

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

Associate Editor

Marta Horban-Carynnyk

Assistant Editors

Andrij Hornjatkevyč

Dushan Bednarsky

Technical Editor

Tania Plawuszczak-Stech

Mykhailo Hrushevsky
History of Ukraine-Rus^ʹ

Volume 6

Economic, Cultural, and National Life in
the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries

Translated by
Leonid Heretz

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 • 2012 • Toronto

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6G 2H8

University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5T 1W5

Copyright © 2012 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies

ISBN 1-895571-22-7 (set)

ISBN 978-1-894865-25-8 (v. 6)

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Hrushevs'kyi Mykhailo, 1866-1934

History of Ukraine-Rus' / Mykhailo Hrushevsky

Translation of: Istoriiia Ukraïny-Rusy.

Vol. 6, translated by Leonid Heretz; edited by Frank E. Sysyn and Myron M. Kapral;
with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk.

Editor in chief: Frank E. Sysyn.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Contents: v. 6. Economic, cultural, and national life in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries.

ISBN 1-895571-22-7 (bound : set) — ISBN 978-1-894865-25-8 (v. 6)

1. Ukraine—History. 1. Ukraine—Histoire. I. Sysyn, Frank E. II. Title.

DK508.5.H6813 1997 947.7

C97-930436-9

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 six of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has been funded by a generous donation from Dr. Jeanette Bayduza and the late Dr. Peter Jacyk.

Підготування шостого тому англomовного видання *Історії України-Руси* Михайла Грушевського здійснено завдяки щедрому дарові д-р Жанет Байдужої та бл. п. д-ра Петра Яцика.

The publication of volume 6 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.

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

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.

Contents

Foreword	vii
Editorial Preface to the Hrushevsky Translation Project	xvii
Editorial Preface to Volume 6	xix
Introduction: The 'Transitional Period': Hrushevsky's Interpretation of the Lithuanian-Polish Era in Ukrainian History — Myron M. Kapral	xxvii
Glossary	lx
Maps	lxix
<i>A Note from the Author</i>	lxxii

* * *

I. Economic Life: Trade and Urban Manufacture

1-108

Introductory remarks (1), the decline of urban life in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (2).

Trade in eastern Ukraine in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries:

The decline in trade in the thirteenth century (2) and the diminution of its geographical range (3), the decline of Kyiv as a city (4), the passivity of Kyiv's trade (5), trade with the Black Sea region (6), caravans (5-6) and caravan routes—the Perekop route (7) and others (7-8), compulsory roads (8), the volume of trade along the Dnipro in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (9-10), trade with Muscovy (10), its main arteries (11) and objects (11-12), Muscovite and Turkish goods (12-13), the participation of the local population in this trade (13), the trade in salt (14) and agricultural goods (15), the slave trade (16), the chief markets (16), and the demand for Ukrainian slaves (16-17).

Trade in western Ukraine in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries:

The earliest records (18), trade with western Europe (18), the Oriental and Byzantine trade (19), beyond the Dnister and the Galician-Black Sea route (20), relations with the Baltic coast (21), the Prussian and Flemish trade (21), the Wrocław and Cracow trade (22), the policy of Casimir Jagiellończyk (23), efforts of the merchants of Cracow to shut down Ruthenian trade (24), the Prussian-Lithuanian route (24), trade routes from Prussia to Volhynia and Galicia (25), goods traded (25-26), the closing of borders in the reigns of Louis and Jogaila (27), the decline in Prussia's trade with Volodymyr and Lviv (28), the development of Cracow's trade in Ukraine (28-29), competition from Wrocław (29), disputes of the fifteenth century (30). Lviv's efforts to gain a monopoly over the southern trade (30-31), the court case with Cracow (31), the Lviv staple right for the towns of Galicia (32) and Podilia (33), the Galician road system (33-34). Podilian trade (34), Podilian trade routes (34), Lviv's legal claims (35-36). Volhynian trade—the decline of Volodymyr (36-37), the Lutsk staple (37), the Volhynian and Polisian roads (38), the volume of trade in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (39), the government's regulation of the roads to the West (40), and changes in these routes in the sixteenth century (40-41), relations with the West: Lublin and Poznań (41), the Prussian trade (42), the artery along the Buh (42-43). The Eastern trade: earliest information on trade with the Crimea (44), the 'Tatar Road' (44), the Moldavian Road (45), trade with Moldavia in the fifteenth century (45-46) and its objects (46-47), relations with the Italian trading centers (47), the Bilhorod trade (48), the Turkish trade (49), the goods exchanged (49-50), west European commodities—cloth (50-51), other manufactured goods and products (51-52), Turkish and Muscovite goods subject to Podlachian tariffs (53), the trade in wine (54), other Oriental goods (54), and Moldavian commodities (54-55).

