 1201 (specifically, spring) and the second to the winter of 1201—1202.

⁹ Vitalii Nahirnyi interpreted Choniates's account to mean that Roman's campaign against the Cumans occurred "before the onset of the internecine conflict between the Galician-Volhynian and Kyivan princes [...] which began in 1201" — for example, in 1199 [19, p. 86]. However, in recounting Roman's campaign, Choniates notes only that the princes' enmity flared "at that time" (ὁ τότε χρόνος). This does not allow for the assertions of a strict sequence of events. At the same time, the *Suzdalian Chronicle* directly shows that both of Roman's campaigns against the Cumans occurred within the same period (late 1201—1204) during which his conflicts with Rurik broke out. Thus, both narrative lines unfolded in parallel, "at the same time," and were fully consistent with Choniates's wording. Consequently, the Byzantine historian does not provide evidence that Roman held the Galician throne before 1201.

one of these dates, as evidence that Roman had become prince of Halych before spring 1200 [20, p. 75—77]. But what, precisely, substantiates this conclusion? The evidence is believed to reside in the subject of the negotiations, the very fact that the embassy was sent, and Roman's title.

It is often assumed that one of the issues — even the main one — of the negotiations was the organization of the steppe campaign, the same campaign mentioned by Niketas Choniates [5, p. 95—99; 20, p. 85—86; 22, p. 7; 23, p. 9—10; 24, p. 496]. Since such a campaign would have been more relevant to the ruler of Halych than to the ruler of Volodymyr in Volhynia, this line of reasoning assumes Roman must have already dispatched envoys as the prince of Halych.

The very fact of the diplomatic mission is implicitly accepted as evidence that Roman was already “based” in Halych as of 1200¹⁰. His predecessors from the first Galician dynasty, the Rostyslavychi, had contacts with Byzantium in three out of four generations¹¹. Therefore, Roman's embassy may appear as a continuation of these ties. Earlier, he supposedly could not — or had no reason to — send envoys to Constantinople. After establishing himself in Halych, however, as its new ruler, he would have needed to establish his own contacts with the Byzantine imperial court¹².

Lastly, the fact that in the *Pilgrim's Book* Roman is called a “grand prince” is linked to his supposedly elevated status, allegedly acquired as a result of conquering Halych [20, p. 81—83; 22, p. 10—11; 23, p. 14; 28, p. 193].

Contrary to the prevailing historiographical tendency, it is evident that the arguments outlined above rest on assumptions that lack evidentiary force, as they themselves require substantiation. The idea that the negotiations concerned an anti-Cuman alliance is entirely arbitrary. Niketas Choniates — the only possible source in this regard — emphasizes that the Ruthenian princes' campaign took place partly of their “own will” and partly at the urging of “their archpastor” (presumably the metropolitan of Kyiv). No agreements with the empire are mentioned. Any direct evidence about the purpose of Roman's embassy is absent¹³, and with it any grounds for linking it to his acquisition of the Galician throne¹⁴.

¹⁰ Roman's rule in Halych in 1200 seemed so self-evident that the envoy of Prince Roman mentioned by Dobrynia was readily converted into a “Galician envoy” (see, for example, [24, p. 496]).

¹¹ The first striking step was the marriage of Volodar Rostyslavych's daughter to a member of the imperial family in 1104, as the *Primary Chronicle* states, specifically, to a son of Alexios Komnenos [25, p. 256; 26, p. 280]. Volodar's son Volodymyr (Volodymyrko) was an ally of Manuel Komnenos in the late 1140s — early 1150s. Later, in 1164—1165, Volodymyr's son Yaroslav hosted the future emperor — at that time a rebel and fugitive — Andronikos Komnenos [14, p. 168, 171—172; 15, p. 73, 75; 25, p. 524].

¹² For instance, see [27, p. 22].

¹³ I leave aside the idea of a marital purpose for the embassy, primarily due to the lack of grounds for the hypothesis of a Byzantine origin of Roman's “second wife,” not to mention that the very notion of his second marriage appears dubious [29, p. 106—119].

¹⁴ If we remain in the realm of conjecture, one can propose an explanation at least as plausible as the idea of an anti-Cuman coalition or marriage negotiations. In 1199, the Archbishop of Novgorod, Martynius, died. Intervening in Novgorod's ecclesiastical affairs, the Suzdalian prince Vsevo-

The notion that Roman could have sent such an embassy only as the prince of Halych is equally arbitrary¹⁵. He had no need to obtain the emperor's approval to occupy the throne of Halych¹⁶. At the same time, there were no restrictions that would have prevented Roman from sending envoys to Constantinople while still in his capacity as prince of Volodymyr.

