

## History of Ukraine-Rus'

The Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research  
Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

## The Hrushevsky Translation Project

*Editor in Chief*

Frank E. Sysyn

*Deputy Editor*

Serhii Plokhly

*Managing Editor*

Uliana M. Pasicznyk

*Senior Editor*

Myroslav Yurkevich

*Project Manager*

Marko R. Stech

*Editor*

Tania Plawuszczak-Stech

*Associate Editor*

Marta Horban-Carynnyk

*Assistant Editors*

Andrij Hornjatkevyč

Dushan Bednarsky

Mykhailo Hrushevsky  
History of Ukraine-Rus'

---

Volume 5

Sociopolitical and Church Organization and  
Relations in the Lands of Ukraine-Rus' in  
the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries

---

Translated by  
Marta Skorupsky and Marta Daria Olynyk

Edited by  
Myron M. Kapral, *Consulting Editor*  
and  
Frank E. Sysyn, *Editor in Chief*

with the assistance of  
Uliana M. Pasicznyk



Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press

Edmonton • 2019 • Toronto

# Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press

University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta  
Canada T6G 2H8

University of Toronto  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5T 1W5

Copyright © 2019 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

ISBN 1-895571-22-7 (set)

ISBN 978-1-894865-54-8 (v. 5)

## Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Hrushevs'kyi, Mykhailo, 1866-1934  
[Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy. English]  
History of Ukraine-Rus' / Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

Translation of: Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy.

Editor in chief: Frank E. Sysyn.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

Contents: v. 5. Sociopolitical and church organization and relations in the lands of Ukraine-Rus' in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries / translated by Marta Skorupsky and Marta Daria Olynyk; edited by Myron M. Kapral, consulting editor, and Frank E. Sysyn, editor in chief, with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk.

ISBN 978-1-894865-54-8 (v. 5 : hardcover)

1. Ukraine--History. I. Sysyn, Frank E., editor II. Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, issuing body III. Title. IV. Title: Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy. English

DK508.5.H6813 1997

947.7

C979-304369

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in Canada

The preparation of volume 5 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has been funded by a generous donation from Dr. Maria Fischer-Slysh of Toronto in memory of her parents, Dr. Adolf Slyz and Olha Slyz.

Підготовка п'ятого тому *Історії України-Руси* здійснено завдяки щедрому дарові д-р Марії Фішер-Слиш з Торонта в пам'ять її батьків, бл. п. д-р Адольфа Слижа й Ольги Слиж.

The printing and dissemination of volume 5 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* have been funded by the Temerty Foundation.

Друк і розповсюдження п'ятого тому *Історії України-Руси* здійснено завдяки фінансовій підтримці Фондації Темертеїв.

## Foreword

The Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research was established at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, in 1989. The Centre was endowed by Peter Jacyk of Toronto, who requested that the Centre undertake the translation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy (History of Ukraine-Rus')*. Mr. Jacyk was an enthusiastic and dedicated supporter of the Hrushevsky Translation Project, and the Petro Jacyk Educational Foundation continues his commitment and legacy of support. The Project has also received support from the Canadian Foundation for Ukrainian Studies. Individual benefactors have undertaken the sponsorship of particular volumes. Numerous individual donors have also contributed to the funding of the Hrushevsky Translation Project.

The publication of volume 5 of the History of Ukraine Rus' has been funded by a generous donation from the estate of Edward Brodacky (1926–2007), who settled in London, England, after the Second World War.

Видання п'ятого тому Історії України-Руси здійснено завдяки щедрому дарові із спадку Едварда Бродацького (1926–2007), який після Другої Світової Війни оселився у Лондоні, Великобританія.



# Contents

Foreword	vii
Editorial Preface to the Hrushevsky Translation Project	xvi
Editorial Preface to Volume 5	xviii
Between Poland and Lithuania: Toward the Westernizing of Society, Law, and Religious Life in the Ukrainian Lands in the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries—Myron M. Kapral	xxvii
Glossary	xlvii
Maps	lvii
<i>A Note from the Author</i>	lxi

\* \* \*

## I. General Overview

1–17

General character of the evolution of the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries (1), influences of Polish law (1–2), territorial differences (2), transitional character of the influences of Lithuanian law (2–3). The Old Rus' basis of Lithuanian law (3–4), conservatism in the policies of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (4). Influences of the state evolution of the Grand Duchy on its law; the use of society in the interests of military needs (4–5); decentralization as an impediment to these influences (5); the Gediminian princes and their relations with the grand duke (5); the decline of the principalities (6); guarantees of the social order of the provinces—land privileges (7); privileges of the Ukrainian lands—Podlachian (7), Kyivan and Volhynian (8–9); the autonomy of lands in the Grand Duchy (9), its practice in Ukraine (9); the structure of the land (10) and of the system of self-government (11), successful achievement of uniformity in administration and law (12). The Ukrainian lands of the Kingdom of Poland: differing circumstances (13), the period of 'Rus' law' (13) and its decline (13–14), the polonization of the system of governance and the law (14–15), the local nobility's strivings for equalization with Polish lands (15), the uselessness of land autonomy to the Ukrainian element (15–16), disdain for Rus' (16–17), the polonization of the western provinces and Poland's march eastward (17).

## II. The Evolution of the Social Order: Lords-Nobles

18–68

The Old Rus' social structure (18). The princely-seigneurial aristocracy (in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania) (18), 'princes and lords,' their prerogatives—the right to send troops to war under the family's own banner (19), princely banner families (19) and nobiliary ones in the sixteenth century (20), the extent of the aristocracy's wealth (21). Volhynia as a princely land—its aristocratic families (21), the Buh region, Polisia, and eastern Ukraine (22). Aristocratic structure of offices (22), the hereditary nature of offices (23), the aristocratic structure of the Council of Lords of the Grand Duchy (24). The aristocracy's judicial privileges (24–25). The magnate class in the Crown lands (25), grants based on princely law (26), émigré princes (26–27).

The nobiliary stratum in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: military service as its foundation (27), the practice of land grants and its origins (28), the formation of the military-service stratum (28), transfers to boyar service from other strata (29), *putni* boyars (30), armored servitors, castle servitors, Horde servitors (31). Attempts to restrict the boyar stratum—the privilege of 1387 (31) and the Horodlo privilege (31–32), the government's policy aims and their failure (32), equalization of the Orthodox—the privileges of 1432 and 1434 (32–33), the formal abrogation of the Horodlo decrees in 1563 (33). The lack of criteria defining

the nobility (34). The expansion of nobiliary liberties in the privilege of 1447 and subsequent ones (35); decisions of provincial privileges (35–36), the codification of nobiliary rights in the Lithuanian Statute (36), the nobiliary character of statutory law—the first [1529] and second [1566] statutes (36–37). Attempts at restricting the nobiliary stratum—terminology: boyars (37), landed gentry (38), nobility (38–39); the criterion for defining noble status (39); the criterion of prescription (39), the sorting of the boyar class (40); the formation of the nobiliary stratum (40–41); Polish influences on the formation of the nobility in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (41–42). Differences between the Lithuanian nobility and the Crown nobility: service obligations (42), restriction of ownership rights (43), the emancipation of nobiliary land tenure (43–44), and the cancellation of limitations (44); the standardization of military service (45); other obligations (45–46); reforms of the mid-sixteenth century (46), the abrogation of the aristocracy's prerogatives (47).

The nobility in the Crown's Ukrainian lands: the formation of nobiliary rights in Poland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (47–48), the obligations of the nobility in Poland's Ukrainian provinces (48), military service in Casimir's land grants (49), the source of these obligations (49–50), the stipulations of Władysław of Opole's land grants (50), feudal law (*iure feudali*) (51), the land grants of Jogaila (51–52), pledged landholding (52), similarities to Lithuanian landholding (53). The strivings of the nobility in the Ruthenian lands for equalization with the Polish lands (54), the privilege of 1425 (54–55), the Jedlnia privilege (55), the grant of Polish law in 1435 (55–56), vestiges of the nobility's lack of full rights (56), the Belz nobility (57).

The non-privileged nobility (57–58), its two categories (58). The servitor nobility in the Crown lands (59), information about it from Galicia (59), its strivings for full rights (59–60), villages of grooms in the Peremyshl area (60–61). The servitor nobility of Podilia—the nobility of Bar (61), its obligations (61), the criteria for its service status (61–62), the nobility of Khmelnyk (63). The non-privileged servitor nobility in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—Ovruch (63–64), Oster and Liubech (64). Boyars and nobles in the seigneurial lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: their obligations (64–65) and dependence (65). In the Crown lands: servitor leaseholds in the Iaroslav area (66), other information (67), the nobility of Szczepieszyn and Sharhorod (67–68).

### III. The Peasantry

69–143

The general evolution of the peasant strata (69). The gradual disappearance of the unfree strata (69), their remnants in the sixteenth century in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (70), their status (71), the law's views of them (72), their extinction in the second half of the sixteenth century (72). The gradual disappearance of slavery in the Crown's Ukrainian lands—vestiges of slavery in the fifteenth century (73). The transition of the remaining slaves into the imposed peasantry (*tiahli*) (73–74), a retrospective look at this process in earlier times (74). Special categories of unfree and semi-free people: *koimintsi* (74), bondsmen (*zakupy*) (75), parallels with economically enserfed peasants (76).

Categories of peasants in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (76–77). Tributary peasants (77), terminology for them (77); tributary peasants in the 1470 inventory of Kyivan state lands (77–78), in the Ratne starosta district in the early sixteenth century (79–80) and in the Volhynian-Pynsk region of Polisia in the 1560s (80), their obligations (81–82) and taxation assessment (82–83); vestiges of old practices from other lands (83–84), the reconstruction of the old taxation system of the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries (84), its evolution (85), the origins of labor obligations (86).

The labor-obligated peasantry—terminology (86), economic categories (87), their description in the Statute of 1529 (87), the expansion of the corvée system in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (87–88) and the lands of the Kingdom of Poland (88), the gradual disappearance of distinctions between the tributary and labor-obligated peasantry (89). Service peasants—their categories (89), servitors in the Kyiv region (89–90), Polisia (90–91), in Volhynia and Galicia (92). The status of servitors (92), the connection with slavery (93), special categories: grooms, servitors of the Horde (93–94), *kalanni* (94), hundreders (95).

The limitation of peasants' personal rights (96). Exclusion from general jurisdiction in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (96), the privilege of 1447 (96–97); the effects of German law in Poland (97); legal rights of peasants in royal domains (98). Restrictions of property rights—peasants' right to own land in the Kingdom of Poland (98–99), traces of tolerance of the peasants' right to own land (100); confiscation of peasants' plots (100). The peasants' right to land in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (101), the erosion of peasant rights (101), their legal recognition in the fifteenth to early sixteenth centuries (101–2), the right of inheritance (102), the restriction (103) and denial of peasant rights in the mid-sixteenth century (104). The connection between the right to own land and personal freedom (104). Restriction of the peasants' freedom of movement in Poland (104–5), practices regarding the freedom of movement in Galicia in the fifteenth century (105),

decisions on peasant movement in Galicia (106–7), the Krasnostav resolutions of 1477 (107); the abolishment of the right to depart in the early sixteenth century (107–8); rootless people (108). Freedom of movement in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (109), hereditary and mobile peasants (109), the right to depart and its gradual disappearance (110), the causes of enservment (110–11), prescription as a criterion of enservment (111), statutory legislation (112). The overall outcome—the disenfranchisement of the peasantry (113).

The *corvée* system—its evolution (113–14). Crown lands—the *corvée* system in villages under German and Wallachian law (114), the 14-day *corvée* (114); the *corvée* system in villages under ‘Ruthenian law’ (115); standardization of the *corvée* system—the Krasnostav (115–16) and Podlachian (116–17) resolutions, the resolutions passed by the Toruń-Bydgoszcz Diets (117–18); the two-day norm in the second half of the sixteenth century (118–19); the *corvée* system in Galicia in the middle and second half of the sixteenth century (119), the burdens imposed by the *corvée* system (120–21), additional labor (122); rents and taxes (122), their evolution (123), taxation in the mid-sixteenth century in Galicia (123–24). The conservatism of villages under Wallachian law (124), their obligations in the middle and second half of the sixteenth century (124–25). Breaches of old norms (126), examples from the second half of the sixteenth century (126–27). Peasant complaints about oppression (127), the government’s powerlessness (128), the recalcitrance of tenancy-holders (*derzhavtsi*) (128–29). The *corvée* system in southeastern Galicia (130), western Podilia (130–31), and eastern Podilia (131). The lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—attempts at standardization from the first half of the sixteenth century (131–32); the ‘Statute on *Voloky*’ (132–34), its implementation in the Ukrainian lands (134); information dating to the second half of the sixteenth century from royal domains (135–36) and private estates—from the Brest region (136), Volhynia—villages not under *voloka* reform (137) and *voloka* villages (138); the Volhynian *corvée* system in the first half of the seventeenth century (138–39). Kyivan Polisia (139–40), the Dnipro River region (140). The eastward advance of the manorial economy (140–41); taxation in the Dnipro region and the Buh region in the first half of the seventeenth century (141–42); peasant opposition (142–43).