The organization of trade:

General conditions (56), the regulation of trade (56), monopolies (57), toll obligations and trading fees (58–59), the weakening of commercial traffic (60), the privileges of the nobility (60–61), privileged cities (62). The burghers' unresourcefulness (62–63) and the loss of the old transit trade (63), the growth in trade in agricultural goods (63), the nobility's competition with and hostility toward the cities (64–65), the growth in prices and the nobility's efforts to counter this (66), price-fixing and restrictions placed on the merchants (66–67), efforts to close the borders (67), the Piotrków resolutions of 1565 (68) and the harm they caused cities (69), partial closings (69–70). Fairs—governmental grants (70), regulation (71), the benefits and detriments of holding fairs (72–73), advantages granted to the fairs (74), western Ukraine's major fairs: Iaroslav (74), Krosno and Sianik (75), Lviv (76), Sniatyn and Kamianets (76–77), smaller fairs in Galicia (77), fairs of Volhynia (78–79). Weekly fairs (79), goods traded there (80), the trade in meat (81). Regular town trade: stall-keepers and stalls (82), stall trade items (82–83), tavern-keeping and the trade in drink (83).

The organization of crafts:

The corporate system of the Middle Ages (84), the origins of guilds in Ukraine (84–85), the guild system (85), its moralistic character (86), the protection of material interests (87), the organization of craft training (88), the typical guild statute in western Ukraine in the sixteenth century and its dissemination (88–89), example of a guild statute from the Dnipro region in the seventeenth century (89–90). The degeneration of the guilds (91), the lack of competition (92), guild exclusivity and protection of members (92–93), persecution of non-guild craftsmen (94), the decline of guild life (95), the institution of the lodge and brotherhoods of journeymen (95). Religio-national exclusivity and impediments for Ruthenians (96–97), the situation of the Jews (97–98). The nobility's hostile policy toward the guilds (98), the abolition of guilds (99), competition from craftsmen subject to the starostas (100) and in the residences of the nobility (101), local goods versus imports (101–2). The condition of urban industry: guilds in Lviv in the fifteenth century (102), in Lutsk (103), Kremianets, Volodymyr, Belz, Kyiv, Kholm, Krasnostav (104–5), and smaller cities and towns (105–6).

An overview of the decline of urban economic life (106–7), and the difficult conditions for the Ukrainian element (107), its impoverishment and decline (108).

III. The Rural Economy**109–84***The old economy and its surviving elements:*

The trade in agricultural goods in Old Rus' (109), its objects (109–10), the lack of demand for agricultural products in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and its symptoms (110–11), the character of the old economy (111), and its surviving elements in Volhynian and Kyivan Polisia (111–12), the old agricultural economy in Volhynia in the fifteenth century (112–13) and its remnants in the sixteenth (114), service villages (114–15) and other surviving elements (116); characteristics of the old economy of Galicia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (117), and elements surviving in the sixteenth—hunting and beekeeping (118–19), remnants of old obligations (119–20), tribute in oats (120–21), Wallachian-law economy (122), animal husbandry (123), and its degeneration (123). The manorial economy of western Ukraine in the first half of the sixteenth century—examples of it: the royal domain of Sianik (123–24), Liubachiv and Drohobych (125), Rohatyn (126). A general picture of the old economy—agriculture (126–27), hunting, fishing, beekeeping, animal husbandry (127–28); the Lithuanian Statute as an illustration of the old economy (128–29), the protection of hunting (129) and the feebleness of the manorial economy (130); agriculture's relatively greater development in Galicia (131); normal directions of development and its perturbations (131).