For the second half of the 12th century, there is little evidence of embassies sent by Ruthenian princes to Byzantium¹⁷. In particular, in 1160, the Prince of Kyiv, Rostyslav, dispatched a mission to Constantinople to accompany the newly appointed metropolitan of Rus, Theodore [25, p. 514—515]¹⁸. After the death of Theodore in 1163, the same ruler sent a mission to restore the former metropolitan, Klym Smoliatych, to the see — although without success [25, p. 522]¹⁹. In the entry for 1164, the *Suzdalian Chronicle* recounts the trial of Leon, the bishop expelled from the see of Rostov, before Emperor Manuel Komnenos, and notes that four envoys from Kyiv, Chernihiv, Pereiaslavl, and Suzdal were present at the emperor's court [26, p. 352]. This passing

lod supported his candidate, Metrophanes, for the vacant position. However, Metrophanes did not actually assume office until 1201 [30, p. 44—45]. Between 1199 and 1201, both Dobrynia's visit to Constantinople and Roman's embassy took place. On this basis, "nothing prevents one from supposing" that Roman's envoys — Roman being the former prince of Novgorod — and Dobrynia's journey constituted a single initiative connected in some way with promoting Metrophanes's candidacy.

¹⁵ The extant sources do not indicate that the relations of the princes of the first Galician dynasty with the Byzantine emperors were systematic rather than situational and episodic. Moreover, in the mid and latter half of the 12th century, the initiative came predominantly from the Byzantine side [31]. After the death of Yaroslav, son of Volodymyrko, and during the reign of his son Volodymyr, there is no evidence of contact between the empire and Halych.

¹⁶ In historiography, the hypothesis that the Galician princes of the 12th century were subordinate to Byzantium has long been discussed. It is based on the fact that John Kinnamos once described the status of Volodymyrko Volodarevych in relation to Manuel I Komnenos as *ὑπόσπονδος*, a term that may be understood either as a subject or as an ally or partner (among the extensive literature, see [31, p. 111—123; 32, p. 256—258; 33, p. 2184]. Today, however, there are no grounds to interpret this characterization of Volodymyrko as an indication of the prince's subordination. Remaining within the bounds of unambiguous evidence, there can be no question of any subordination of the Galician throne to the empire, even a merely formal one. In light of Volodymyr's vassal agreement with Frederick Barbarossa [25, p. 666], one might more readily expect Roman to have petitioned the western emperor for Galicia. Yet this is a fantastic scenario, since Frederick's sudden death would presumably have invalidated any personal agreement.

¹⁷ There are also a few reports of Byzantine embassies to Ruthenian princes in the second half of the 12th century, in particular to Rostyslav Mstyslavych of Kyiv in 1164—1165 and to Yaroslav Volodymyrovych of Halych in 1165. For an overview of Rus-Byzantine contacts in the second half of the 12th century, see [34, p. 72—77].

¹⁸ For a discussion of the chronology of events of the first half of the 1160s, see [35, p. 174—176].

¹⁹ The envoy Hiuriata Semkovych, as can be inferred from the text, managed to reach only Oleshshia in the lower Dnipro, where he encountered the newly appointed metropolitan of Rus, Ioann, and an imperial envoy with whom he returned to Kyiv. Unfortunately, at this point — midway through the Byzantine envoy's speech to Rostyslav — the text of the *Kyivan Chronicle* breaks off, after which an entirely different narrative begins. We therefore do not know how the negotiations concluded.

reference does not reveal the purpose of such broad representation. However, it seems reasonable to assume that the embassies from the “southern” princes were connected with the “affair of Leon,” which concerned an issue relevant to the entire metropolis of Rus: the observance of fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays that coincided with church feast days [35, p. 174]²⁰. Around the same time, Andrii (Andrew) of Bogoliubovo also sent a petition to Constantinople requesting the establishment of a new see in Vladimir, which Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges responded to [37, p. 63—76]²¹.

The available sources unambiguously demonstrate, first, that there was nothing exceptional about the diplomatic contacts of the Galician princes with Byzantium. Roman Mstyslavych did not have to be the prince of Halych in order to send an embassy to Constantinople. Second, in reliably attested cases from the second half of the 12th century, Ruthenian princes sent envoys to Byzantium on ecclesiastical matters, which had nothing to do with succession, the division of principalities, or the organization of steppe campaigns.

Finally, the mention of Roman as “grand prince” in the *Pilgrim's Book* does not directly attest to his holding the Galician throne as of 1200. Judging by the author's reference to himself as “Anthony, Archbishop of Novgorod,” [21, p. 230] the work was compiled no earlier than his appointment to the see around 1211, that is, after Roman's death. Accordingly, Roman's grand-princely title may have been an honorific designation of the deceased and/or a kind of summary of his political influence, achieved through his campaigns to Kyiv and against the Cumans beginning in late 1201²². The author of the much later *Praise of Roman* in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* went even further by calling him not only “grand prince” but “autocrat of all Rus” [25, p. 715].