#### IV. Burghers. Clergy.

144–86

The burgher stratum and its separateness (144). The reception of German town law (144–45), its beginnings under the Rus’ dynasty (145), traces in Volodymyr and Lviv (145–46), the grant of German town law to Sianik (146); the political role of German communities and their promotion in Galicia (147). The spread of German law: its beginnings in Podilia and the Buh region (148) and Volhynia (149), its expansion in the sixteenth century (149). Models of urban organization (149). City immunity (150), the consequences of exclusion from the general organization (150–51), rivalry within the nobility (151), the restriction of burghers’ rights (151–52), competition from the nobility (152). The decline of the burgher stratum (153). Contempt for the Ruthenians (153), restrictions on offices (154–55). Typical examples: Ruthenians in Lviv (155), restrictions of civil rights (155), lawsuits brought by Lviv’s Ruthenians (156) and their failures (157), exclusion from guilds (157), the religious basis of this (158). Ruthenians in Kamianets (159), Ruthenian and Armenian jurisdiction (160), lack of equality (160). The polonization of cities (161–62). Armenian colonies (162), their statistics (162–63), the ruthenization of the Armenians (163), a church union and the polonization of the Armenians (163). Jews in Ukraine (164), their expulsion and return in the sixteenth century (164), restrictions on their rights (165) and the separateness of Jews (165–66). Jews dominate in city life (166), Christians’ complaints (166–67); cities that were closed to Jews (167–68).

Clergy: old categories of church people and the changes that took place in them (168). Monastic people—the multitude of monasteries in Galicia (169), Volhynia (170), the Kyiv region (171); the founding of monasteries—monasteries founded by the nobility (171), monasteries founded by burghers (172), ones founded by monks (172); monasteries known to us only later (173); the size of monasteries (173). The secular clergy—its numbers (174), reasons for the proliferation of churches (174–75), attempts to gather statistics (175). The founding of parishes (176), parish clergy (176–77), its familial character (177). The upkeep of the clergy (178), grants of land (178), grain taxes (179), imitation of tithes (179–80), other revenues (180). Taxation of the clergy (181), the clergy’s exemptions and their violation (181–82), the *corvée* system among the clergy (182), other revenues from priests (183), the sale of parishes (184). The clergy’s hereditary rights (184), their restrictions (185), priestly dynasties (186).

#### V. Civil Administration

187–251

Remnants of the Old Rus’ system of governance (187), the system of ‘rotational’ holdings (188–89); the lower-ranking administration (189); changes in the Old Rus’ administrative system (189–90), the

disappearance of old offices (190). Provincial administration in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania until the mid-sixteenth century (190), the division of the Ukrainian lands into counties (191), vicegerents-starostas (191–92), their economic management (192) and public functions (193), their subordinates (193–94); voivodes and palatines (195–96); special officials (196). Administration in the Crown lands: the evolution of a provincial administration in Poland (197), the decline of the old administrative system (197) and the formation of a starosta-based administration (198); court organization (199).

The transfer of the Polish administrative structure to Rus'—the transitional period (199–200), Old Rus' offices (200) and their decline (201), the office of voivode and its disappearance (201), the language of administration (202), starosta-based administration (202–3). The full-fledged introduction of the Polish system of governance in 1435 (203); lands and palatinates (204) institutions of the land and castle (204), judicial and non-judicial starostas (205), their gradual differentiation in Ukraine (206), the proliferation of non-judicial starostas (206) and the weakening of the public character of the office of starosta (206), mortgaging of starostaships (207); nobiliary self-rule (208), honorary offices (208). The development of parliamentarism in Poland (209) and the participation of the Ukrainian lands in the parliamentary system (210), parliamentary practice of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (210–11). Reforms of the sixteenth century (211–12), the judicial system (212–13), the establishment of tribunals (213); military affairs (213), the defense of Ukrainian borders (213); financial matters (213–14), taxation by the Diet (215), the 'quarter' tax (216) and the standing army (216), the state budget and military expenditures in the late sixteenth century (216–17), the organization of the army in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (217–18), payment arrears (218) and military confederations (219), the reform of 1717 (219). The organization of the eastern Ukrainian lands on the Polish model (220), the organization of palatinates (220), the division into counties (221), starostaships (221), tribunals and the law (221–22).

Urban organization: the office of reeve (222–23), the city council and bench court (223), various categories of reeveship—privileged reeves (224), the 'incorporation' of reeveships (224–25), appointed reeves (225). Types of municipal administration: broader self-governance—Lviv (225–26), cities with a high level of interference by the reeve—Kremianets (226–27), the starosta-reeve—Kovel (227–28); the illusory nature of municipal self-governance (228); private cities—Olyka (229). The judicial system: hierarchy of courts (229–30), codices of municipal law (230), German law in practice (231).

The rural system of governance: various types of organization (232). Vestiges of the old community organization (232), the domain (*volost'*) system (233), the dissolution of domains (233–34), community courts (234), remnants of domanian organization in the sixteenth century (335), the village community (236), self-governing functions (237), village leaders under 'Ruthenian law' (237–38), village heads—*starts'i* and *tyvuny* (238), heads of rural communities—*otamany* (239), their duties (239–40), the rural judicial system (240–41). Villages under German law: the office of reeve (241), judicial guarantees and higher courts (241–42), the buying up of reeves' offices (242), the weakness of self-rule (243). Villages under Wallachian rule (243), origins (243–44) and development (244), forms of founding (245), village chiefs (*kniazi*) (245), district heads (*krainyky*) (246), village assemblies (246–47). Mixing types of rural governance (247). Uniformization—the Statute on *Voloky* (248–49). The evolution of rural governance in the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries (250); the vitality of community organization (250–51).

## VI. Church Organization

252–332

The importance of church relations in national life during the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries (252).

### *Hierarchical relations:*

The unity of the metropolitanate in the mid-fourteenth century and efforts at separation—Metropolitan Teodoryt (252), Roman's candidacy (253), the separation of the Lithuanian metropolitanate (254), the rivalry between Aleksei and Roman in Kyiv (254), the death of Roman (255). The restoration of the Halych metropolitanate—Casimir's letter (255–56), Antonii's consecration as metropolitan (256), measures taken by Algirdas, Kypriian's consecration as metropolitan (257), the merging of the metropolitanates (258), Kypriian's measures concerning the Halych metropolitanate (258), Ivan's candidacy (259), Kypriian takes control of the Halych metropolitanate (260). Metropolitan Fotii and his conflict with Vytautas (260–61), the election of Hryhorii Tsamblak (261), his past (261–62), rejection by the patriarchate (262), Tsamblak's installation as metropolitan (263), Fotii's extension of authority over the Lithuanian and Polish eparchies (264). Metropolitan Herasym (264). The consecration of Metropolitan Isidore (265), his fall (265), consecration of Hryhorii as metropolitan (265–66), Moscow's opposition (266–67), patriarchal confirmation of Hryhorii (267), the final separation of the metropolitanates (267). Incumbency in the

metropolitanate in the second half of the fifteenth century, Mysail (268), Spyrydon (268), Symon (269), Iona (269), Makarii (270), Iosyf Bolharynovych (270). Incumbency in the metropolitanate in the sixteenth century—Iona and Iosyf Soltan (270–71), Iosyf and Makarii, the sale of the metropolitanate (271), Sylvester Velkevych and Ilia–Iona Kucha (272), Onysyf Divochka and Mykhailo Rohoza (272–73). The weakening of the patriarchate's role in installing a metropolitan (273), discontent with the patriarchate (274), the weakening of the patriarchs' participation in the church affairs of Rus' (275–76), the government's increasing involvement (275–76).

*The status of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian state:*

Radical changes produced by Polish occupation (276), the formation of the Catholic Church in Ukraine—bishops *in partibus* (276–77), Casimir's position (277), plans for the latinization of Orthodox bishoprics (278), a turning-point in Casimir's church policy (278), measures taken by Władysław of Opole and King Louis of Anjou (279), the papal bull *Debitum pastoralis* and the founding of the Latin archdiocese of Halych (280), its transfer to Lviv (280), Catholic dioceses—Peremyshl (281), Kholm and Lutsk (281–82), Podilia (282). The decline of the Halych metropolitanate (282), claims to it by Latin archbishops (283), the clash over the Halych vicarship—Hdashytsky's appointment (284), measures taken by the Halych Orthodox in the eparchy's interests (285), the election of Makarii Tuchapsky (285–86) and measures concerning his confirmation (286–87), the restoration of the Orthodox bishopric (288), the Catholic archbishop's claims (288–89). Restriction of the Orthodox faith in the Polish lands (289), restrictions on religious practices (289–90), prohibition of the construction of Orthodox churches (290), restrictions of burgher rights (291); the lack of privileges for the Orthodox (292); privileges for the Orthodox hierarchy (292–93). The Orthodox Church in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: relations between the grand dukes (293) and local princes (293–94); legislative restrictions on the rights of the Orthodox (295), the privileges of equality of 1432 and 1434 (295), the principle of barring Ruthenians from holding offices (296), its confirmation in the sixteenth century (296–97), the formal equalization of the Orthodox in 1563 (298). The position of the government of the Grand Duchy with regard to the Orthodox Church (298), the lack of equality with the Catholic Church (298–99); privileges for bishops (299).

*The internal organization of the Orthodox Church:*

Metropolitanates (300) and eparchies (300). The decline of the metropolitan's authority—the naming of bishops (301), their impunity with respect to the metropolitan (302), the metropolitan's lack of executive power (302), helplessness before the secular authorities (303). Bishops' councils (304), the resolutions of 1509 (304); the ineffectualness of council resolutions (305). Episcopal authority—the main ecclesiastical powers (306), the rivalry between episcopal authority and patronage (307), moral censorship (307–8) and the ecclesiastical court (308), rivalry between the secular authorities and the ecclesiastical court (308–9), lack of executive power (309). The cathedral chapter (*krylos*)—its composition and functions (310); vicars (311), officials of the episcopal administration (311). The procedure of installing priests (312); payments from priests (313). The monastic system of governance—self-rule (313), the community (314). Material resources, properties (315). The patronage system (315–16), treatment of it as a source of revenue (316), revenue from patronage—intercalary periods (317), payment of tributes (317–18), the snapping up of church properties by patrons (318–19), acceptance of the patronage system and its justification (319). The government's non-canonical treatment of Orthodox ecclesiastical offices (319–20), 'expectancies' (320), conflicts between nominees (321), battles for the Lutsk bishopric and the Zhydychyn archimandritship (322), the appropriation of properties by bishops (322–23). Disorganization of the Orthodox Church during the second half of the sixteenth century (323), the influences of the period—a picture of the disorganization of the Catholic Church in Poland in the mid-sixteenth century (323–24), characteristics of the Orthodox Church in the late sixteenth century (325), the investives of Ivan Vyshensky (325–26), the demoralization of the episcopate (326–27), the grabbing of properties (327), armed raids (327), acts of violence (328), descriptive accounts in documents of the Lviv Brotherhood (329), disorder in the Peremyshl and Lviv eparchies (329), the demoralization of the lower clergy (330–31). Society's attempts to institute reforms (331), an alliance with the patriarchate (331–32); the bishops' dissatisfaction and the plan for a union (332).

## VII. The Creation of the Uniate Church

333–406

*Attempts at forging a union in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries:*

Papal measures concerning union with the Rus' Church (333). The first plans for union in the Polish-Lithuanian state (333), Jogaila's conference with Kypriian and the plan for a church in 1396 (334),

opposition from the patriarchate (334–35). Tsamblak's installation as metropolitan in connection with plans for a union (335), Tsamblak's journey to the Council of Constance (335–36), his greetings to the council (336) and speech concerning the union (337), failure to resolve the issue (338), Jogaila's hopes (338). An interruption in the union issue and Švitrigaila's manifestations (339), Herasym's letter (339). Byzantine plans for a union and Metropolitan Isidore (340), the Council of Ferrara–Florence (340–41) and the Union of Florence (341), Isidore's circular letter (341–42), the hostile attitude of government and clerical circles in Poland and Lithuania (342–43), cool reception in Ruthenian circles (343), ignorance of the union (343), Moscow's position, Isidore's arrest and flight (344), his departure from the diocese (344–45), opposition to the union in Ukraine and Belarus (345–46), the collapse of the Union of Florence—Metropolitan Hryhorii (346) and his submission to the patriarchate (347). The difficult situation vis-à-vis the government and attempts to establish a *modus vivendi* with the patriarchate and the Curia (347), Mysail and his missive (347–48), his motives (348), the clergy's lack of sympathy with these measures (349–50). Measures taken by Metropolitan Iosyf Bolharynovych (350–51), correspondence with the patriarchate (351) and a mission to the pope (351–52), Metropolitan Iosyf's letter and the pope's response (352–53). An interruption in the efforts pertaining to union (353).

*The realization of a union and the separation of the Uniate Church:*

The revival of the Catholic Church of Poland (353). Favorable circumstances for a union and the revival of this idea (354), promotion of a union—Herbest (354–55), Skarga (355–56), Possevino and Bolognetto (356–57), relations with the princes Ostrozky (357), attacks against the Orthodox Church (357) and vacillation among the Orthodox (358), the plan for a union in the form of a merger of the Churches (359). Conception of a plan for union among the bishops (360), bad behavior by Greek hierarchs (360), Patriarch Jeremiah's arrival (360–61), his directives concerning the brotherhood issue (361–62), removal of the metropolitan (362), the exclusion of twice-married people from ecclesiastical offices (362–63), appointment of an exarch (363), the rescinding of charters (364), the directives issued upon departure (365), the bishops' dissatisfaction with Jeremiah's directives (365), Dionysios's forgeries (366), confusion caused by Greek hierarchs (367), the bishops decide to escape the patriarch's authority (368). The first stages of the bishops' conspiracy (368), Balaban as the initiator (368–69), the congress in Belz (370), the synod in Brest (370), the declaration of union in 1590 (371), the bishops' desiderata (371–72) and their motives (372), Terletsky's delays (373), submission of the declaration to the king (374) and his reply (374). Changes in the episcopate—Kopystensky (374), letter proclaiming anathema against the metropolitan (375), Potii as bishop (375–76). Terletsky's public declaration about the union (376), the congress in Sokal (376–77), the declaration (377) and articles of union of 1594 (378). Negotiations with the metropolitan (378–79) and his assent to the union (380). The Lviv synod in January 1595 (380). Opposition to the union—Prince Ostrozky (381), Potii's endeavors on this account (381–82), the question of a council (382).