The growth in exports of rural products in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries:

Stages in the development of the export trade (132). The export of furs (132). The export of wax and honey (133–34). The export of livestock (134), herds of oxen (135) and statistics for them from castle customs records (136–37), customs relief granted for herds belonging to the nobility (137), some statistical data from the early seventeenth century (137–38). The export of fish: the trade in fish (139), salting of fish (140),

ponds and their exploitation (141–42). The export of forest products (142–43), the Gdańsk lumber market (143), prices for lumber in our country and abroad (144), the production of forest products—information from the royal domains of Liuboml (144) and Ratno (145), the destruction of forests (145–46), the attempt to establish a state monopoly in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (147), its abolition (147–48), the production of forest products in eastern Ukraine (148), the destruction of forests (149).

The export in grain and its effects:

The growth in demand (150), the Gdańsk market (150), the radius of its demand (151), the growth in export from Ukrainian territory—in the basins of the Buh and Sian (152–53), in Volhynia (153–54), the rise in prices (155), and the growth of agriculture for export (155), the growth of the manorial economy and the expansion of its territory (156–57), the expropriation of peasant land (158) and the diminution of peasant holdings (158–59), the increase in the number of land-poor households (160), cottagers in the Peremyshl and Sianik regions (160–61) and in the royal domain of Lviv (161), the growth of *corvée* (162), ‘novelties’ (163); the expropriation of peasant lands on private estates (164); the proletarianization of the peasants in the central (164–65) and eastern (166) lands.

Forms of industry connected to the rural economy:

The production of salt (166–67), its techniques (167–68), labor hired (168) and *corvée* (169), the quantity of production (169), the radius of distribution (170). Ironworks (171–72). Saltpeter mounds and grounds (172). Foundries and paper mills (172–73). The milling industry (173–74) and compulsory milling (174), water mills and sawmills (175–76), forms of large-scale milling (176). Brewing beer (177), peasant beer-brewing and its restriction (177); the fermentation of mead (178), the distillation of vodka (179); the significance of these industries for the economy overall (180). General observations (181), the irrational way in which the seignorial economy functioned (181), Poland’s balance of trade (182), excessive export (183), and the depletion of natural resources (183–84).

III. Cultural and National Relations: The Population’s National Composition and National Elements

185–230

Western Ukraine:

The weakening of the Ukrainian element in Galicia (185), the influx of foreign nobility (185–86), Ukrainian noble families in the fifteenth century (186), and their denationalization (187), the Ukrainian nobility of Galicia in the sixteenth century (188), the petty nobility (189), its poverty and lack of influence (190), national movements among the nobility—the Moldavian irredenta of the sixteenth century (191), the struggle against the Union (192), developments during the time of Khmelnytsky (192–93). The nobility of the Kingdom of Poland’s Buh region (193–94), its polonization (194), Polish law and the Polish language in Podlachia (195). The nobility in Podilia (196), Polish and Ukrainian elements (196–97), the Ukrainian noble families of the sixteenth century (197) and their decline in western Podilia (198), the Ukrainian petty nobility in eastern Podilia (199–200). The burgher stratum—the influx of privileged elements (200), German colonies (201), the condition of the Ukrainian element, examples: Krasnostav (201), Horodok (202), Drohobych (203), the curtailment of the rights of the Ukrainian element (204), the organization of Ukrainian burgherdom (205), the participation of burghers in anti-Polish movements (205), manifestations of attachment to one’s nationality among the burghers (206). The clergy (207). The higher strata of the peasantry (207–8). The national composition of the peasantry—examples from the Sianik region (208–9), the Peremyshl region (210), the Buh region (211), Podilia (211–12); manifestations of civic and national consciousness (212), mass movements: Mukha’s rebellion (213), its character (214), later movements (214).

Central and eastern Ukraine:

Obstacles to the influx of foreign elements (214). The influx of foreign elements into the burgher order (215); the national status of the cities—examples (215–16), Polish elements among the Volhynian nobility (216), the natives’ resistance (217–18), the denationalization of the nobility (219). The immigration of Polish elements to the Kyiv and Bratslav regions (219), Polish holders of *latifundia* in the Kyiv region (220), Ukrainian magnates (220–21), the Ukrainian petty nobility in Polisia (222), the Bratslav landed

gentry (221), its national patriotism (223). The Trans-Dnipro region (223–24), occupation of the frontier lands (224), the formation of latifundia (224–25). The Siverian region (226). The national significance of the eastern Ukrainian latifundia (227). The burgher order (228). The peasantry (228–89), Polish theories about immigration (229), the actual character of the villages—examples (230).