However, even if one were to assume that the text was composed in 1200 and remained unchanged²³, and that its author exhibited a remarkably strict historicism, there would still be no evidence linking the grand-princely title to Halych. At that time, no Galician prince had ever been called “grand” in the sources. Moreover, Roman's hereditary city of Volodymyr was older than Halych as a recognized princely residence. It served as the seat of the leading prince within the extended family of the Volhynian

²⁰ Platon Sokolov believed that the Ruthenian envoys had arrived specifically to discuss military assistance to the emperor in his war against King Stephen III of Hungary. The ecclesiastical issue, in his view, was rather secondary [36, p. 110—112]. However, the military-political purpose of the collective embassy remains only a supposition. Both directly and indirectly, the sources attest that ecclesiastical matters were the subject of the negotiations. It is telling that the cities from which the envoys arrived were closely connected with the “affair of Leon.” Expelled from Suzdal, the bishop went to the prince of Chernihiv and from there to the prince of Kyiv. Pereiaslavl, meanwhile, was ruled by Hlib, son of Yurii the Long Arm and brother of Andrii of Bogoliubovo.

²¹ In Platon Sokolov's opinion, the “Suzdalian envoy” mentioned under the year 1164 was in fact traveling with this very petition [36, p. 111].

²² A recent commentary on the title “grand prince” in Old Rus see in [29, p. 148—151].

²³ The *Pilgrim's Book* has survived in ten manuscript copies dating from the 16th to the 18th centuries, while their archetype can be dated, at the earliest, to the beginning of the 14th century [21, p. 44, 90, 135].

princes. In relation to his junior kinsmen, Roman was the “senior,” and, in this sense, a “grand” prince. Thus, if the two are compared, it was Volodymyr, not Halych, that would theoretically have had a better claim to confer a grand-princely designation on its ruler²⁴.

Thus, neither the designation of Roman as “grand prince,” which is ambiguous, nor the fact of the embassy, whose purpose is unknown, necessitates any conclusion linking the diplomatic mission to the prince’s occupancy of the Galician throne. Accordingly, the information in the *Pilgrim’s Book* should be excluded from the sources used to establish the chronology of Roman’s establishment in Halych.

The *Chronicle* of Wincenty Kadłubek

The only “early” text that directly describes Roman’s conquest of Halych is the *Chronicle* of Wincenty Kadłubek. It recounts how, following the death of Volodymyr Yaroslavych, Halych was seized by the joint forces of Roman and the Polish prince Leszek the White. Despite the absence of dates for these events, there have been attempts to use the *Chronicle* to establish their absolute chronology. In fact, however, these attempts serve to “confirm” the pre-assumed dates of 1198 or 1199²⁵. Crucial in this context is Kadłubek’s narrative structure concerning the struggle for Kraków and the associated status of the supreme prince of Poland after the death of Casimir the Just.

The first episode is the battle of Mozgawa, independently and reliably dated to 1195. In it, Casimir’s brother, Mieszko the Old, faced Casimir’s sons, Leszek the White and Conrad. Each side was supported by its own allies, Roman being the ally of Leszek and Conrad. According to Kadłubek, as a result of the battle, Mieszko retreated, and Leszek took Kraków. This is followed by the death of Volodymyr Yaroslavych and the successful Galician campaign of Leszek and Roman. Afterwards, Leszek yielded the Kraków throne to Mieszko, who ruled there until his death. Since the battle of Mozgawa and Mieszko’s death are dated by parallel sources to 1195 and 1202, respectively, Roman’s seizure of Halych would have occurred somewhere “in between,” if one follows Kadłubek’s depiction of events.

The renunciation of Kraków by Leszek in favour of Mieszko has, since the late 19th century — beginning with Stanisław Smolka [38, p. 543 (footnote 12)] — generally been dated by Polish historiography to 1198 or 1199, in turn relying on the conventional date of Roman’s seizure of Halych. Accordingly, the end of Leszek’s “first rule” cannot be used to confirm the “traditional” chronology of the change of the Galician prince, as doing so would constitute a “circular reasoning” fallacy.

²⁴ One might object that it was not the Galician throne itself that conferred the grand princely title on Roman, but rather the fact that he headed a “united Galician-Volhynian state.” However, this explanation is even less convincing, since the idea of such a “united state” is no more than an extrapolation from the situation in the second half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th centuries, when the Galician and Volhynian dominions were held continuously by a single family — Roman’s descendants.

²⁵ In precisely this way, Kadłubek’s text was employed by Vitalii Nahirnyi to support the “Długosian” date for Roman’s conquest of Halych [4, p. 519; 5, p. 90–94].

Overall, any attempts to link these events chronologically lack a sufficient basis, because Kadłubek's entire narrative is highly unreliable and biased in favour of Leszek. In particular, the chronicler sought to downplay Leszek and Roman's defeat on the battlefield and, more importantly, to minimize the duration of Mieszko's rule in Kraków. He portrayed the situation as if Mieszko took Kraków only shortly before his death, while Leszek occupied the throne for a long period after Mozgawa [39, p. 437—444]²⁶.