Unreliable evidence concerning the final stages of implementing a union (383), documents of union in 1594–95 and bishops' signatures (383), a conference with the Catholic clergy in Cracow (384), the final redaction of the articles of union (384–85), their approbation in Cracow (385–86), the king's letter to Prince Ostrozky (387), Ostrozky's opposition (387–88), Balaban's and Kopystensky's disavowal of the union (388), Ostrozky's circular (388–89) and his emissary to the congress in Toruń (389), consternation at the king's court (390) and conferences on the union issue (390–91), the dispatch of bishops to Rome (391). Potii and Terletsky in Rome (391–92), a public audience on 23–24 December (392–93), the bishops' return and papal letters concerning the union (393–94). Agitation against the union by the Orthodox (394), their protests at the Diet of 1596 (394–95), the lack of help from the patriarchate (395), the protosyncellus Nikephoros and his arrival in Rus' (396). The scheduling of a council (397). The gathering in Brest (398), the formation of an Orthodox council (398–99), its negotiations with the Uniates (399) and the creation of two separate councils (400), the activities of the Orthodox council (400–1) and its documents (401), the proclamation of a union by the Uniate council (401–2) and protests from the Orthodox (402), the controversy surrounding the legitimacy of the councils (403), the accusations of Catholics and Uniates against the Orthodox council and its canonical justification (403–4). Measures adopted by the Orthodox to demolish the Uniate hierarchy (404), the king's position (404–5), restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy and the separation of the Orthodox and Uniate Churches (405–6).

<b>Notes</b>	<b>407–61</b>
1. Study of the Law of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Its Literature	407
2. Theories of Feudalism in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania	423
3. Study of the Sociopolitical Order in the Ukrainian-Ruthenian Lands of Poland and Its Literature	426
4. The Date of Grand Duke Casimir's Privilege	436
5. Taxation Table for Pynsk Households prior to Land Redistribution	437
6. Categories of Peasants and Terms for Them in the Kyiv Inventory of the 1470s	442
7. Sources and Literature on the History of Cities	443
8. Literature on Jewish Colonization	448
9. Literature on the Ukrainian Clergy	450
10. Church Organization and Relations in the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries	453
11. The Church Union	456

\* \* \*

Bibliography	462
Abbreviations	462
Unpublished Sources	463
Published Sources	464
Secondary Literature	474
Appendix 1: Monetary Units	501
Appendix 2: Units of Measure	504
Tables of Rulers	506
Translations and Publications Consulted	516
Index	517

# **Between Poland and Lithuania: Toward the Westernizing of Society, Law, and Religious Life in the Ukrainian Lands in the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries**

MYRON M. KAPRAL

Volume 5 of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* continues the Lithuanian-Polish cycle of the chronology of Ukrainian history, encompassing the period from the mid-fourteenth century to the early seventeenth century in its social, political, and religious dimensions. Generally speaking, volumes 4, 5, and 6 constitute a chronological whole, recreating the transitional stage of Ukrainian history from the princely era to the Cossack age. In volume 4 Hrushevsky examines the development of the political relations that formed in the Ukrainian lands as a result of their being drawn into the orbit of the two most powerful states in the region, Poland and Lithuania, which concluded a personal union enshrined in the Union of Krėva (Krewo), signed in 1385. Volume 6 surveys the economic, cultural, and national life of Ukrainians in the early modern period, including the beginning of the seventeenth century.

The historian's work on the Polish-Lithuanian era did not last very long, as attested by the rather brisk pace of publication of those three large volumes of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*: volume 4 was published in 1903, volume 5 in 1905, and volume 6 in 1907.<sup>1</sup> The scholar accounted for his productivity by explaining that he had devoted himself to the study of sociopolitical and economic topics 'beginning with my first scholarly work, written nearly twenty years ago, and I have put much effort into the compilation, publishing, and analysis of new, unpublished material' (p. lxii).

Hrushevsky began to work on volume 5 the second day after finishing his work on volume 4, that is, on 1/14<sup>2</sup> November 1901.<sup>3</sup> It did not take him long to realize that writing it would take quite some time. On 14/27 April 1902, he noted in his diary: 'This volume, 5, is a great deal of work, because it requires rewriting from "a" to "z," and I realize with chagrin that there still remains perhaps two-thirds to three-fourths of it to do.'<sup>4</sup> But 1903 ushered in other, more urgent projects: a short course on the history of Ukraine in the Russian language, permission for whose publication was finally obtained from the Muscovite

---

1. The history of work on volume 6 is discussed in the introduction to the English-language translation of that volume. See Myron M. Kapral, 'The "Transitional Period": Hrushevsky's Interpretation of the Lithuanian-Polish Era in Ukrainian History,' in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 6, trans. Leonid Heretz, ed. Myron M. Kapral and Frank E. Sysyn, with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk (Edmonton and Toronto, 2012), pp. xxviii–xxx.

2. Here and in dual dates that follow, the first date is according to the Julian calendar (O.S.) and the second according to the Gregorian calendar (N.S.).

3. Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukraïny u Kyievi (hereafter TsDIAUK), fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 137, ark. 14. I express my thanks to Svitlana Pankova, director of the Mykhailo Hrushevsky Memorial Museum in Kyiv, for directing my attention to certain archival materials relating to the historian that are held in Kyiv archives.

4. *Ibid.*, spr. 25, ark. 18



government;<sup>5</sup> the German translation of volume 1 of the *History*;<sup>6</sup> and a new edition of this first volume. In 1904 the historian had to prepare new editions of volumes 2 and 3; also, the political demands of the time obliged him to write various articles for the press. Hrushevsky's scholarly work was slowed by illness ('depression'), the result of stress brought on by attacks against him by figures within the Ukrainian national-democratic camp in Galicia and, simultaneously, by individuals who were mounting opposition to him in the Shevchenko Scientific Society (Oleksander Barvinsky, Volodymyr Budzynovsky, Stanislav Dnistriansky, and Volodymyr Shukhevych).<sup>7</sup>

During November–December 1904, April–May and October–December 1905, as well as January–early February 1906, the scholar worked intensively on the 'review,' augmentation, and preparation of the final chapters of volume 5 for publication.<sup>8</sup> The course of Hrushevsky's work on the text of the volume is indicated by the dates that he jotted down on the manuscript while working on it intermittently from November 1901 to December 1905: dates in 1901—November 1/14, 8/2[1], 9/22, 10/2[3], 14/27, December 1/14, 2/15; dates in 1902—March 20/April 2, May 5/18, 7/20, 9/22, 12/25, May 28/June 10, June 11/24, June 22/July 5, June 24/July 7, June 30/July 13, September 20/October 3, September 22/October 5, October 12/25, November 16/29; dates in 1903—January 19/February 1; dates in 1904—December 8/21, 16/29; dates in 1904–5—December 25/January 8; dates in 1905—October 29/November 11, November 25/December 8, December 2/15.<sup>9</sup> At the end of 1904, when Hrushevsky completed his initial revision of the text, he presented a synopsis of volume 5's first five chapters at a session of the Historical-Philosophical Section of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.<sup>10</sup> As with the preceding volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, it was decided to publish these chapters in the *Zbirnyk Istorychno-Filosofichnoi sektiï Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka* (Collection of the Historical-Philosophical Section of the Shevchenko Scientific Society) as volume 8 in that series, and subsequent chapters as volume 9 and, possibly, volume 10. At this time Hrushevsky did not yet know whether his study of the Lithuanian-Polish period would span two or three volumes. According to his original plan, volume 5 was to cover not only society, economic life, and ecclesiastical administration but also culture, the economy, and religion. But the author had not fully considered the volume of archival material involved, as he himself relates in his author's note to the volume (p. lxi–lxii). In consequence, he was obliged to transfer analysis of some of this material to the subsequent volume 6. At times readers of the *History*'s volumes 5 and 6 are indeed aware of an interplay in the historical themes of the two volumes, especially with regard to social and church history.

As planned, in 1905 volume 5 was printed as two publications of the *Zbirnyk Istorychno-Filosofichnoi sektiï Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, that is, its volumes 8 and 9.<sup>11</sup>

5. M. Grushevskii (Hrushevsk'kyi), *Ocherk istorii ukrainskogo naroda* (St. Petersburg, 1904).

6. M. Hruševskij (Hrushevsk'kyi), *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes* (Leipzig, 1906), vol. 1, *Band Urgeschichte des Landes und des Volkes: Anfänge des kijever Staates*.

7. 'Shchodennyky M. S. Hrushevsk'koho (1904–1910 rr.),' *Kyïvs'ka starovyna* (Kyïv), no. 1 (1995): 11–13.

8. M. Hrushevsk'kyi, 'Shchodennyk [1904–1905 rr.],' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 4, nos.1–2 (2006–7): 27–34, 49–51, 53, 60, 67, 70, 72–74; TsDIAUK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 25, ark. 101<sup>v</sup>–103<sup>v</sup>, 104<sup>v</sup>.

9. TsDIAUK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 25, ark. 4, 9<sup>v</sup>, 10, 16, 32, 39, 165, 171, 377, 507<sup>v</sup>, 509, 527<sup>v</sup>, 528, 1020<sup>v</sup>, 900, 1018<sup>v</sup>, 1063, 1080, 563, 572, 928, 912, 679<sup>v</sup>, 410-a, 1021, 1058<sup>v</sup>, 766<sup>v</sup>, 899, 815

10. Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukraïny u L'vovi (hereafter TsDIAUL), fond 309, op.1, spr. 42, ark. 58<sup>v</sup>.

11. On publications of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, see: *Periodychni ta seriïni vydannia Naukovoho Tovyarystva imeni Shevchenka (1895–1939): Anotovanyi pokazhchyk*, comp. T. Kul'chys'tka (Lviv, 1991), pp. 39–40; *Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi: Pershyi prezident Ukraïny, akademik. Biobibliohrafiia (1885–2000 rr.)*, comp. Borys Hranovsk'kyi, 2d rev. ed. (Kyiv, 2004), p. 163. Both of these works give 1906 instead of 1905 as the year of publication of volume 5's second half (*Zbirnyk Istorychno-Filosofichnoi sektiï Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, vol. 9). Printing of the volume began in 1905 and continued into the following year. On 15 January 1906, Hrushevsky presented a summary of volume

The first of these encompassed the first five chapters, dealing with administrative organization and class structures, whereas the second included the two chapters dealing with church organization and the processes of union on the Ukrainian lands. The first of the two publications appeared in the first half of 1905.<sup>12</sup> At a meeting of the Shevchenko Scientific Society's board (presidium) on 15 July 1905 [N.S.], Hrushevsky reported that volume 5 of his *History* had been set in print as volumes 8 and 9 of the *Zbirnyk*.<sup>13</sup> Hrushevsky had the whole of volume 5 reprinted at his own cost by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, at its printshop and 'under the management of K. Bernadsky.' That publication came out in February of 1906 (the title page has 1905), as the scholar noted in his diary: 'The first copies of volume 5 have been printed.'<sup>14</sup> The press run of volume 5 was 600 copies, a hundred more than that of the *History*'s volume 4.<sup>15</sup>

### *The Scholar's Research Workshop: The Archaeographic and Source Component*

Owing to the underdevelopment or weak historiography of many topics in Ukraine's history in the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries, Hrushevsky could not simply rely on using monographs, articles, and research by others in writing his *History*. He himself had to read and independently analyze numerous records and narrative and epistolary documents. His positivistic approach,<sup>16</sup> deeply grounded in source study, obliged him to verify the sources cited in the works by various authors that he did use, in an effort to examine and interpret these source materials independently. This is particularly evident in relation to authors whose historical concepts were incompatible with or different from his own.

Hrushevsky himself had already introduced a wide array of source records into scholarly circulation. These were published in the corpus of documents entitled *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Archive of South-Western Russia) in the 1890s,<sup>17</sup> in the course of work on his master's thesis about the Bar starosta district.<sup>18</sup> As Hrushevsky wrote in his autobiography: 'I had to put in a lot of work...the very hard school of archival work that I had to go through for it [his thesis topic]; hundreds of examined record-books, the work in archives in Kyiv, Warsaw, Moscow, did not go to waste and afterwards served me well.'<sup>19</sup> Hrushevsky consulted archival collections in the Kyiv Central Archive, the Main Archive of Ancient Acts, the archive of the Treasury Chamber in Warsaw, the archive of the Ministry of Justice in Moscow (MAMlu), the main archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow, and

5's second half at a meeting of the Historical-Philosophical Section: see TsDIAUL, fond 309, op. 1, spr. 42, ark. 62. However, publishing information gives 1905 as the year of publication.