IV. Everyday Life and Culure

231–320

Religious and national traditions:

National and religious feeling—the mingling of these attitudes (231), their evolution (231–32), religion's transformation into a national characteristic (232), ethnic and political antagonism on the western front (233), religious antagonism (234), the effect of restrictions under Polish rule (235), the 'Ruthenian faith' becomes a national banner (236), religion as the emblem of national and social struggle (236). The religious element in life (236–37), its weakening in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (237); guardianship of the church in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (238–39), ecclesiastical foundations of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (239), endowments for churches (240–41), offerings for the repose of souls (241–42), inscriptions in the diptychs (242), monastic tonsures (243–44). Three testaments as an illustration of a religious and moral worldview and general view of life in the sixteenth century (244), their authors' feeble political interests (244), the insurance of material interests (245), practicality and idealism (246), family relations (246–47), the right to divorce (247), the property rights of women (248), illustrations of family ties in testaments (249), the raising and education of children (250–51), religious concerns (251), ecclesiastical endowments (252), technical details (253), church and hospital (253–54), deacon and school (254), maintenance of clerics (254–55), relations toward subjects and servants (255–56), social and political attitudes (256).

Cultural life:

The decline of the church (257) and the weakening of its cultural significance (257–58), the hapless condition of Ruthenian culture (259), contemptuous remarks about schooling (259), its low level (259–60), the views of progressive Ukrainians (260), the spread of elementary schools (261), their organization and instruction (261–62), home instruction (263), Ukrainians in foreign schools (264). Book culture (264–65), the supply of books—the catalog of the Suprasl library (265–66), theological literature (267), moralistic and historical literature (267–68), the Old Rus' book tradition (268), later additions (269), original writings (269) and translations (270), the insignificant number of Western borrowings (271–72). Work in editing and compiling (272), hagiographic compilations (273), polemical compilations (273), historical compilations (274–75); stagnation in literature (275), literary devices (276) and the decline in creativity (276), examples of literary style (277), passive conservatism (278). Non-ecclesiastical literature—the cycle of Lithuanian-Ruthenian Chronicles (278–79), redactions of the chronicles—the older (279), the intermediate (280) and the expansive (281), their style (282), the old Ruthenian literary tradition—the Suprasl Chronicle (282–83), examples of rhythmic language (284), 'dumas' (284), the influence of the Serbian heroic epic (285), the song about Stefan as a monument of creativity in song (285–86), religious verses (286); the formation of a new book language as a symptom of the decline in tradition (287–88). Artistic creativity—contraction in the sphere of native art (288–89), impediments to development and training (289), what is of interest in Ukrainian art of these centuries (289–90). Painting—the extent and influences of Ruthenian painting (290), its examples in Poland (291), Western influences—guilds (292) and guild exclusivity (293), non-guild influences (294), Western elements (295), the spread of Western influences to eastern Ukraine (295–96), examples of creativity (296). Stone architecture (296), currents within it (297), wood architecture (298)—its liveliness and heterogeneity (298–99). Woodcarving (299–300) and comments about it (300), decorative and iconographic carving (300); sculpture (300). Goldsmithing (301–2). Embroidery (302–3). Music and singing (303), information about musicians (304), music in the life of the people (304–5).

Everyday Life:

The ideological content of life (305), feeble social ideas (305), material interests (306), superficial displays of wealth and extravagant surroundings (307), examples from magnate and noble life (308–9). The enjoyment of life—its primitive materialism (310–11). Contemporaries' complaints about capricious-

ness—Rej (311–12), Pseudo-Meleshko (313), Michael the Lithuanian (313–14); changes in everyday life (314), the superficiality of culture (315); Beauplan on Polish feasts (315–16); conservatism in Ukrainian society (316–17), Vyshensky on the new fashions (317–18), his denial of any idealistic content in contemporary life (318), examples of the lack of culture (318–19), the contrast between the paradise of the nobility and the hell of the peasantry (319), Vyshensky on the plight of the peasantry (319–20).