The artificiality of this so-called "first rule" of Leszek is well demonstrated by Jacek Banaszkiewicz, who analyzed the description of the battle of Mozgawa in the context of Master Wincenty's narrative strategies and in contrast with the Polish annals, whose accounts were unaffected by Kadłubek's *Chronicle* [40]. The older annals, in particular the *Kraków Chapter Annals*, present a different, entirely coherent and uncontradicted account. Mieszko emerged victorious at Mozgawa in 1195²⁷, after which he secured Kraków and ruled there until 1202. Only after his death did Leszek have the opportunity to occupy the principal Polish throne [39, p. 800, 836; 41, p. 66—67, 238—239]. In other words, there was apparently no "first rule" of Leszek in Kraków, and therefore Roman's conquest of Halych cannot be chronologically correlated with it.

Thus, given the fictitious nature of the historical framework into which Kadłubek places Roman's establishment on the Galician throne, his text proves unsuitable for determining the date of that event.

Termini post et ante quem

What reliable basis, then, remains? We can confidently delineate a chronological window for the death of the Galician prince Volodymyr and Roman's acquisition of Halych. This occurred no earlier than the autumn — winter of 1196, when Volodymyr is last directly mentioned in the *Kyivan Chronicle* [25, p. 697—698]. At the same time, the upper limit is set by Rurik's failed campaign against Roman, who — already prince of Halych — marched rapidly to Kyiv before Rurik could set out for Halych himself. This conflict between son-in-law and father-in-law is recorded in the *Suzdalian Chronicle* in the year entry for 6710, but it should be dated to the second half of 6709, that is, late 1201²⁸. The next action of Roman mentioned in the same text falls in the winter of 1201—1202 [35, p. 86—87]. This was his campaign against the Cumans "for the winter."

²⁶ The lengthy account of Mieszko's unworthy accession to power in Kraków is tied to the report of his death.

²⁷ Roman's defeat in the battle against Mieszko is independently confirmed by the *Kyivan Chronicle* [25, p. 686—687].

²⁸ Andrei Gorovenko noted that, according to this chronicle, Vsevolod of Suzdalia installed his ten-year-old son Yaroslav in Pereiaslavl in 1200 (the text places this entry s.a. 6709 (1201), which should correspond to 1200). Gorovenko suggests that the prince sought to demonstrate his presence in southern Rus amid Roman's rising influence [20, p. 76—77]. However, this explanation is entirely arbitrary and already assumes the premise that Roman had established himself in Halych by 1200. The report of Yaroslav's installation in Pereiaslavl can be understood on the basis of reliable evidence and in a territorially closer context, specifically as a response to the death of Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodovich of Chernihiv at the end of 1198.

These chronological boundaries are beyond doubt. However, the time frame can be narrowed even further. The final entry of the *Kyivan Chronicle* covers the entire year 1198, and, chronologically, the last event — the birth of Euphrosyne, daughter of Rostyslav, son of Rurik — is dated to “the same year, in winter.”²⁹ Thus, the entire year 1198 was still closely monitored by the Kyivan chroniclers [35, p. 209—210]. Events of such significance for Prince Rurik of Kyiv — namely, the death of Volodymyr and Roman’s seizure of his throne³⁰ — would hardly have escaped their attention had they occurred during 1198³¹. Thus, three years remain during which the change of the prince in Halych could have taken place: 1199, 1200, and 1201.

Roman’s campaign to Kyiv as a chronological criterion

If the sources considered above do not favour any one of these three years, is there, nevertheless, any way to refine the dating of Volodymyr’s death and Roman’s conquest of Halych? It seems that this history can be unravelled from the end, with Rurik’s conflict with the new Galician prince serving as a chronological reference point.

Rurik responded militarily on three occasions when the succession in Halych was at stake. In 1189, following the death of Yaroslav Volodymyrovych and the Hungarians’ seizure of Halych, Sviatoslav, then prince of Kyiv, attempted to install his son Hlib in Halych with the Hungarian king’s agreement. Rurik — then Sviatoslav’s de facto co-ruler — immediately protested, threatening Sviatoslav, and effectively compelled him to

²⁹ However, in the text, this event is placed well before the end. Euphrosyne’s birth is followed by a report on the marriage of Rurik’s daughter Vseslava to Prince Yaroslav Hlibovych of Riazan “that same year,” although without a precise date. It is then followed by elaborate accounts of the construction of the retaining wall of St. Michael’s Monastery of Vydubychi on 10 July and the completion of the building on 24 September of the same year, accompanied by Rurik’s extensive praise. These “architectural” notices were placed in their present position in the chronicle no earlier than the winter of 1198—1199, since Euphrosyne was born after the construction of the wall, “in winter.” Such a disruption of chronological order indicates a deliberate structuring of the text after 1198, designed to present Rurik’s pious act in favour of the Vydubychi Monastery as a ceremonial conclusion to the chronicle.