12. I. Hyrych, 'Shchodennyky M. S. Hrushevs'koho (1904–1910 pp.),' *Kyivs'kaia starovyna* (Kyiv), 1995, no. 1, p. 14.

13. TsDIAUL, fond 301, op. 1, spr. 34, ark. 69.

14. TsDIAUK, fond 1235, op. 1, spr. 25, ark. 104'; notation of 7 February (O.S.) 1906.

15. *Khronika NTSh* (Lviv), 1906 (*Spravozdanie za 1905 r.*), 1, no. 25: 42. The cost of printing volume 5 was just short of 4,000 Austro-Hungarian *Kronen*, that is, 20 percent less than for the preceding volume 4: *ibid.*, 1907 (*Spravozdanie za 1906 r.*), 1, no. 29: 44.

16. The following authors have written in detail about positivism and Hrushevsky's broader methodological methods and approaches: Omelian Pritsak, 'Istoriografiiia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' in Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 1, reprint edition (Kyiv, 1991), pp. lvii–lx; Leonid Zashkil'niak, 'Istoriografichna tvorchist' Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho na tli ievropeis'koï istorychnoi dumky kintsia XIX–pochatku XX st.,' in Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi *ta Ukraïns'ka istorychna nauka: Zb[irnyk] materialiv konferentsii*, ed. Iaroslav Hrytsak and Iaroslav Dashkevych (Lviv, 1999), pp. 31–46; Vitalii Tel'vak, *Teoretyko-metodolohichni pidstavy istorychnykh pohliadiv Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho (kinets' XIX–pochatok XX stolittia)* (New York and Drohobych, 2002).

17. *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Kyiv, 1893), pt. 8, vol. 1, *Akty Barskogo starostva XV–XVIII st.*; *ibid.* (1894), vol. 1, *Akty Barskogo starostva XVII–XVIII st. (prodolzhenie)*.

18. See its reprint edition, with a comprehensive afterword and commentaries by Mykola Krykun: Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi, *Bars'ke starostvo: Istorychni narysy XV–XVIII st.* (Lviv, 1996).

19. Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi [*Avtobiohrafiia*] (Kyiv, 1926), p. 8 (manuscript); *idem*, 'Avtobiohrafiia,' *Arkhivy Ukraïny*, no. 1 (1926): 18–19.

archives in Vilnius.<sup>20</sup> The profound historiographical erudition and knowledge of sources acquired by Hrushevsky in these years stood him in good stead in his later historical labors, particularly in writing volumes 4, 5, and 6 of his *History*.

After arriving in Lviv in 1894, Hrushevsky had launched a wide range of historical publishing activities when he became head of the Archaeographic Commission of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.<sup>21</sup> He proposed a formidable publishing project that included chronicles; historical-literary, ethnographic, and historical-statistical sources; monuments in the history of the church, education, society; and the like.<sup>22</sup> He prioritized the materials to be published; dominant among them were public documents (inventories, inspection reports, registers, audits), records of various kinds, literary monuments, and legal sources. He himself published a corpus of inspection reports from the Ukrainian lands in the second half of the sixteenth century,<sup>23</sup> thereby delineating the ethnic borders of the Ukrainian people.

Nearly every issue of the *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Annals of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, *ZNTSh*) edited by Hrushevsky featured his published documents. Starting with issue 5, with which he took up his duties as editor, a new rubric entitled ‘Miscellanea,’ featuring small selections or historical sources, began to appear. Between 1894 and 1913, Hrushevsky independently published twenty-two selections of documentary materials or separate documents. The majority related to the fourteenth through eighteenth centuries, the transitional and Cossack periods of Ukrainian history. Among his larger serial publications of that time, particularly noteworthy is the article ‘Materiialy do istorii suspil'nykh i ekonomichnykh vidnosyn Zakhidnoi Ukraïny’ (1905), which Hrushevsky cites widely in volume 5.

Hrushevsky consulted archaeographic publications by Ukrainian scholars and historians from other countries that dealt with issues pertaining to Ukrainians, whether directly or indirectly. During his time in Lviv, he reviewed more than fifty such works, published in Kyiv, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Cracow, Berlin, and other centers of scholarship in Europe.<sup>24</sup>

Having acquired excellent training in archaeography and source studies, Hrushevsky set about ably and professionally analyzing the documentary materials he had consulted for volume 5, exposing unreliable data, clarifying the chronology of documents, and tracing the actual course of historical processes. For example, in providing data on the institutional development of monasteries in the Ukrainian lands, he rejected the veracity of the founding charter of 1517 for the Torokan Monastery, the authenticity of which had previously been accepted by several scholars, including Metropolitan Makarii (Bulgakov). Hrushevsky

20. Krykun, ‘Mahisters'ka dysertatsiia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,’ in Hrushevs'kyi, *Bars'ke starostvo*, pp. 585–87.

21. For detailed discussion of Hrushevsky's archaeographic activities, see Boris Krupnitskyj, ‘Die archäographische Tätigkeit M. Hrušewskijs,’ in *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven* (Berlin), nos. 3–4 (1935): 610–21; new edition, Borys Krupnyts'kyi, ‘Arkheohrafichna diial'nist' M. Hrushevs'koho,’ in *Istoriia ukrains'koï arkheohrafii: Personalii* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 84–97. It is difficult to concur with Krupnytsky's view that Hrushevsky's organizational activities were more important than his archaeographic projects. See also Myron Kapral', ‘Arkheohrafichna diial'nist' Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho u l'vivs'kyi period zhyttia (1894–1914),’ in *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi ta L'vivs'ka istorychna shkola: Materialy konferentsii (L'viv, 24–25 zhovtnia 1994 r.)* (New York and Lviv, 1995), pp. 166–73.

22. See *Edytsiina arkheohrafiiia v Ukraïni u XIX–XX st.: Plany, proekty, prohramy vydan'*, comp. Oleh Zhurba, Myron Kapral' et al., vyp. 1 (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 150–54.

23. *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy* (Lviv, 1895), vol. 1, *Opysy korolivshchyn v zemliakh rus'kykh XVI viku: Liustratsii zemel' Halys'koï i Peremys'koï*; *ibid.* (1897), vol. 2, *Opysy korolivshchyn v zemliakh rus'kykh XVI viku: Liustratsii zemel' Peremys'koï i Sianots'koï*; *ibid.* (1900), vol. 3, *Opysy korolivshchyn v zemliakh rus'kykh XVI viku: Liustratsii zemel' Kholms'koï, Belz'koï i L'vivs'koï*; *ibid.* (1903), vol. 7, *Opysy korolivshchyn v zemliakh rus'kykh XVI viku: Liustratsiia 1570 r.*

24. The calculation was made on the basis of the following publications: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka: Bibliohrafichnyi pokazchchyk (1892–2000)*, comp. Vasyli' Maikher (Lviv, 2003). These reviews are republished in Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvory: U 50 t.*, vol. 15, *Seriia ‘Retsenzii ta ohliady’ (1898–1904)* (Lviv, 2012). For a survey of Hrushevsky's activity as a reviewer at the turn of the nineteenth century, see Iaroslav Dashkevych, ‘Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi naprykintsi XIX st.,’ in Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvory: U 50 t.*, vol. 6, *Seriia ‘Istorychni studii ta rozvidky’ (1898–1904)* (Lviv, 2004), pp. i–xiii.

reached this conclusion based on the facts that prior to the Union of Lublin the office of castellan of Volhynia did not exist and that the Pischynsky mentioned in the charter is missing from the registers of castellans. In Hrushevsky's view, the charter was fabricated in the second half of the eighteenth century by local monks in order to extricate themselves from the authority of the neighboring Zhydychyn Monastery (pp. 170–71). In exposing falsifications, the scholar also relied on his comprehensive linguistic training and knowledge. For example, by analyzing its language Hrushevsky became convinced that the complaint against the monk vicars in Vilnius dated to 1511 should be attributed to a later period (p. 311).

Hrushevsky corrected an error made by Ivan Novytsky, who mistakenly assumed that the monastery in the village of Hoshcha was founded by the Kyivan palatine Adam Kysil. Concurrently Hrushevsky cited a document dated 1639 that he uncovered during his work in the Lviv archive which mentions the true founder of this monastery—Princess Raina Solomyretska, wife of the castellan of Smolensk (p. 172). Elsewhere, Hrushevsky corrects the Polish historian Jozef Wolff, who mistakenly extended to Brest county the 1514 charter issued by King Sigismund I of Poland to the counties of Podlachia [Pidliashia] (p. 195).

Hrushevsky was scrupulous in his treatment of the chronology of historical events, on whose accuracy and consistency historical interpretation frequently relied. For example, he demonstrated his remarkable grounding in source study while determining the dates of the letters written by Galician noblemen to the Kyivan metropolitan in 1535–38 in the matter of establishing the Lviv bishopric.<sup>25</sup> To do so, Hrushevsky made a thorough study of the Polish king's itinerary and the future nominee to the post of bishop of Lviv, Makarii Tuchapsky, establishing the years of the Polish chancellor's term in office and the dates marking sessions of the Diet (pp. 285–86). Applying his source-based approach—in this case, studying the itineraries of officials and the recipients as well as writers of documents—Hrushevsky rejected the date commonly accepted in the literature for the union charter issued by King Sigismund III and proposed that it was actually dated 18 March, rather than May, 1591 (p. 374).

### *Historiographic Discussions*

At the dawn of the twentieth century Mykhailo Hrushevsky's thoroughly elaborated conception of the history of Ukraine-Rus' had no analogues in any other generalizing, synthesizing work. In the coverage of the periods of Ukrainian history and the thoroughgoing resolution of many problems pertaining to the historical past, no other work approached the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.<sup>26</sup> Thus, in volume 5 Hrushevsky was engaging not with historians who had a broad conceptualization of the history of Ukraine-Rus' but with scholars concerned with narrower social, historical-ecclesiastical, or historical-

25. For the most recent synthesizing work on the Lviv bishopric during the medieval and early modern periods, see Ihor Skochyliias, *Halyts'ka (L'vivs'ka) ieparkhiia XII–XVIII stolit': Orhanizatsiina struktura ta pravovyi status* (Lviv, 2010).

26. See, e.g., Ivan Linnichenko [Lynnychenko], 'Nauchnoe znachenie zapadnorusskoi istorii,' *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 1 (1889): 187–203; Oleksander Barvyns'kyi, *Iliustrovana istoriia Rusy vid naidavnishykh do nynishnykh chasiv* (Lviv, 1890). For the wider historiographic context in which the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* was created, see Stephen Velychenko, *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian and Ukrainian Writings from the Earliest Times to 1914* (Edmonton, 1992), pp. 141–213; Volodymyr Kravchenko, *Narys z ukrains'koi istoriohrafii epokhy natsional'noho Vidrodzhennia (druha polovyna XVIII–seredyna XIX st.)* (Kharkiv, 1996); Iryna Kolesnyk, *Ukrains'ka istoriohrafiiia XVIII–pochatku XX st.* (Kyiv, 2000); Serhii Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 2005), pp. 153–66 (Ukrainian translation: Serhii Plokhyy, *Velykyi peredil: Nezvychnaia istoriia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*, Kyiv, 2011, pp. 163–76); Viktoriia Tel'vak and Vitalii Tel'vak, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi iak doslidnyk ukrains'koi istoriohrafii* (Kyiv and Drohobych, 2005), pp. 195–272.

economic topics. Examples of such works were Ivan Lunnychenko's study of social strata in Galician Rus' in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Mytrofan Dovnar-Zapolsky's research on economic and social relations in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Władysław Abraham's study of the spread of Roman Catholic institutions in the Ruthenian lands during the medieval period. Consistently expounding on materials relating to the legal system, social relations among various classes, and religious institutions, Hrushevsky engaged in polemics against these scholars' flawed views, corrected erroneous statements, and advanced a pro-Ukrainian standpoint in his historiographic interpretations or source-based analyses. In some instances he contradicted the general historical thrust of other scholars' historical views.

One author who found himself on the receiving end of Hrushevsky's fault-finding in volume 5 was Ivan Lunnychenko, a colleague from his own alma mater of Kyiv University and an adherent of the historical school of Volodymyr Antonovych.<sup>27</sup> Hrushevsky's numerous critical comments, corrections, and clarifications of Lunnychenko's views, scattered through volume 5, are explained by the convergence of many thematic contexts that were analyzed by the two scholars, who had adopted similar methodological and source-based approaches of the Kyiv document school. Academic wrangling about Prince Lev's falsified charters flared up in 1904, that is, at the very time that Hrushevsky was writing volume 5 of his *History*.<sup>28</sup> While both historians rejected the authenticity of the prince's charters, in dispute was the legal assessment of the discrete phenomena of the princely period that were reflected in the falsifications: the patrimonial court, a lord's jurisdiction over a peasant, and the right to own land.<sup>29</sup>

Hrushevsky became embroiled in a discussion with Lunnychenko. He did not agree with Lunnychenko's depiction of the move of Ukrainian boyars in Galicia into the nobiliary stratum through the adoption of Polish coats of arms (p. 32), linkage of the *sotni* category of dependent peasants to the 'hundreds organization' of the princely period (pp. 95–96, 108), or differentiation in how granting Magdeburg law was granted to towns during the princely and Polish periods (p. 159). The pages of volume 5 bristle with Hrushevsky's clarifications of Lunnychenko's statements about the number of Wallachian-law settlements (p. 246), the use of terms such as that for 'castellan' and 'palatine' (p. 200), the existence of villages with Polish law (p. 233), and the like. Hrushevsky frequently reproached Lunnychenko for his professional inaccuracy, for not having mastered the source materials on the peasants' abandonment of their masters, for pointing to non-existent books of Armenians living in Bar (supposedly held at the Kyiv archive), for drawing unnecessary distinctions between villages under Polish and Ruthenian law, and so on. Such fault-finding—even captiousness—with regard to numerous details may have resulted from the two scholars' unpleasant personal

---

27. For insight into the personality of Lunnychenko, whose ideological worldview was pro-Russian ('Little Russian') and who produced polished works on the history of Ukraine, and an account of his relationship with Hrushevsky, see M. Labun'ka, 'Mykola Pavlovych Dashkevych ta Ivan Andriiovych Lunnychenko,' in *125 rokiv kyïvs'koï ukrains'koï akademichnoï tradytsii, 1861–1986*, ed. Marko Antonovych (New York, 1993), pp. 219–64; O. P. Tolochko, 'Dvi ne zovsim akademichni dyskusii: I. A. Lunnychenko, D. I. Bahalii, M. S. Hrushevsk'kyi,' in *Ukrains'kyi arkhoehrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 92–103; O. Muzychko, 'Ivan Lunnychenko ta Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi (do problem komunikatsiinykh zv'iazkiv u seredovysheci kyïvs'koï istorichnoï shkoly),' in *Visnyk NTSh: Informatsiine vydannia*, no. 49 (Lviv, 2013), pp. 71–74.