V. The Cultural and Religio-National Movement in Ukraine in the Sixteenth Century

321–416

The cultural movement of the sixteenth century and its reflections in Ukraine:

Poland's lack of cultural predominance in previous centuries (321), the meager content of Polish cultural life in the fifteenth century (321–22), humanistic influences (322), the cultural movement of the mid-sixteenth century (323), the political movement among the nobility (324–25), Protestant currents (325), the movement's superficiality and ostentatious aspects (325–26) and attractiveness for noble circles in Ukraine (326). The insignificance of Reformation influences on Ukraine (327), their exaggeration in historians' views (327–28) and in contemporaries' comments (328), the greater development of Protestant ideas in Belarus (329), Russian rationalists (329–30), references to the success of Protestantism (330), its reflections in Volhynia (331), efforts at popularizing literacy independent of Reformation ideas—translations of the fifteenth century (331–32), the activity of Skaryna (332), its independence from Protestantism (333), Skaryna's supporters in Vilnius (333), the popularity of his translations in Ukraine (333–34), other analogous translations (334–35), Protestant translations (335), the activity of Tsiapinsky (335–36), Nehalevsky (336), Smera's letter (336–37), Orthodox polemical writings (337–38). The inertness of Ukrainian and Belarusian society (338), Tsiapinsky's grievances (339). The Zabludów printing press (339), Fedorov in Lviv (340), the beginnings of the Ostrih printing press (341); Kurbsky (342), his activity (342–43), his circle (343), literary ties and relations (344).

Denationalization in central and eastern Ukraine and the beginnings of a cultural and national reaction:

Jesuit influences (344–45), Jesuit colleges: Vilnius (345–46), Iaroslav (346–47), Lublin, Niasvzh, Lviv (347–48), Lutsk, Kamianets (348), other colleges in Ukraine (349), Jesuit education (349–50), the school program (350), the manner of instruction (351), catholicization (352), the popularity of Jesuit schools in Ukraine (352), that schooling's denationalizing effect (353). Jesuit preaching (353–54), its effects on the higher strata of society (354), demonstrations of the helpless situation of the Orthodox Church and Ruthenian culture: Skarga (354–55), Herbest (355–56), an awareness of impotency among the Orthodox—the evasion of polemics (356), the first polemical writings (357). The calendar issue: the reform of the calendar (358), the opposition of the patriarchate (358–59), acts of violence in Lviv and elsewhere in Galicia (359), the struggle of the Orthodox and the government's capitulation (359–60), further polemics (360), the significance of this episode (361). The beginnings of the awakening of Ukrainian and Belarusian society (361); the danger posed by denationalization (362), representatives of contemporary society as depicted in Vyshensky's writings (363). Old belief and progressive currents: Artemii and Kurbsky (363–64), Vyshensky as the spokesman for religious reaction (364), his war against worldly learning (365) and apotheosis of Orthodox simplicity (365–66), other manifestations of religious reaction (366), progressive currents—the views of the *Warning* (366–67), the conflict between these two currents (367), the progressives' predominance (368), the message for national enlightenment and education (369–70).

The Ostrih Academy:

The paucity of information (370); the person of the patron—Prince Ostrozky (370), his character (371), lack of energy and initiative (371), passivity in religious and national matters (372), his unwillingness to be harsh or exclusive (372–73). The Ostrih school—the plans for a higher school and its inadequacy (373–74), the program (374–75), the Greek element (375–76), the school's significance (376–77). The Ostrih circle, and the enthusiasm for it in Orthodox circles (377), its composition (377–78), chief representatives: Herasym Smotrytsky (379), his tract (379), his rhymes and verses (380), Vasyi of Surazh and his treatise (381), 'Khrystofor Filalet Bronsky' (382), the 'Cleric of Ostrih' (382). Other Ostrih publications (383), a register of Ukrainian imprints up to the year 1600 (382–84). The end of the Ostrih Academy (384–85).

The Lviv Brotherhood and the brotherhood movement:

The hopeless character of the magnate stratum (385), the cultural movement within the burgher order—the Lviv movement (385–86), the brotherhood as a form of organization among the Ukrainian and Belarusian burghers (386), the genesis of the brotherhoods (386–87), brotherhoods in Old Rus' times (387), the question of their Western influences and unique nature (387–88), their characteristics (388), mead brotherhoods and their prerogatives in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (388–89), influences of the guild system (389–90), examples of the composite structure of the brotherhoods of Vilnius (390), the Lviv brotherhoods—statutes of the suburban brotherhoods (391), the structure of the local brotherhoods (391–92), their significance as forms of legal organization (392). The beginnings of the brotherhood movement—the significance of the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood (393), the revival of burgher life (394), the brotherhood's plans—the printing press (395), plans for a school (395–96), the reform of the constitution (396), Patriarch Joachim and the privileges he granted the brotherhood (397–98), their rashness and excessive character (398), the successes of the brotherhood movement (398–99), the brotherhood school (399), its program (400), its augmentation with Latin studies (401) the successes of brotherhood education (401–2), *Adelphotēs* and other testimonies to success (402), the more feeble activity of the printing press (403), lack of resources (403), the conflict with the bishop (403–4), confirmation of the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood's rights by the patriarch of Constantinople (405), the bishop's irritation and plans for church union (405), the effect of this on the brotherhood's prestige (405–6). The spread of the brotherhood organization (406), plans for an all-national brotherhood organization (407–8), the brotherhood movement in Galicia—our data in chronological order: the Rohatyn Brotherhood (409), the Lviv Epiphany Brotherhood (409–10), the Horodok Brotherhood (410), the Brest Brotherhood (410–11) the Peremyshl Brotherhood (411), the Komarne and Sataniv Brotherhoods (412), others (412), the goal of the brotherhood organizations (413), obstacles (413–14), wrongs done by the bishop of Lviv (414), the disbanding of the Brest Brotherhood (414–15), the influence of the Church Union on the conservatism of brotherhood activity (415–16).

VI. The Struggle For and Against the Church Union after its Declaration— in Life and in Literature

417–64

Proclamation of the Union and the literary battle for and against it:

Before the Union (417), agitation in Vilnius (417–18), the murky situation in Lviv (418), Zyzanii's *Katekhyzys* and the writings that it evoked (419), the *Homily on the Anti-Christ* (419), Zyzanii's trial (420). The Synod of Brest and controversy about its legitimacy (420–21), Skarga's *Description and Defense* (421), *Exposition* (422–23), *Apokrysis: Reply or Answer* (423), the latter's historico-political (424) and theological (424–25) argumentation, its unorthodoxy (425). Vyshensky (425), his biography (426), first polemical writings (427). The *Writing Addressed to the Bishops Who Have Fled* (427–28), criticism of the hierarchy (428–29), the letter to Ostrozky and the *Advice on How Christ's Church Might Cleanse Itself* (429), its ecclesiastical radicalism and inconsequence (430), the *Briefly Worded Response From a Servant of God and How a Wise Latin Picked a Fight with a Foolish Ruthenian* (431). Potii—his letter to Ostrozky and the 'Cleric's' response (431), *Antirrhis: Refutation or Apology* (432) and other writings of Potii's (433), Mysail's letter (434), Orthodox writings (434–35), the *Warning* (435–36).

The political struggle:

The significance of the literary polemics (436), the impossibility of an understanding (436–37), the government's actions in favor of the Union (437), Orthodox efforts at redress at the Diets—the Diet of 1597 (438), the Orthodox summon the bishops to the Diet court (439), the government's apparent concession (439), the alliance between the Orthodox and the Protestants—the Confederation of 1599 (439–40), displays of pusillanimity—the address of 1598 (440), the failure of the legal case (441), new attacks on the Orthodox (441), their moral victory at the Diet of 1601 (442) and first achievements at the Diet of 1603 (443), the Diet of 1605 (443), the decisions of the Tribunal of Vilnius (444–45). The nobiliary insurrectionist movement (445) and participation of the Orthodox in it (446), their articles (447–48), concessions from the government (448), the Volhynian articles (448–49) and the Constitution of 1607 (449).

The defeat of the Orthodox:

The government's insincerity (449), the nomination of the bishop of Lutsk (450), the Diet of 1609 (450), the resolution on the jurisdiction of the Tribunal and its falsification (451), the helpless situation of the Orthodox (451–52). The devastation of the clergy of Vilnius (452). The matter of the bishop of Lviv: Hedeon's capitulation to the Lviv Brotherhood (453), Isaia Balaban and the protest against him (453–54), the election of Tysarovsky and his promise of union (454–55), interventions by the Orthodox and Tysarovsky's declaration of Orthodoxy (455). The bishopric of Peremyshl (455–56). The lack of a hierarchy (456–57) and landowners' pressure on the Orthodox clergy (457), hopelessness (457), the desertion of the Orthodox nobility—the address of 1603 (458), the denationalization of the magnate stratum (458), the decline of Protestantism (459). Depression among the Orthodox—the *Thrēnos: Threnody or Lament* (459), its predecessor—*Antigrafe: Response or Reply* (459), the alarm caused by the *Threnody* (460–61), the decline of the Orthodox church as depicted by Smotrytsky (461–62), the aristocracy's renegation (462–63). The first manifestations of a new factor—Cossackdom (463). The Hrekovych and Neophytos affair (463–64).