³⁰ Throughout its text, the *Kyivan Chronicle* keeps careful track of changes on the throne of Halych. Had Volodymyr died in 1198, such an exception would be difficult to explain. The chronicle’s attention to Halych is fully consistent with its importance for Rurik, as reflected in the sources.

³¹ M. Hrushevskyi once reasoned in a similar way. Vitalii Nahirnyi disagreed with this logic, arguing that since the entry for 1198 served as the solemn conclusion of the *Kyivan Chronicle*, a notice of the prince’s death would have been stylistically inappropriate. Therefore, in his view, “nothing prevents” dating the death of Volodymyr Yaroslavych to that year [4, p. 516]. However, this idea is difficult to accept for two formal reasons. First, the entry for 1198 does in fact mention the princely death of Yaroslav Vsevolodovych of Chernihiv. Nahirnyi, citing Nikolai Berezhkov, argues that the death of this prince may in fact have fallen in 1197. Yet in the relevant passage of his study, Berezhkov, to the contrary, argued that this event should correspond to 1198—1199 “March” year (beginning on 1 March) [35, p. 209]. Second, the premise of Nahirnyi’s argument rests on an assumption about the chronicler’s stylistic strategy, which is itself a hypothesis and requires proof.

enter a joint campaign against Halych [25, p. 662—663]³³. Rurik acted just as swiftly after Roman's death on 19 June 1205. Together with the princes of Chernihiv, he marched on Halych without delay, no later than the autumn of that same year [26, p. 426].

Thus, in two of the three analogous cases, Rurik reacted to the "Galician challenge" without delay — within no more than a year, or even just a few months, after the triggering event. This consistency provides grounds to assume that following Roman's establishment in Halych, which completely disrupted the existing balance of power, the prince of Kyiv did not wait a year or two, but immediately began assembling a campaign³⁴. In fact, the entire conflict between Rurik and Roman at the end of 1201 was a contest of speed, in which the latter prevailed. Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that his reaction to the "vacating" of the Galician throne was equally prompt³⁵.

This context provides an argument in favour of shifting the date of Roman's accession in Halych closer to the end of the established chronological window. Thus, both the death of Volodymyr Yaroslavych and Roman's conquest of Halych most likely occurred in 1201.

More than chronology

The question of when Roman conquered Halych is not merely a matter of chronology, not a trivial shifting of the event two or three years backward or forward. It directly affects how we conceptualize the subsequent political history of Galicia-Volhynia. If Roman's rule in Halych is reduced from six or seven years to barely four, his reign begins to appear not as the foundational phase of a durable political order, but rather as a brief and contingent episode cut short by his death. In that case, the traditional image of Roman as the founder of the "Galician-Volhynian state" becomes far less self-evident, and the subsequent political developments of the following century and a half require a different narra-

³² Yet, the campaign ended unsuccessfully, as the princes were unable to agree on the division of the still unconquered Galician land and returned home.

³³ It is noteworthy that historians have long been puzzled by Rurik's inexplicable delay. It appears that Sergey Solovyov was the first to remark on this. Assuming Roman took control of Galicia in 1198, he noted: "The chronicle says nothing about why, three years after this (1201), Rurik decided to march against Roman. It is quite natural that the prince of Kyiv did not welcome Roman's establishment in Galicia; but why then did he delay so long before campaigning against his son-in-law?" [8, p. 549]. Later, Martin Dimnik also noted — though without specifically explaining — Rurik's "procrastination": "After procrastinating for a period of time, Rurik finally retaliated against Roman with the help of the Ol'govichi" [42, p. 248]. Oleksandr Holovko attempted to resolve the problem by dating the conflict between Roman and Rurik, as described in the Suzdalian Chronicle, to the year 1200, which is closer to the "traditional" date of 1199. However, such an artificial backdating of the events is not supported by the sources and is therefore groundless [18, p. 230].

³⁴ Even Leszek's participation as Roman's ally in the expedition into Galicia would hardly have slowed the pace of events significantly. Communication between the princes' residential centres — Sandomierz and Volodymyr, respectively — and the wait for the Polish prince's arrival would scarcely have delayed the campaign by more than roughly a month.

tive framework. It would then appear that Galicia and Volhynia largely followed distinct historical trajectories until the 1240s. After — and paradoxically, in part because of — the Mongol invasion, both lands entered a prolonged period under the rule of a single dynasty, namely the descendants of Roman. From this perspective, it makes sense to speak of a common Galician-Volhynian political tradition only from the 1240s onward.