28. See I. A. Linnichenko, 'Gramoty galitskogo kniazia L'va i znachenie podlozhnykh dokumentov kak istoricheskogo istochnika,' *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Akademii nauk* 9, no. 1 (1904): 80–102; M. S. Grushevskii (Hrushevsk'kyi), 'Eshche o gramotakh kniazia L'va: Po povodu stat'i I. A. Linnichenko,' *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Akademii nauk* 9, no. 4 (1904): 268–83.

29. See also the academic publication of documents of the Galician-Volhynian rulers: O. Kupchynsk'kyi, *Akty ta dokumenty Halys'ko-Volyn's'koho kniazivstva XIII–pershoï polovyny XIV stolit': Doslidzhennia, teksty* (Lviv, 2004).

relationship, which was manifested in both their public, scholarly debates and distinctive ideological and political sparring.<sup>30</sup>

At times Hrushevsky's views coincide conceptually with those advanced in the monographs of other scholars. With respect to volume 5, one such example is the work of the Belarusian scholar Mytrofan Dovnar-Zapolsky [Mitrafan Dounar-Zapolski].<sup>31</sup> In citing his monograph on the organization of the state economy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (*Gosudarstvennoe khoziaistvo Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo pri Iagellonakh*), Hrushevsky often cites and uses its factual information, clarifies positions, and at times engages in discussions and clarifications without a critical or confrontational dimension. However, in the discussion surrounding the assessment of Magdeburg law that flared up between Dovnar-Zapolsky and Vladimirsky-Budanov, Hrushevsky sided with the latter. To Hrushevsky, Dovnar-Zapolsky's defense of German law and his claim that one cannot speak at all about restrictions of municipal rights in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries seemed to 'go too far' (p. 151)

Hrushevsky cites from and analyzes most of the studies he dealt with in the writing of volume 5 in order to demonstrate or clarify his own thesis or conception. He does not recognize any authorities in Ukrainian, Polish, or Russian historiography, and the most distinguished figures do not escape his sharp criticism. Hrushevsky disagreed categorically with Orest Levytsky, his senior colleague from the Antonovych historical school and one of the first members of the future Ukrainian Academy of Sciences,<sup>32</sup> who formulated a concept of the Old Rus' origins of the principle governing the selection of clerics (pp. 301–2). In Hrushevsky's view, another well-known Ukrainian historian with a Moscovophile orientation, Antonii Petrushevych, dealt with Wallachian law 'completely devoid of all scholarly standards' (p. 243). To Michał Bobrzyński, the recognized authority on Polish historiography, Hrushevsky explained the legal aspects—incomprehensible to the Polish scholar—of the decision concerning the one-day corvée passed by the Toruń Diet of 1519 (p. 117–18). Hrushevsky argued with Antoni Prochaska about feudal law in Galicia in the post-princely era, which supposedly was of Western derivation (p. 52), as well as about the hypothetical negotiations of bishops concerning a church union prior to Patriarch Jeremiah's arrival in the Ukrainian lands in 1589 (pp. 368–69). The scholar bluntly reproaches the Polish church historian Edward Likowski of tendentiously repeating three-century-old accusations of deceit and treachery that contemporaries aimed at Nikephoros, the protosyncellus of the patriarch of Constantinople, during the drafting of the Union of Brest in 1596 (p. 243).

Hrushevsky made solid use of Russian-language literature on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, including the works of Russian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian historians: Matvei Liubavsky, Fedir Leontovych, Mykhailo Iasynsky, Mikhail Vladimirsky-Budanov, and others. With his own firm grasp of these historians' source materials, Hrushevsky allowed himself critical comments on the amplitude of their exposition, adequacy of argument, accuracy of chronology, and quality of hypothetical constructs. He acknowledged the high level of scholarly research done by historians of the Russian Empire, and he reproached certain Polish historians for their unfamiliarity with Russian historical literature and

---

30. For example, during the revolutionary events of 1917 Lynnychenko wrote an open letter to Hrushevsky that was driven by ideological motives: see I. A. Linnichenko, *Malorusskii vopros i avtonomiia Malorossii: Otkrytoe pis'mo M. A. [sic] Grushevskomu* (Odesa, 1917).

31. About this scholar, see the following studies: S. I. Mikhal'chenko (Mykhal'chenko), *Kievskaiia shkola v rossiiskoi istoriografii: V. B. Antonovich, M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii i ikh ucheniki* (Moscow, 1997); L. M. Buslenko, *Dovnar-Zapol's'kyi iak istoryk Ukraïny* (Kyiv, 2007).

32. Upon Levytsky's death in 1922, Hrushevsky wrote a laudatory obituary: see M. Hrushevsk'kyi, 'Orest Levyts'kyi,' in *Ukraïna: Naukovyi tr'okhmisiachnyk Ukraïnoznavstva*, bks. 1–2 (Kyiv, 1924), pp. 199–202.

published sources, which led to erroneous conclusions—among them, the Polish church historian Jan Fijałek (p. 253).

In his debates with fellow historians, Hrushevsky, as a researcher dedicated to truth and accuracy, recognized errors and inaccuracies in his earlier works when he later discovered them. For example, in a discussion with Prochaska about the term *szluskie prawo*, he acknowledged his error in having mistakenly taken it to mean ‘Silesian’ rather than ‘service’ (p. 53). In writing about peasant landownership as discussed in his previous work on the Bar starosta district, Hrushevsky clarified his position about this in volume 5 of the *History*, expressing full agreement with Lynnychenko’s interpretation that even though the government and juridical practice recognized peasant landownership, Polish law did not (p. 101).

*The Legal and Social Dimension of the Transitional Period in the History of the Ukrainian Lands (Mid-Fourteenth to Early Seventeenth Centuries)*

Hrushevsky begins the exposition of his material in volume 5 of the *History* with a general survey of the evolution of social, legal, and religious relations. The transitional stage of Ukrainian history is comprised mainly of the radical changes that took place under the influence of Polish law, culture, and social models. These changes came soonest to the western Ukrainian lands that were in closest geographic proximity to Polish ones. First and foremost, Hrushevsky writes about the westernmost territory of Galician Rus', a reduced version of which, in the shape of the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia, became part of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1772. Beginning in the mid-fourteenth century, the former lands of the Galician-Volynian state gradually came under Polish control. The eastern lands of the principality, that is, western Podilia, which became part of the Polish state as a result of the struggle against Lithuania in the late fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries, were also highly polonized.<sup>33</sup>

Podlachia, too, ended on a similar level of cultural and civilizational proximity. Even though this region had become part of the Lithuanian state, it soon experienced large-scale Polish colonization and came under Polish law in the fifteenth century. However, the other lands—Volhynia and the Brest, Pynsk, Kyiv, and Bratslav regions—were able to close themselves off from strong Polish colonization until the Union of Lublin. Hrushevsky was convinced that even after 1569, Polish influences in the Kyiv and Bratslav regions were limited to exceptional conditions of colonization ‘as in Ukraine’ (p. 1), thanks to which the Polish colonizing factor grew fundamentally weaker. The historic Siverianian and Pereiaslav regions were least exposed to Polish sociocultural influences, and during the Khmelnytsky period these were completely nullified. As revealed by current research on colonizing processes in the newly created Chernihiv palatinate (1618–38), the measures regarding settlement and economic development adopted by the Polish government, local officials, and noblemen had a long-lasting and beneficial impact on this territory’s development in the early modern period.<sup>34</sup>

In view of the influence of Western social and legal standards as represented by the Polish and Lithuanian machinery of state, all the Ukrainian lands may be divided into three groups: (1) territories where Polish influences supplanted those of Old Rus'; (2) lands belonging to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with modification of Rus' law; and (3) poorly colonized territories weakly influenced by both Polish and Lithuanian law.

33. For current research on western Podilia during this era, see J. Kurtyka, *Podole w czasach jagiellońskich 1394–1572: Studia i materiały* (Cracow, 2011); V. Mykhailovs'kyi, *Elastychna spil'nota: Podil's'ka shliakhta v druhtii polovyni XIV–70-kh rokakh XVI stolittia* (Kyiv, 2012).

34. P. Kulakovs'kyi, *Chernihovo-Siversshchyna u skladi Rechi Pospolytoi: 1618–1648* (Kyiv, 2006), pp. 246–390.

A survey of legal, social, and religious relations in other lands populated mostly by Ukrainians in Hrushevsky's time—that is, Transcarpathia, Bukovyna, the northern Black Sea region, and elsewhere—was not included in the scholar's narrative. At times, in order to present a more accurate picture of the specifically Ukrainian character of social or legal processes, he referred to source materials on territories that belonged to other nationalities, above all Belarusian and Lithuanian. Already in Hrushevsky's time critics had noted the shortcomings of such a selective territorial approach, for example, in a review written by the Polish historian Ludwik Kolankowski.<sup>35</sup> Today, historical narratives try to include the lands within the present-day borders of Ukraine as fully as possible.<sup>36</sup>

Hrushevsky's analysis of legal relations starts with the legislative norms of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, in some Ukrainian lands it was Polish legal elements that appeared soonest; also, documents attesting to them have been preserved in much fuller form, at least for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. These documents are primarily books of land and magistrates' courts and records issued by municipal governments and courts, which, with respect to the lands of the Kingdom of Poland, were preserved in full from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.<sup>37</sup> But the law of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was typologically closer to Old Rus' law, and it served as a transitional stage on the way to the Polish legal system. The Lithuanian state-legal system was at a lower stage of development than that of the Old Rus' state, and, in Hrushevsky's view, after the Lithuanian conquest of the Ukrainian lands its system fell under the influences of Rus' law owing to the latter's cultural superiority. Therefore, 'the state law, and legal relations in general, of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania developed on the basis of Old Rus' law and practices' (p. 2). Hrushevsky, who intended to reveal the vestiges of original Lithuanian legal norms, nonetheless also proposed that historians refer to the most ancient court records preserved in the ethnic Lithuanian lands (the province of Samogitia).

Owing to the insufficiency or outright lack of any source materials, it was very difficult for Hrushevsky to trace, let alone create, a detailed picture of the main features in the evolutionary transition of Old Rus' legal relations in the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth centuries and compare them with the established features of the Lithuanian legal system of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The legal mechanism of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was characterized by conservatism, and its motto became the well-known formula: 'we do not touch the old order, nor do we introduce anything new.' For that reason, it was logically assumed that new legal forms could emerge arbitrarily, brought about by life itself, 'independently of any government reforms' (p. 13). But even the absence of reforms determined important changes in social relations. For example, the urgent demand for military service in the needs of the state in its frequent conflicts with neighboring states (the Principality of Moscow, the Teutonic Order, the Crimean Khanate) determined the limitation of the right of landownership and, in fact, based it on the ruling class's military obligations. The restrictions introduced by the Lithuanian government on the disposal of property led to a practice similar to classical Western feudalism, with conditional (*prekarnyi*) ownership (p.

---

35. For detailed discussion of reviews of the 'Lithuanian-Polish' volumes of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* by Kolankowski and other Polish historians, see Kapral, "'Transitional Period,'" pp. liv–lv.

36. For example, N. Iakovenko, *Narys istorii seredn'ovichnoi ta rann'omodernoï Ukraïny*, 2d rev. ed. (Kyiv, 2005); Paul R. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and Its Peoples*, 2d rev. ed. (Toronto and Buffalo, 2010) (Ukrainian translation: P.-R. Magochii, *Ukraïna: Istoriia iï zemel' ta narodiv*, Uzhhorod, 2012). Magocsi titled one part of his book 'The Lithuanian-Polish-Crimean Period,' thereby introducing the history of the Crimean Khanate and Crimean Tatars into the overall Ukrainian and regional contexts.

37. For a detailed study of archival sources of Ukrainian history preserved on the territory of the former Soviet Union, see Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, *Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Ukraine and Moldavia* (Princeton, N.J., 1988).