Notes

465–508

1. The Economic Life of the Ukrainian Lands in the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries: Sources and Literature	465
2. The Black Sea Trade Route of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries: The Castles of Karavul, Chorni Horod, and Haji Bey	472
3. The National Composition and Relations of the Population of Ukraine	475
4. Heraldic Groups of the Western Ukrainian Nobility	477
5. Schooling	479
6. Book Culture and Literature of the Fourteenth to Seventeenth Centuries	480
7. On the Question of Ukrainian Dumas	485
8. Artistic Creativity in the Ukrainian Lands in the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries	487
9. The Literature on Culture and Everyday Life	494
10. Protestant Congregations in Ukraine	496
11. The Religio-National Movement in Ukraine in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century and Religious Polemics	500
12. The Literature on Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky and His Family	503
13. The Brotherhoods	505

* * *

Bibliography	509
Abbreviations	509
Unpublished Sources	510
Published Sources	510
Secondary Literature	524
Appendix 1: Monetary Units	551
Appendix 2: Units of Measure	554
Tables of Rulers and Hetmans	556
Translations Consulted	570
Index	571

The 'Transitional Period': Hrushevsky's Interpretation of the Lithuanian-Polish Era in Ukrainian History

MYRON M. KAPRAL

Historiographic and Sociopolitical Contexts

Mykhailo Hrushevsky devoted the sixth volume of his *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* (*History of Ukraine-Rus'*) to the Lithuanian-Polish period in Ukrainian history, a time of the decline and transformation of the old princely forms of social, economic, and cultural life as well as, simultaneously, the birth of new forms of sociopolitical administration and national and cultural development.¹ In Hrushevsky's view, this period encompassed the time from the demise of the Galician-Volhynian state in the mid-fourteenth century to the era during which Cossackdom became an important factor in the Ukrainian lands, that is, the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Hrushevsky emphasizes the transitional character of this period in Ukrainian history, as in the cultural sphere Western influences began to take precedence over Byzantine ones and in the socioeconomic sphere a privileged stratum began to emerge. Change in the political system led to changes in the way society lived, which in turn brought about a sharpening of national and religious conflict with Poland. The instinct for national self-preservation awakened a resilient energy that was funneled into the cultural and national movement of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, which, in turn, 'opened the way to political and armed conflict' led by Cossackdom in the mid-seventeenth century.²

In discussing the final phase of the Lithuanian-Polish period, Hrushevsky partly ignored clear state-building criteria in his periodization of Ukrainian history and chose not to make 1648, the year of the actual emergence of the new Cossack state, the terminal point of the period.³ Of course, in some measure the populist conception of 'nation as people' rather than 'nation as state' to which Hrushevsky consistently subscribed throughout his *History* required this chronological structure, in which the interweaving of economic, religious, and national factors reached its historical apogee in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, having ushered Ukrainian Cossackdom into the historical arena.

Hrushevsky dealt with the Lithuanian-Polish period in two earlier volumes of his *History*, the fourth and fifth. He combined these into a separate chronological subsection, or 'cycle,'

1. M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 6, *Zhytje ekonomichne, kul'turne, natsional'ne XIV-XVII vikiv* (Kyiv and Lviv, 1907).

2. M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 1, *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, trans. M. Skorupsky, ed. A. Poppe and F. Sysyn with the assistance of U. Pasicznyk (Edmonton and Toronto, 1997), p. 15, 'Introductory Remarks.'