* * *

In the early 15th century, the compiler of the *Hypatian* copy of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, who arranged the originally absent chronological grid in its text, assigned the year 1201 as the start of Roman's rule: "In the year 6709, the beginning of the reign of Grand Prince Roman, who was autocrat of all the Ruthenian Land, prince of Halych"³⁵ ("В лѣтѣ . ҃҃҃҃ . ѿ . начала княжениа . великаго князя . Романа . како держе^ѣ бывша всеи Роуской . земли . князя Галичкого" [25, p. 715]).

This entry, absent from another, *Khlebnikov* copy of the chronicle, was even highlighted in vermilion. There is no doubt that the chronology imposed on the text is artificial [45]. At the same time, it may be one of those rare cases in which a 15th-century scribe, purely by chance, hit the mark, and the arbitrarily chosen year 1201 truly represents the "beginning of the reign [...] of Roman [...] the prince of Halych."

REFERENCES

1. Ioannis Dlugossi. *Annales seu Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae*. Liber 5-6. Varsaviae, 1973. 431 p. [in Latin].
2. The *Hustynja Chronicle* / Compiled with an Introduction by Oleksiy Tolochko. Boston, 2013. 421 p. [in Middle Ukrainian].
3. Strykowski, M. *Kronika polska litewska, żmódzka y w szyskiej Rusi Kijowskiej, Moskiewskiej, Siewierskiej, Wołyńskiej, Podolskiej, Podgorskiej, Podlaskiej, etc.* Królewiec, 1582. 807 s. [in Old Polish].
4. Nahirnyi, V. "Начало княжениа великаго князя Романа": do pytannia pro chas utverzhennia Romana Mstyslavycha v Halychi. *Ukraina: kulturna spadshchyna, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*. 2011. 20: 511-521 [in Ukrainian].
[Нагірний В. «Начало княжениа великаго князя Романа»: до питання про час утвердження Романа Мстиславича в Галичі. *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*. 2011. Вип. 20. С. 511—521].
5. Nagirnyj, W. *Polityka zagraniczna księstw ziem Halickiej i Wołyńskiej w latach 1198 (1199) — 1264*. Kraków, 2011. 362 s. [in Polish].
6. Hrushevsky, M. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Vol. 2. Edmonton; Toronto, 2021. 606 p.
7. Hrushevskiy, M. *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*. T. II. Kyiv, 1992 [in Ukrainian].
[Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси*. Т. II. Київ, 1992. 633 с.].
8. Solovev, S.M. *Istoriya Rossii s drevneyshikh vremen*. Kn. 1, t. 2. Saint Petersburg, 1895 [in Russian].
[Соловьёв С.М. *История России с древнейших времен*. Кн. 1, т. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 1895. 1726 с.].
9. Zubritskiy, D. *Istoriya drevnego Galichsko-Russkogo knyazhevstva*. Ch. 3. Lviv, 1855 [in Ukrainian].

³⁵ Here I accept the conjecture which interprets the defect reading "како держе^ѣ бывша" as originally meaning that Roman was "самодержецъ" (autocrat) [43, p. 185, 485; 44, p. 77].