4). But, in fact, similar sociopolitical circumstances emerged in various parts of the European continent in different periods. For example, in the late Middle Ages a well-studied system of patrimonies was created in the Grand Principality of Moscow, where lands were transferred to conditional ownership requiring that state and military service be carried out.<sup>38</sup>

Another distinctive feature of the lands belonging to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was de facto decentralization, which promoted and manifested the conservatism underlying legal relations. It was indeed difficult for the Lithuanian government to control its far-flung Ukrainian territories, which were leading their own autonomous lives. Scholars today, confirming this view of Hrushevsky's, have shown that in the fourteenth century the Koriiatovych princes in Podilia were able to mint their own coins and pursue a rather independent political line, maneuvering among Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, and the Golden Horde.<sup>39</sup> The ouster of the Koriiatovyches and other Lithuanian-Ruthenian princes, which took place during the reigns of Vytautas and Casimir IV, resolved this problem only in administrative terms and provoked the Ukrainian population into mounting an uprising spearheaded by the princes Švitrigaila and Mykhailo Hlynsky. Analyzing land privileges, Hrushevsky formulated a thesis about the absence of guarantees for land autonomy, for example, in Volhynia. At the same time, the largest number of legal immunities was obtained by the nobility in Podlachia, which benefited from its proximity to Poland and its legal models. But in real political life there was, in fact, no need for such guarantees. The Lithuanian elite could not and did not want to resort to force in order to impose its social and legal system on the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands.

A genuine manifestation of the autonomist features of the Ukrainian lands in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the appointment of representatives of local noble families to various positions. These features were expressed most fully in densely populated Volhynia, where there was a solid stratum of magnates within the privileged population. Diets of the nobility allowed the local elite to create legislative traditions and customs in various matters relating to administration and economic and social life. At these Diets secular representatives of the local elite were appointed not only to secular positions but also to ecclesiastical offices. Over time, phrases along the lines of 'the rights of the Volhynian land' (p. 10) began to appear in documents, which might de facto attest to the acquisition of legislatively regulated rights. But, according to Hrushevsky, prior to the Union of Lublin a 'true federation' did not exist in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; there were only forms that approximated a federated system, because, in contrast to the Polish lands, the nobility did not represent its territory in the central bodies of power.

Russian historians who were contemporaries of Hrushevsky, Matvei Liubavsky among them, threw a chronological bridge from the Old Rus' popular assembly to the boyar diets of the Lithuanian period. But the author of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* did not accept such a scheme of evolution for two public institutions dating to different periods of history. In general, the question of the continuity and discontinuity of sociopolitical relations and institutions was constantly present in Hrushevsky's exposition of his material.

Hrushevsky viewed the homogeneity and unity of the social system in the Old Rus' state as its basic feature, and also as one that began to change in subsequent epochs. At times, such clear-cut and frequent parallels in the text, to the detriment of subsequent social changes in the Lithuanian-Polish period, give rise to the notion that he viewed the princely era as a

---

38. See Janet Martin, 'Widows, Welfare, and the *Pomest'e* System in the Sixteenth Century,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (1995): 375–88; Nancy Shields Kollman, *By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1999), pp. 11–12, 184, and passim; Lee A. Farrow, *Between Clan and Crown: The Struggle to Define Noble Property Rights in Imperial Russia* (Newark [Del.], 2004), pp. 45–49.

39. On the princes Koriiatovych of Podilia, see Mykhailovs'kyi, *Elastychna spil'nota*, pp. 28–63.

distinctive 'golden' period in the history of Ukraine. However, there arises another likely explanation. Without disavowing the populist convictions in his worldview, Hrushevsky subconsciously expressed a pro-statehood approach, as he positively emphasized Ukrainian statehood during the princely era and 'othered' the Polish and Lithuanian states of the transitional period.<sup>40</sup>

This dichotomy was especially striking in Hrushevsky's negative assessment of the introduction of Magdeburg law in Ukrainian towns. In his view, Western municipal law, which had developed in western Europe under different social circumstances, ruined the established patterns of the Old Rus' municipal system and severed the link between the land and the city around which life was centered (p. 11).<sup>41</sup> These changes in social organization, which took place not via the path of reformation but the long conservative route of accommodation, led to the atomization and destruction of the integrity of the social system and other aspects of society. The expansion of the nobility's jurisdiction over the peasantry stripped peasants of all sociopolitical rights. Besides the peasants, townsfolk, too, forfeited influence on the development of their own community, as 'counties and lands were transformed into the corporations of lords-nobles' (p. 12).

According to Hrushevsky, this kind of social differentiation brought about the strengthening of centralizing tendencies as the principalities' autonomy disappeared at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Lithuanian Statute of 1529 greatly weakened local law in the sixteenth century, and the *voloka* reform of 1557 undertook to unify economic relations. Paradoxically, for a lengthy period of time such centralizing measures existed along with the conservative, autonomist system of municipal social life.

Different circumstances arose in the Ukrainian lands that came under Poland's control in the mid-fourteenth century. First of all, the Ukrainian population here was confronted with strongly developed traditions of law and culture that were in no way inferior to those of Old Rus'. Second, the Polish elite regarded the new lands as subjugated territories captured by the 'right of the sword.'<sup>42</sup> For that reason, ancient social customs were broken soonest of all in these Ukrainian lands. Although Hrushevsky wrote that 'Life itself caused breaches in Rus' law' (p. 13), he did not dismiss the active measures taken by the Polish government, which had to retain the newly annexed Ukrainian lands within its orbit. Those steps protected the German and generally Polish colonization of towns and village. In Galicia, it was Poles above all who were appointed to municipal positions, while minor unimportant positions were left for local Ukrainians. At the same time, appointed Polish officials switched mechanically to the Polish law with which they were familiar, although it was not introduced officially until 1434. This led to a confusing jumble of Old Rus' and new Polish offices. The transition toward the introduction of Polish law was marked by restrictions for the privileged

40. Plokyh, *Rewriting Ukrainian History*, p. 482 (Plokhii, *Velykyi peredil*, p. 493). State-seeking ideology in Hrushevsky's historical worldview is discussed in Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi—istoryk narodnyts'koho chy derzhavnyts'koho napriamu?' in *Ukraïna: Nauka i kul'tura*, vyp. 30 (Kyiv, 1999), pp. 136–52; I. Hyrych, "'Narodnyts'vo" ta "derzhavnyts'vo" v ukrains'kii istoriohrafii: Problema zmistovnoho napovnennia poniat', *Moloda natsiia*, no. 4 (2000): 5–30; idem, 'Do problem narodnyts'tva ta derzhavnyts'tva u zv'iazku z postattiu M. Hrushevs'koho,' in *Derzhavy, suspil'stva, kul'tury: Shhid i Zakhid. Zbirnyk na poshanu Iaroslava Pelens'koho* (New York, 2004), pp. 387–98.

41. For more details, see A. Zaiats', 'Pohliad Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho na rozvytok mist Ukraïny XVI–XVII st.,' in *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' i materialiv Mizhnarodnoi iuvileinoi konferentsii, prysviachenoi 125-i richnytsi vid dnia narodzhennia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho* (Lviv, 1994), pp. 155–61.

42. For the wider social context, see J. Orzechowski, 'Okcydentalizacja Rusi Koronnej w XIV, XV i XVI w.,' in *Państwo, naród, stany w świadomości wieków średnich*, ed. A. Gieysztor (Warsaw, 1990), pp. 215–42. The reform of the Galician lands based on sociocultural models adopted from the West is discussed in detail in A. Janeczek, *Osadnictwo pogranicza polsko-ruskiego: Województwo belskie od schyłku XIV do początku XVII w.*, 2 vols. (Wrocław, 1991); idem, 'Miasta Rusi Czerwonej w nurcie modernizacji: Kontext reform XIV–XVI w.,' *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, no. 1 (1995): 55–66.

class of Ukrainian society that were unknown to the nobility in the Polish lands. These restrictions were characterized above all by greater military obligations and higher taxes than in the Kingdom of Poland. As Hrushevsky notes, the Ukrainian nobility, which ‘was still very numerous and powerful’ in Galicia at the time, did not act as a strong political force and did not rise to the defense of Rus’ law. Foremost among its goals, instead, were class interests, avoidance of economic losses, and the acquisition of rights equal to those of the Polish nobility.

That stance by the leading strata of Ukrainian society led to the polonization of the system of Ruthenian lands and, generally, to the gradual polonization of the entire territory. In Podilia these processes took place at a more rapid pace because there local tradition was weaker than in Galicia. District autonomy in the form of representation at the Diet of the three newly created palatinates of Rus’, Belz, and Podilia and the introduction of nobiliary self-rule came too late to preserve Ruthenian customs, which had already shrunk and been marginalized in the preceding period. In the end, as Hrushevsky says toward the end of volume 5’s opening chapter, ‘The Ruthenian people remained, but only as an ethnic mass, not a nation’ (p. 16).

*The Western Transformation of the Social and Class System of Ukrainian Society*

During the transitional period of the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries, cardinal changes took place in the social structure of Ukrainian society, compared to the princely era. Hrushevsky held that in the Old Rus’ state, free citizens comprising three basic categories predominated—boyars, townsfolk, and peasants. The ruling princely elite, which consisted of both the Riurykovyches and the Gediminids, underwent fundamental change. After the abolition of autonomy in the principalities and the ousting of princes during Vytautas’s reign, there took place a gradual social degradation of the princely stratum and its amalgamation into a single group together with the wealthiest representatives of servitor boyars and boyars of the land. This group formed an aristocracy, establishing between itself and ordinary nobles a distinctive social barrier that was impossible to overcome. The individual family banners with their own military formations that the aristocrats of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania displayed during military censuses can be considered a visible manifestation of this social boundary.<sup>43</sup> Among the privileges enjoyed by the aristocracy Hrushevsky lists participation in the Council of Lords of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania regardless of holding a specific position and exemption from provincial jurisdiction (pp. 24–25); the latter prerogative disappeared only in 1564. In the Polish lands the political elite and the magnates did not obtain the kind of court immunity that existed in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Magnates in the Ruthenian lands of the Crown did not comprise a compact group, and they did not have separate privileges.<sup>44</sup> Thus, already in the late fourteenth century opposition against the awarding of special grants to princes arose in the Crown’s Ukrainian lands, especially following the abuses that occurred when King Jogaila (Władysław II Jagiełło) issued a privilege and land grant of the western part of Podilia to the Polish magnate Spytek of Melsztyn in 1395.

The fundamental difference between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland, provisionally joined into a single state at Krėva in 1385 on the basis of a personal

43. In his analysis Hrushevsky relied on the military registry (*popys*) of 1528, which was still not published by the early twentieth century. See *Perapis voiska Vialikaha kniastva Litouskaha 1528 hoda: Metryka Vialikaha kniastva Litouskaha*, bk. 523, *Knjyha] Publichnykh sprau*, ed. A. I. Hrusha, M. F. Spiridorov, and M. A. Vaitovich (Minsk, 2003).

44. See M. Wilamowski, ‘Magnate Territories in Red Ruthenia in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: Origin, Development and Social Impact,’ in *On the Frontier of Latin Europe: Integration and Segregation in Red Ruthenia, 1350–1600*, ed. T. Wunsch and A. Janeczek (Warsaw, 2004), pp. 81–118.

union, was revealed precisely in the oligarchic-magnate component of the social structure. After the Union of Lublin (1569), an aristocratic-oligarchic character gradually spread in the political order of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, ultimately leading to the strengthening of anarchic elements throughout society, continuing decline, and the destruction of statehood by the end of the eighteenth century.

The privileged stratum in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Ukrainian lands of the Kingdom of Poland was organized around military service requirements. In fact, the principle of military service from the land was established immediately after the Grand Duchy's acquisition of the Ukrainian lands. The sociopolitical system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had a service character, 'from ruling princes to peasants' (p. 28). Through providing military service, or even some elements of it, peasants had the opportunity to enter the nobiliary, privileged class—for example, by serving as *putni* boyars, who performed various administrative duties, or as castle servitors. The government transformed taxes and service requirements into the obligation to dispatch one or more mounted soldiers, based on the income generated by their estates.

Hrushevsky traces the evolution of nobiliary immunity and prerogatives in both spheres of the Ukrainian lands in privileges dating to the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth centuries, paying special attention to social and national components. As early as 1447, the nobility obtained the right to leave the country, except to hostile states. That same year saw the introduction of patrimonial jurisdiction by the hereditary landlord over the peasant; also, managers of large princely estates were forbidden to accept and settle noblemen's subjects. In keeping with fifteenth-century land privileges, palatines or starostas could not try a nobleman without the participation of a prince, lord, and boyars of the land. The conditions of land grants were the pivotal question around which the struggle against officials in the nobiliary stratum was mostly waged. For an extended period, the nobiliary landownership awarded by government grants had mostly a conditional (*prekarnyi*) character. Land was awarded for service, and the transfer of property took place under the government's supervision. In the Ukrainian lands of the Crown this situation endured until 1434, whereas in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania the conditional granting of landownership in theory lasted to 1569, although Hrushevsky, through the example of the Bar nobility, identified vestiges of such conditional landownership even in the eighteenth century.

Hrushevsky carefully traces the processes of discrimination and equalization of the Ruthenian ('Orthodox') nobility with the Catholic one, beginning with the Horodlo privilege of 1413. In the Ukrainian lands of the Crown, no formal restrictions were recorded in legal documents, inasmuch as the Ukrainian element immediately ended up on the margins of sociopolitical life. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the struggle for equal rights lasted a long time, given the large number and influence of the Ruthenian nobility, which managed to obtain a crucial document only in 1563, on the very eve of the Union of Lublin. But even after 1569, in the Bar district about which Hrushevsky was so well versed, a significant portion of Ukrainian noblemen still had unequal status because they did not possess documents of landownership, yet all the while continued to fulfill their military service obligations.