- [Зубрицкий Д. История древнего Галичско-Русского княжества. Ч. 3. Львов, 1855. 314 с.].
10. Sharanevych, I. Istoriiia Halytsko-Volodymyrskoi Rusy ot naidavniishyshh vremen do roku 1453. Lviv, 1863 [in Ukrainian].
[Шараневич І. Історія Галицько-Володимирської Русі от найдавніших времен до року 1453. Львів, 1863. 462 с.].
 11. Zatyliuk, Ya. & Kyrychenko, K. Povidomlennia "Annaliv" Yana Dluhoshha pro koronatsiiu Danyla Romanovycha ta ikh pokhodzhenia. *Ruthenica*. 2016. XIII: 108-136 [in Ukrainian].
[Затилук Я., Кириченко К. Повідомлення «Анналів» Яна Длугоша про коронацію Данила Романовича та їх походження. *Ruthenica*. 2016. Т. XIII. С. 108—136].
 12. Bielaszka-Podgórný, B. Walka o księstwo Halickie po śmierci Włodzimierza Jarosławowicza w świetle relacji Jana Długosza zanotowanej w "Rocznikach" pod 1198 r. *Studia Sandomierskie. Teologia-Filozofia-Historia*. 2016. 23: 5-29 [in Polish].
 13. Bielaszka-Podgórný, B. Obraz Rusi Kijowskiej przed najazdem mongolskim w Annales Jana Długosza. Kraków, 2025. 484 s. [in Polish].
 14. Nicetae Choniatae Historia. Bonn, 1835. 974 p. [in Greek, in Latin].
 15. O city of Byzantium. Annals of Niketas Choniates / Translated by Harry J. Magoulias. Detroit, 1984. 441 p.
 16. Brand, C.M. Byzantium Confronts the West 1180—1204. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1968. 394 p.
 17. Vásáry, I. Cumans and Tatars. Oriental Military in the Pre-Ottoman Balkans, 1185—1365. Cambridge, 2005. 230 p.
 18. Holovko, O.B. Korona Danyla Halytskoho: Volyn i Halychyna v derzhavno-politychnomu rozvytku Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy rannioho ta klasychnoho seredniovichchia. Kyiv, 2006 [in Ukrainian].
[Головко О.Б. Корона Данила Галицького: Волинь і Галичина в державно-політичному розвитку Центрально-Східної Європи раннього та класичного середньовіччя. Київ, 2006. 574 с.].
 19. Nahirnyi, V. Do pytannia pro datuvannia pershoho pokhodu halytsko-volynskoho kniazia Romana Mstyslavovycha proty polovtsiv. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu "Lvivska politekhnika"*. 2006. 571: 85-88 [in Ukrainian].
[Нагірний В. До питання про датування першого походу галицько-волинського князя Романа Мстиславовича проти половців. *Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка»*. 2006. Т. 571. С. 85—88].
 20. Gorovenko, A. Mech Romana Galitskogo. Knyaz Roman Mstislavich v istorii, epose i legendakh. Saint Petersburg, 2011 [in Russian].
[Горовенко А. Меч Романа Галицкого. Князь Роман Мстиславич в истории, эпосе и легендах. Санкт-Петербург, 2011. 476 с.].
 21. Jouravel, A. Die Kniga palomnik des Antonij von Novgorod. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar. Wiesbaden, 2019 [in German, in Old Church Slavonic, in Old Ruthenian].
 22. Hrushevsky, M. History of Ukraine-Rus'. Vol. 3. Edmonton; Toronto, 2016. 651 p.
 23. Hrushevskiy, M. Istoriiia Ukrainy-Rusy. T. III. Kyiv, 1993 [in Ukrainian].
[Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси. Т. III. Київ, 1993. 587 с.].
 24. Levchenko, M.V. Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiyskikh otnosheniy. Moscow, 1956 [in Russian].
[Левченко М.В. Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношений. Москва, 1956. 554 с.].
 25. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei. T. 2. Saint Petersburg, 1908 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic, in Old Ruthenian].

- [Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 1908. XVI с. + 938 стлб. + 87 с.].
26. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei. T. 1. Leningrad, 1926—1928 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic, in Old Ruthenian].
[Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 1. Ленинград, 1926—1928. VIII с. + 579 стлб.].
 27. Voitovych, L.V. Roman Mstyslavych i utvorennia Halytsko-Volynskoho kniazivstva. *Halychyna ta Volyn u dobu seredniiovichchia. Do 800-richchia z dnia narodzhennia Danyla Halytskoho*. Lviv, 2001. 13-30 [in Ukrainian].
[Войтович Л.В. Роман Мстиславич і утворення Галицько-Волинського князівства. *Галичина та Волинь у добу середньовіччя. До 800-річчя з дня народження Данила Галицького*. Львів, 2001. С. 13—30].
 28. Pashuto, V.T. Ocherki po istorii Galitsko-Volynskoy Rusi. Moscow, 1950 [in Russian].
[Пашуто В.Т. Очерки по истории Галицко-Волынской Руси. Москва, 1950. 330 с.].
 29. Halytsko-Volynskiy litopys: tekstolohiia / Za red. O.P. Tolochka. Kyiv, 2020 [in Ukrainian].
[Галицько-Волинський літопис: текстологія / За ред. О.П. Толочка. Київ, 2020. 929 с. + 18 с.].
 30. Novgorodskaya pervaya letopis starshego i mladshego izvodov. Moscow; Leningrad, 1950 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic, in Old Ruthenian].
[Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов. Москва; Ленинград, 1950. 580 с.].
 31. Kozachok, O.B. Vidnosyny Halytskoho kniazivstva z Vizantiieiu u konteksti mizhnarodnykh zviazkiv seredyny — druhoi polovyny XII stolittia (Candidate's diss. of the historical sci). Lviv, 2017. URL: https://lib.in.ua/163673-vidnosyny-galyczkogo-kniazivstva-z-vizantiieiu-u-konteksti-mizhnarodnyh-zviazkiv-seredyny-drugoi-polovyny-hii-stolittia#google_vignette [in Ukrainian].
[Козачок О.Б. Відносини Галицького князівства з Візантією у контексті міжнародних зв'язків середини — другої половини XII століття: дис. ... канд. іст. наук. Львів, 2017. 246 с. URL: https://lib.in.ua/163673-vidnosyny-galyczkogo-kniazivstva-z-vizantiieiu-u-konteksti-mizhnarodnyh-zviazkiv-seredyny-drugoi-polovyny-hii-stolittia#google_vignette (дата звернення: 22.03.2026)].
 32. Litavrin, G.G. Bolgariya i Vizantiya v XI—XII vv. Moscow, 1960 [in Russian].
[Литаврин Г.Г. Болгария и Византия в XI—XII вв. Москва, 1960. 472 с.].
 33. The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium. Vol. 3. New York and Oxford, 1991. XXXI pp. + p. 1475-2232.
 34. Bibikov, M.V. Vizantijskie istochniki po istorii Rusi, narodov Severnogo Prichernomorya i Severnogo Kavkaza (XII—XIII vv.). *Drevneyshie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR. Materialy i issledovaniya. 1980 god*. Moscow, 1981. 5-151 [in Russian].
[Бибииков М.В. Византийские источники по истории Руси, народов Северного Причерноморья и Северного Кавказа (XII—XIII вв.). *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР. Материалы и исследования. 1980 год*. Москва, 1981. С. 5—151].
 35. Berezkhov, N.G. Khronologiya russkogo letopisaniya. Moscow, 1963 [in Russian].
[Бережков Н.Г. Хронология русского летописания. Москва, 1963. 376 с.].
 36. Sokolov, P.P. Russkii arkhieriei iz Vizantii i pravo ego naznacheniiia do nachala XV veka. Kyiv, 1913 [in Russian].
[Соколов П.П. Русский архиерей из Византии и право его назначения до начала XV века. Киев, 1913. 577 с.].
 37. Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka. T. 6. Saint Petersburg, 1880 [in Russian, in Old Church Slavonic].
[Русская историческая библиотека. Т. 6. Санкт-Петербург, 1880. 930 с. + 316 с. + 70 с.].
 38. Smolka, S. Mieszko Stary i jego wiek. Warszawa, 1881. 544 s. [in Polish].