The path to full-fledged nobility most often led to various methods of social and legal struggle. Success was achieved through collective efforts that sometimes lasted for many years, when judicial decisions in favor of royal officials forced people to act rather than remain in limbo. Hrushevsky cites examples of the struggle for nobility by military servitors of the Dobriansky, Nehrebetsky, and Vitoshynsky families in the Galician lands, in the Bar

and Ovruch districts and elsewhere.<sup>45</sup> In order to obtain the desired noble status, they occasionally resorted to falsifying charters issued by princes, most often ones attributed to Lev Danylovykh (p. 60).

In Hrushevsky's view, the increase in high social status and in the social privileges enjoyed by the nobility took place at the expense of the Ukrainian peasantry. As he puts it: 'as the privileges of the noble class expanded, the civic rights of the peasantry contracted. In this bilateral process lies the center of gravity of the entire social evolution of that period, the root of the entire restructuring of social as well as national and cultural relations' (p. 69). Our own contemporary, the historian Serhii Plokhyy, has noted that Hrushevsky, as a national historian who demonstrated the discreteness of the Ukrainian historical process, should not, in theory, have paid so much attention to economic or social contexts.<sup>46</sup> But in delving into the social contexts of the late medieval and early modern periods, Hrushevsky simultaneously singled out and brought to light against that background the cultural, religious, and national aspects that at times were inextricably interwoven with social ones. Thus, in writing about the legal status of the peasantry and how it worsened from century to century, he implicitly saw the total deterioration of the historical fate of the Ukrainian people. Here, in particular, one can detect the influence of populist views on Hrushevsky's historical conception.

As a result of the repressions that took place in the 1930s, Hrushevsky was branded a 'Ukrainian nationalist' in Soviet historiography, and various myths were circulated to the effect that he recognized the classless nature of the Ukrainian nation and the absence of a Ukrainian noble class ('the theory of a single national current').<sup>47</sup> But such tendentious notions were shattered upon familiarization with any of Hrushevsky's scholarly works, even those of a semi-popular nature. In the late 1980s Soviet historians finally repudiated these wholly ungrounded accusations, which were based wholly on a political dimension.<sup>48</sup>

The scholar begins his analysis of the peasant class from the most dependent categories of the peasantry: domestic slaves (*cheliad'*), slaves (*khology*), and other unfree peasants (*nevil'ni seliany*). According to Hrushevsky's observations, in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries there were no longer as many of these people as one might expect, even in the most conservative corners of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The social process evolved in such a way that the condition of unfree peasants improved as the condition of free peasants worsened. This transformation had features in common with those in western Europe and the Muscovite lands (p. 70). Hrushevsky raised a question regarding the genetic links of the unfree peasantry from the Old Rus' period onward because researchers had focused more on the classification of various categories of peasants than on their genetic connection.<sup>49</sup>

Hrushevsky frequently casts aside the social practices of the Old Rus' period, always keeping a keen scholarly eye on the element of continuity as the premise of his methodological stance. This does not lead to the construction of uncertain or implausible historical-genetic connections, however. For example, in his analysis of a category of

45. For a genealogical and onomastic study of the petty gentry in the western Ukrainian lands, see I. Smutok, *Vstup do henealohii shliakhty Sambirs'koho povitu XVI–pochatku XVII st.: Shliakhts'ki prizvys'ka* (Lviv, 2008).

46. Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial History*, p. 188 (Plokhyy, *Velykyi peredil*, p. 195).

47. For more detailed discussion, see Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial History*, pp. 270–72 (Plokhyy, *Velykyi peredil*, pp. 272–74).

48. O. Hurzhii, 'M. S. Hrushevs'kyi pro sotsial'nu strukturu seredn'ovichnoï Ukraïny,' in *Istoriia Ukraïny v istoriohrafii ta arkheohrafii*, ed. I. M. Khvorostianyi et al. (Kyiv, 1989), pp. 3–19.

49. The problem set forth by Hrushevsky remains unanalyzed in a fairly recent synthesizing history of the Ukrainian peasantry: A. Hurbyk, 'Ekonomichni ta pravovi aspekty selians'koho zhyttia,' in *Istoriia ukrains'koho selianstva*, 2 vols. (Kyiv, 2006), 1: 85–102.

peasant that in a unique document is called ‘people [obligated] for money’ (*liudy v’ peniazikh*) (p. 76), Hrushevsky candidly notes the difficulty of establishing it fully, owing to the lack of corroborating information.<sup>50</sup>

Of the three categories of peasants—tributary, working or impostable, and service—the first group most preserved the features of the free peasants of Old Rus'. They continued to exist in places where a manorial economy did not develop. The variety of taxes imposed on the Ukrainian peasantry also revealed ancient archaic forms. Hrushevsky writes about the division of the Old Rus' tax (*dan'*) into the tribute (*sokha, pososhchyna*) and hearth (*podymne*) taxes of the Lithuanian-Polish transitional period. Another tax of the princely era, called *poliuddia*—the maintenance tribute, that is, the obligation to provide board for the prince and his retinue—developed into an ox tax, the *povolovshchyna* in Volhynia and the *bolkunovshchyna* in the Kyiv region (p. 85).

In their higher categories, service peasants, among whom rural craftsmen should be included, were closer in status to boyars, especially those who were obliged to perform military service (*pantsyrni* and *putni* servitors). Strangely enough, this stratum was connected genetically to the lowest stratum of unfree domestics (*nevil'na cheliad'*).

The overall evolution of the legal status of the peasantry in the transitional period passed through three consecutive stages: (1) the removal of a peasant from the state's jurisdiction and his subordination to a lord's jurisdiction; (2) the denial or restriction of a peasant's right to land; and (3) the restriction of personal freedom and enslavement. For the sake of comparison, Hrushevsky establishes a point of departure: during the princely era, the law gave a lord exclusive and complete power over slaves (*khology*) and other unfree domestics (*nevil'na cheliad'*), but indentured laborers (*zakupy*) and landless peasants were subject only to disciplinary authority. In this context Hrushevsky observes a different attitude toward the right to land in Old Rus' and ancient Poland. In Poland, a peasant was only a user of land, whereas in Kyivan Rus' there was a separate group of peasant owners existed (for example, independent peasants known as *smerdy*) (p. 98). It is interesting to note that in his discussion with Lynnychenko about falsifications of Lev Danylovych's charters, Hrushevsky refuted that the privileged strata of the population (boyars) in the Galician lands enjoyed the right to own land, but in this context he acknowledged it with respect to the upper stratum of peasant-proprietors (*smerdy*).<sup>51</sup> Here, too, populist elements in the scholar's world perception are undeniably present.

According to Hrushevsky, in Poland the ancient principle of peasant landownership came into immediate conflict with the nobleman's absolute right to own land. Later, however, the historian goes on to cite numerous instances that the government documented not only the peasants' holding and use of land but their ownership of it as well. He also cautions that such peasant rights were recognized to some degree by juridical practice and local officials, but Polish law contained unambiguous nobiliary immunity for land.<sup>52</sup>

50. For a separate article about this document, see M. Hrushevs'kyi, “‘Liudy v penezekh’”: Dokument Zhygymonta z r. 1524,’ *ZNTSh* 65 (1905): misc., 1–4.

51. M. Grushevskii (Hrushevs'kyi), ‘Eshche raz o gramotakh kn. L'va Galitskogo: Po povodu st[at]a prof. Linnichenka,’ in *Izvestiia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, vol. 9, bk. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1904), pp. 268–83. For detailed discussion of the essential questions raised in the scholars' discussions, see a new version of Hrushevsky's article with commentaries by Oleh Kupchynsky: M. Hrushevs'kyi, ‘Shehe pro hramoty kn. L'va halys'koho: Z pryvodu statyi prof. Lynnychenka,’ in *idem Tvory: U 50 t.*, vol. 7, *Seriia ‘Istorychni studii ta rozvidky’ (1900–1906)* (Lviv, 2005), pp. 461–71, 646–53 (commentary).

52. In writing about peasant landownership, Hrushevsky refines the position that he had expressed earlier in his monograph on the Bar starosta district, which could be interpreted as recognition of peasant rights that bordered on the right of ownership through the right of ‘eternal and hereditary landlord ownership, or, to put it better, utilization’ (Hrushevs'kyi, *Bars'ke starostvo*, pp. 250–51). In the *History*, Hrushevsky expresses a view similar to Lynnychenko's, indicating the categorical nature of Polish law with regard to peasant landownership (p. 98).

Hrushevsky's objective and impartial exposition of his material is at times interspersed by journalistic expressions when the discussion turns to the subject of the Ukrainian peasantry's enservment. The decline of the peasants' legal status was followed by an increase in payments and taxes, which undermined their prosperity and 'turned them into working cattle—the lord's inventory' (p. 113). The *corvée* was the most plastic component of peasant obligations, and it increased constantly. Through his study of documents Hrushevsky traces the dynamic of the rents and taxes imposed on peasants, correlating them with the growth of the *corvée* system. He notes the worsening of the peasants' condition already in the fifteenth century, and he rejects the claim of the Polish historian Władysław Łoziński, who linked this process to an increase in the number of complaints lodged by peasants and submitted to royal courts of assessors in the late sixteenth century and to repressions targeting peasants in the neighboring Austrian Empire (pp. 127–28).

Concluding the chapter on the peasantry, Hrushevsky cites a document concerning the inhabitants of 'Old' and 'New' Slobodyshche, located in the Zhytomyr region, where efforts were made to measure the land into *voloky* and thereby to treat these people as peasants (pp. 139–40). In his next chapter, Hrushevsky proceeds to a description of Ukrainian burghers during the transitional period. From the standpoint of the national issue, the negative significance of the urban stratum was similar to the nobility's loss of all importance in economic and political life and, ultimately, its physical displacement from towns by foreign ethnic groups. Hrushevsky also writes negatively about Ukrainian burghers' lack of significant influence in cultural life. However, the example of the church brotherhoods that launched their national-cultural activity precisely in towns in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries allows the historian to introduce a corrective into his rigoristic position.<sup>53</sup>

The categorical nature of Hrushevsky's statements underscores his historical and legal analysis of the norms of German law that were introduced in Ukrainian towns. He places special emphasis on the artificiality of town law, which arrived from western Europe and did not develop locally. Once again, the 'golden era' when 'urban life in Old Rus' was highly developed' (p. 114), serves as a distant and positive model. The town law brought from the West practically did not develop in the local realities of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland; by its immunities it severed the natural linkages of the territory, erecting barriers in the form of autonomous judicial procedures and administration. In Germany and other western European countries, towns could acquire absolute immunity, at least in economic matters, and they could take part in the political life of their countries through participation in parliamentary life and the formulation of legislation. In east central Europe, including Hungary, the Czech land, and the Polish and Lithuanian states,<sup>54</sup> not only political but also economic matters came under the complete control of the ruling nobiliary stratum.

53. See, e.g.: Iaroslav Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton and Toronto, 2006); idem, 'Between Eastern Tradition and Influences from the West: Confraternities in Early Modern Ukraine and Byelorussia,' *Ricerche slavistiche* 37 (1990): 269–94; Myron Kapral', *Natsional'ni hromady L'vova XVI–XVIII st.: Sotsial'no-pravovi vziaimyny* (Lviv, 2003); idem, 'Les Orthodoxes et les Catholiques de L'vov (fin du XVI<sup>e</sup>—première moitié du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle),' *XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, no. 3 (July–September 2003): 449–66; idem, 'Legal Regulation and National (Ethnic) Differentiation in Lviv 1350–1600,' in *On the Frontier of Latin Europe*, pp. 211–28; etc. One should also mention the subconscious impact on Hrushevsky of the russified and polonized Ukrainian city of the turn of the nineteenth to twentieth century, whose residents mostly ignored the Ukrainian national interest that the historian saw embodied in the Ukrainian peasantry.

54. For the notion of east central Europe that became the most popular concept in the mental cartography of our region among historians, see E. Szűcs, *The Three Historical Regions of Europe* (Budapest, 1983); George H. Hodos, *The East-Central European Region: An Historical Outline* (Westport, Conn., 1999); *East-Central Europe in European History: Themes & Debates*, ed. Jerzy Kłoczowski and Hubert Łaszkiwicz (Lublin, 2009). For discussion on a Ukrainian foundation, see a synthesis presented in the form of a university textbook: *Istoria Tsentral'no-Skhidnoi Ievropy*, ed. L. Zashkil'niak (Lviv, 2001). Regarding a work by a Czech author that ignores the Ukrainian and

Hrushevsky sees the causes behind the decline of the burgher class during the transitional period precisely in the inappropriate legal instruments used by foreign governments in the Ukrainian lands. There was an important religious component to German Magdeburg law, which immediately led to restricting access by Ukrainian Orthodox burghers to municipal government. Such warnings are already in evidence in Grand Duke Vytautas's municipal grants for towns in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.<sup>55</sup> In Lviv in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, Ukrainians encountered not only lack of access to municipal offices and trades, together with restrictions on residing in town centers, but also non-recognition of the authoritativeness under town law of oaths sworn in their church. But Hrushevsky exaggerates when he writes that the Ruthenians in Lviv 'were cast in the role of a barely tolerated nation in the municipality, like the Jews in medieval German cities' (p. 155).

Hrushevsky does not dwell in detail on the forms of town law in the Ukrainian lands. Most highly developed were those in Lviv, where town leaders purchased the office of reeve from Prince Władysław of Opole and incorporated it in the prerogatives of the municipal community. In reality, however, such expansion of municipal self-rule led to the oligarchical character of the town administration. On the other hand, owing to the borderland character of the Ukrainian lands, there was no civic authority here whatsoever (p. 221). In towns authority could be usurped by royal starostas through their servitors and vicegerents. Not only small cities and towns but also large ones like Kyiv, Lviv, and Kamianets were constantly embroiled in court disputes with local starostas and officials concerning the distribution of government powers.

Harsh criticism of the anarchic tendencies in the Lithuanian-Polish state is encountered frequently in the *History*. In discussing the social system of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, or *Rzeczpospolita*, Hrushevsky often goes beyond the chronology of the transitional period to note the development of social relations and legal institutions in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In reality, the nobiliary republic—the *Rzeczpospolita*, translated from the Latin *res publica*—was transformed into nobiliary anarchy.<sup>56</sup>

The negatively colored description of the sociopolitical system of the Commonwealth recalled an expression coined by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the eighteenth-century French philosopher of the Enlightenment period, which is cited in the volume: 'nothing dominates it [the Polish Diet], but neither does anything heed it' (p. 212).<sup>57</sup> Yet the political circumstances behind the decline and fall of the Commonwealth in the second half of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries differed from those of the preceding era: the latter coincided with the rule of the Jagiellonian dynasty and the beginning of the reign of the first king from the Swedish dynasty, Sigismund III Vasa, at a time when Poland was on the

---

Belarusian context in a study of urban communities in central and eastern Europe, see my review of Jaroslav Miller, *Urban Societies in East-Central Europe: 1500–1700*, in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 29 (2009): 473–75.

55. See A. Janeczek, 'Exceptis schismaticis: Upośledzenie Rusinów w przywilejach prawa niemieckiego Władysława Jagiełły,' *Przegląd Historyczny* 75, no. 3 (1984): 527–42.

56. The contemporary Polish historian Łukasz Adamski, in his *Nacjonalista postępowy: Mychajło Hruszewski i jego poglądy na Polskę i Polaków* (Warsaw, 2011), has somewhat overemphasized the critical orientation of Hrushevsky's historical views of Poles and Poland overall, portraying them as very nationalistic. For a critique of Adamski's judgments from the point of view of Ukrainian historiography, see Viktor Telvak's review in *Ukrains'kyi arkhеohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* (Kyiv), vyps. 16–17 (2012): 637–49.

57. The author references Rousseau but the citation he gives is truncated and somewhat distorted. The full quotation: 'La Diète est aussi souveraine qu'elle l'était lors de son établissement. Cependant elle est sans force; rien ne la domine, mais rien ne lui obéit' (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Considérations sur le gouvernement de la Pologne et sur sa réformation projetée*, The Hague and Lausanne, 1783, p. 45). It is important to note that the text of Rousseau's manuscript is dated to the time of the first Polish partition in 1772.



rise.<sup>58</sup> Hrushevsky was convinced, however, that in this ascendant period of development, the social and political institutions of the Commonwealth already had the defects, later becoming grievous failings, that would prove catastrophic to the state's existence.

*On the Road to the Union of Brest of 1596: Pro-Union Tendencies and the Orthodox Church System in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*

At the beginning of chapter 6, dealing with church organization in the Ukrainian lands, Hrushevsky writes of focusing on church relations at the turn of the sixteenth century because it was precisely then that they became the focal point in the political, national, and social aspirations of the Ukrainian-Ruthenian people. These aspirations could not be placed entirely on hierarchical church relations, even though it was precisely the Church that the Ukrainian community turned into 'its national bulwark' in society, dominated as it was by the Polish element (p. 252).

Hrushevsky analyzes in chronological order the development of church institutions in the Kyiv metropolitanate and the evolution of relations between that metropolitan see and various government and hierarchical institutions.<sup>59</sup> From the time that Metropolitan Petro of Ratne of Kyiv moved to Moscow in the early fourteenth century, two governments, the Lithuanian and Muscovite, vied for the right to appoint the Kyivan primate. The Muscovite factor disappeared only in the second half of the fifteenth century. Moreover, the appointment of the Kyiv metropolitan was influenced in various ways by the patriarch of Constantinople and the Orthodox synod. But these factors were gradually supplanted by the right of patronage or right of presentation of candidates for ecclesiastical positions that took root in the Lithuanian-Polish state.<sup>60</sup>

Enmeshed in the web of patronage relations were both the highest ecclesiastical offices—of metropolitan, bishop, and archimandrite—and the lowest parish positions in towns and villages. Hrushevsky cites many examples of the Lithuanian-Polish government's glaring abuses of the right of patronage, in which ecclesiastical offices were treated as 'spiritual bread' by analogy with the 'secular bread' of a government position (pp. 315–323). The author concludes that the right of patronage was the main cause of the discord in relations within the Orthodox Church.

In general, the Orthodox Church under foreign rule forfeited the privileges of the princely era, and its status was lower than that of the Roman Catholic Church. The Orthodox even lacked a general privilege, though the kings issued them to individual bishops—for example, the bishops of Peremyshl, Lviv, and Kholm, among others. In the Polish state only those who were pro-union were recognized as equals, a status legitimized after the Union of Florence (1439) by Jogaila's privilege of 1443. Religious restrictions applied to Ukrainians in various spheres, beginning with the performance of church rites in towns, and in appointments to state positions. Hrushevsky analyzes in detail the exceptional situation that arose in the early sixteenth century, when the renowned military commander Prince Kostiantyn Ostrozky, who was especially highly regarded by the state in view of his military

58. For a detailed discussion, see Norman Davies, *God's Playground: A History of Poland in Two Volumes*, vol. 1, *The Origins to 1795* (Oxford, 1981).

59. Literature on the topic of processes of union was compiled by Isydor Patrylo in his 'Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii Ukraïns'koi tserkvy,' in *Fontes et bibliographia historiae ecclesiae Ucrainae*, 3 vols. (Rome, 1975–92).

60. For synthesizing studies regarding the right of patronage in the Ukrainian and Polish lands in the medieval and early modern periods, see: W. Abraham, 'Początki prawa patronatu w Polsce,' *Przegląd Sądowy i Administracyjny* (Lviv), no. 14 (1889): 423–40; M. Koczarska, 'Prawo patronatu w Polsce późnego średniowiecza i jego wpływ na kulturę pisma społeczeństwa świeckiego,' in *Sacri canones servandi sunt: Ius canonicum et status ecclesiae saeculis XIII–XV* (Prague, 2008), pp. 224–34; B. Szady, *Prawo patronatu w Rzeczypospolitej w czasach nowożytnych: Podstawy i struktura* (Lublin, 2003).

victories over Muscovite troops, acceded to the post of palatine of Trakai. Lithuanian dignitaries, Catholics without exception, had no desire to establish any such future precedents: they demanded that the government recognize Ostrozky's nomination to this position as an exception not to be repeated (pp. 298–99).

The disorder in the Ukrainian Church reached its apogée in the second half of the sixteenth century, particularly in its final decades. Hrushevsky cites numerous contemporaries, among them Ivan Vyshensky, Zakhariia Kopystensky, and the author of *Warning*, who wrote about the deplorable state of the Church. Among church figures of that period, Bishop Kyryl Terletsky of Ostrih and Lutsk was the target of the largest number of Hrushevsky's critical remarks and invective (pp. 328–30). Today, however, research scholars tend to regard the subjective and one-sided statements contained in court sources and others made by Terletsky's contemporaries more tentatively in characterizing his ecclesiastical, cultural, and enlightenment activities.<sup>61</sup>

Amid the trying situation of the Orthodox Church in the Ukrainian lands, forces bent on institutional reform emerged within the ranks of the Church's faithful. Hrushevsky perceives such an attempt at reform in the alliance forged between the lay community—especially the burgher class as represented by the brotherhoods—and the Eastern patriarchate,<sup>62</sup> which was aimed against the local bishopric. It was precisely this unambiguous longing for reform that became the main catalyst for the pro-union processes leading to the formation of the Uniate Church (pp. 331–32).

Hrushevsky recognizes that Polish-Lithuanian government circles were active in the pro-union processes taking place in the Ukrainian lands in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The idea of a union occurred to officials once they became convinced of the strength and viability of the Ruthenian Church (pp. 333–34). Thus, the historian describes as decisive the pressure exerted by the governments of Jogaila and Vytautas when Metropolitan Hryhorii Tsamblak resolved to attend the Council of Constance in 1415. Hrushevsky relates how the Union of Florence was ignored in the Ukrainian lands, where Metropolitan Isidore was welcomed circumspectly when he returned to his metropolitan see after a church union was concluded.

Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, a foundation of pro-union influences and attitudes became manifest among the secular elite and the highest-ranking hierarchs of the Kyiv metropolitanate. Particularly distinctive from this standpoint is Metropolitan Mysail's message to the Roman pope of 1476. As an experienced source specialist, Hrushevsky could not reject the authenticity of this document. But the fact that the message was discovered and published at the beginning of the seventeenth century by the staunch advocate of union and later metropolitan Ipatii Potii led the historian to comment about the 'rather suspicious circumstances' of this document's publication (p. 348). Hrushevsky describes a similar letter written by Metropolitan Iosyf Bolharynovych in 1497 to Patriarch Niphon II of Constantinople in connection with the union issue as 'highly suspect, and if it is not entirely falsified, then at the very least it had undergone significant

61. L. Tymoshenko, 'Iepyskop Kyrylo Terlets'kyi: Rodovid i pochatok dukhovnoi kar'ieri,' in *Drohobyt's'kyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*, vyp. 9 (2005): 202–13; idem, 'Zapovity, smert' i pokhovannia iepyskopa Kyryla Terlets'koho,' in *ibid.*, vyps. 11–12 (2008): 467–83; idem, 'Kniaz' Vasyl'-Kostiantyn Ostroz'kyi i iepyskop Kyrylo Terlets'kyi: Do problemy vzaiemovidnosyn svits'koho i relihiinoho lideriv Volyni doby Beresteis'koï unii,' in *Košciół Unicki w Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. W. Walczak (Białystok, 2010), pp. 169–85.

62. By the term 'patriarchate' Hrushevsky meant not only the patriarchate of Constantinople, to which the Kyiv metropolitanate was subordinated, but also the representatives of other Eastern patriarchs. In his view, the 1586 brotherhood reform in Lviv, in which Joachim V, patriarch of Antioch, played an active role, was recorded in the well-known statute of the Lviv Brotherhood. However, the distinguished historian of Ukrainian brotherhoods Iaroslav Isaievych insisted on the key role played by local members of the brotherhood, who drafted this document, in contrast to the patriarch, who passively affixed his signature to the prepared statute. See Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood*, pp. 21–22.

correction' (p. 351). Although pro-union attitudes may have become prevalent in the upper echelon of Ukrainian society, the historian was convinced of the pointlessness of overestimating such signs of readiness to accept the union, because 'the masses remained true to their instinctive aversion to any kind of rapprochement with the Latin rite' (p. 359).<sup>63</sup> This statement once again manifests Hrushevsky's populist approach, for in the long run the broad popular masses, not the elite, were the carriers and guardians of the Ukrainian national and church tradition.

The arrival in 1589 of Jeremiah, patriarch of Constantinople, in the Ukrainian lands decisively accelerated pro-union processes within the episcopate. In addressing problems afflicting the life of the Church, the patriarch, through lack of sound judgment and diplomacy, did little to endear himself. His numerous tactless and inconsistent actions, especially the dismissal of Metropolitan Onysyfor Divochka and raising of church brotherhoods against the episcopate, created an uproar within the episcopal hierarchy. The final stages in the process of union took place under the watchful eye of Polish government circles. The intervention of Prince Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky, the powerful protector of the Orthodox, could not halt this process. The main weapon used against the Orthodox was forged by the Orthodox themselves, through the longstanding practice of the unconditional use of the king's right of patronage vis-à-vis the Orthodox Church. Only the emergence of a new player on the state's political and military horizon—that is, Ukrainian Cossackdom—would allow the restoration in 1620 of the Orthodox Church hierarchy.

\* \* \*

In summary, volume 5 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* is unique among generalizing works in its successful blending of original historical conceptions with the scrupulous and thorough study of a large number of sources. Even today, volume 5 remains unparalleled in its historical-legal and historical-ecclesiastical research of the Ukrainian lands during the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries. Although now, in the first decades of the twenty-first century, the paradigm of grand historical narratives has been exhausted, this volume's many assessments of specific phenomena, incisive historical analyses, and detailed, source-based approach to historical study remain relevant for contemporary research on the Lithuanian-Polish period in Ukrainian history. In content, approach, and scope, Mykhailo Hrushevsky's work remains a masterful and unique achievement.

*Translated from the Ukrainian by Marta Daria Olynyk*

---

63. It is difficult to find authentic and reliable documents bearing on the church sympathies of ordinary Ukrainians in the sixteenth century. The contemporary Russian historian Boris Floria corroborated the anti-union sentiment among the populace of the eastern Ukrainian lands in the first half of the seventeenth century with statements made by Cossacks who had crossed the Russian border and spoken with Muscovite officials. See Boris Floria, 'Natsional'no-konfesiina svidomist' naselennia Skhidnoi Ukraïny v pershii polovyni XVII st.,' in *Beresteis'ka uniiia ta vnutrishnie zhyttia tserkvy v XVII st.: Materialy chetvertykh 'Beresteis'kykh chytan'*, L'viv, Luts'k, Kyiv, 2–6 zhovtnia 1995 r., ed. Borys Gudziak and Oleh Turii (Lviv, 1997), pp. 125–34, 134–47 (discussion).