39. Monumenta Poloniae Historica. T. 2. Lwów, 1872. 998 s. [in Polish, in Latin].
40. Banaszekiewicz, J. Narrator w przebraniu, czyli Mistrz Wincenty o bitwie mozgawskiej. *Onus Athlanteum. Studia nad Kroniką biskupa Wincentego*. Warszawa, 2009. 423-434 [in Polish].
41. *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*. Series Nova. T. V. Warszawa, 1978. 333 p. [in Polish, in Latin].
42. Dimnik, M. Power Politics in Kievan Rus: Vladimir Monomakh and His Dynasty, 1054—1246. Toronto, 2016. 432 p.
43. Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. Т. 5. Saint Petersburg, 1997 [in Russian]. [Библиотека литературы Древней Руси. Т. 5. Санкт-Петербург, 1997. 527 с.].
44. Kotliar, M. (Ed.). Halytsko-Volynskiy litopys. Doslidzhennia. Tekst. Komentar. Kyiv, 2002 [in Ukrainian]. [Галицько-Волинський літопис. Дослідження. Текст. Коментар / За ред. Миколи Котляра. Київ, 2002. 400 с.].
45. Tolochko, A.P. Proiskhozhdenie khronologii Ipatевского spiska Galitsko-Volynskoy letopisi. *Palaeoslavica*. 2005. XIII(1): 81-108 [in Russian]. [Толочко А.П. Происхождение хронологии Ипатьевского списка Галицко-Волинской летописи. *Palaeoslavica*. 2005. Т. XIII, № 1. С. 81—108].

Received 10.05.2026

Accepted for publication 23.06.2026

Вадим АРИСТОВ

Кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник,
відділ історії України середніх віків і раннього нового часу,
Інститут історії України НАН України (Київ, Україна)
aristov3000@ukr.net
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3094-8850>

ХРОНОЛОГІЯ ЗАВОЮВАННЯ ГАЛИЧА РОМАНОМ МСТИСЛАВИЧЕМ: ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА АРГУМЕНТИ

Точна річна дата завоювання володимирським князем Романом Мстиславичем Галича відсутня у джерелах, хоча зрозуміло, що це відбулося не раніше 1198 і не пізніше 1202 рр. Наукова історіографія з XIX ст. приймає хронологію цієї події, яка з'являється лише у пізніх текстах — «Анналах» Яна Длугоша (1198 р.) і Густинському літописі (1199 р.). **Мета статті** — з'ясувати, чи дають джерела XIII ст. підстави вважати, що Роман завоював Галич у 1198 або 1199 р. і на основі такого аналізу запропонувати більш обґрунтоване датування. При цьому використано низку стандартних **методик** і **підходів** критики джерел. **Наукова новизна**. Уперше запропоновано аналіз хронології завоювання Романом Галича на основі винятково ранніх джерел (XIII ст.), не спираючись на фіктивні дати Яна Длугоша й залежного від нього (за посередництва польської історіографії XVI ст.) Густинського літопису. **Висновки**. На підставі аналізу ранніх джерел (візантійських, руських і польських) з'ясовано, що жодне з них не дає переваги 1198 чи 1199 року як даті завоювання Романом Галича. Натомість запропоновано аргументи на користь того, що ця подія відбулася відповідно на три або два роки пізніше.

Ключові слова: Київська Русь, Галицьке князівство, середньовічні студії, середньовічні джерела, історична хронологія.