3. In their reference and research works, Hrushevsky's students and academic successors, among them Ivan Krypiakevych (1886-1967) and Dmytro Doroshenko (1882-1951), representatives of the statist school, consistently took the year 1648 as the chronological divide between the stateless Lithuanian-Polish era and the Cossack Hetmanate.

to use his own word,⁴ of the *History*, similar to the way in which his first three volumes focused on the princely Old Rus' period. In volume 4, Hrushevsky described political events and diplomatic relations; volume 5 focused on the legal aspects of sociopolitical and cultural relations in the Ukrainian lands; and volume 6 continued an examination of socioeconomic and national and cultural matters in the fourteenth through seventeenth centuries. In the last of these volumes, however, Hrushevsky usually presented historical materials not in the context of 'static' official or legal documents, such as constitutions, charters, statutes, diplomas, and the like, but as a 'dynamic' historical analysis based on records, narratives, and memoirs as well as statistical and other essential historical sources.

In 1894, Hrushevsky arrived in Lviv with the idea of publishing a history of Ukraine, and with discipline and dedication he set about making that goal a reality.⁵ The first volumes of his work, dedicated to the princely period of Ukrainian history, were published in the years 1898–1900. In tandem with their publication, Hrushevsky gathered material about the Lithuanian-Polish period and wrote articles on topics of social and economic⁶ as well as religious and cultural history.⁷ He also involved students of his history seminar at Lviv University in this undertaking.⁸ While still in Kyiv, Hrushevsky had received good historical training under the tutelage of Volodymyr Antonovych (1834–1908) during the process of researching archival documents and writing his doctoral work on the Bar starosta district.⁹ After the turn of the century, when Hrushevsky finished gathering the materials he needed on the Lithuanian-Polish period of Ukrainian history, the process of writing and producing his history's next volumes proceeded quite quickly: volume 4 appeared in 1903 and volume 5 in 1905. Hrushevsky's personal journal entries confirm that he was working on volume 6 in the latter half of 1905 and during 1906.¹⁰

Hrushevsky completed the manuscript of volume 6 and sent it to the printer in December 1906. He was in his fortieth year, and his vital and creative powers were in full bloom. His scholarly output included five volumes of the *History* (the first three of which had already

4. M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 7, *The Cossack Age to 1625*, trans. B. Strumiński, ed. S. Plokhly and F. Sysyn with the assistance of U. Pasicznyk (Edmonton and Toronto, 1999), p. lxiv, 'Preface.'

5. See Frank E. Sysyn's introduction to volume 1 of the *History*, pp. xxii–xlii.

6. Among the larger documentary collections published by Hrushevsky was *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy* (Lviv, 1895–1903). That series of publications included: vol. 1 (1895), *Liustratsii korolivshchyny v zemliakh Halyts'kii i Peremys'kii z r. 1565–1566*; vol. 2 (1897), *Liustratsii korolivshchyny v zemliakh Kholms'kii i Sianots'kii z r. 1565*; vol. 3 (1900), *Liustratsii korolivshchyny v zemliakh Kholms'kii, Belz'kii ta L'vivs'kii z 1565–1566 rr.*; vol. 7 (1903), *Liustratsiia 1570 r.*; all these volumes include lengthy introductions by Hrushevsky. Also published were *Materiialy do istorii suspil'no-politychnykh ta ekonomichnykh vidnosyn Zakhidnoi Ukraïny* (Lviv, 1906) (= *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* [hereafter *ZNTSh*] [Lviv], 1905, no. 63: 1–46; no. 64: 47–94; 1906; no. 69: 84–166).

7. 'Metryka Sambirs'ka: Podrobytsi z istorii vidnosyn religiinykh,' *ZNTSh*, 1896, no. 10: 1–8; 'Kil'ka dokumentiv z zhyttia Zabuz'koi Ukraïny XVI v.,' *ZNTSh*, 1899, no. 28, miscellanea: 1–10; 'Storinky z istorii ukrains'ko-rus'koho sil'skoho dukhovenstva (po sambirs'kym aktam XVI v.),' *ZNTSh*, 1900, no. 34: 1–82.

8. For instance, Hrushevsky involved his student Ivan Krypiakievych in researching the history of Lviv in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. See I. Kryp'iakievych, 'L'vivs'ka Rus' v pershii polovyni XVI viku,' *ZNTSh*, 1907, no. 77: 77–106; no. 78: 26–50; no. 79: 5–51; 2d ed. (Lviv, 1994). Publication of the first edition of the latter paralleled that of volume 6 of the *History*, in which Hrushevsky made abundant use of the source material his student had gathered (pp. 29–30, 200, 385–86).

9. M. Grushevskii (Hrushevsk'kyi), *Barskoe starostvo: Istoricheskie ocherki* (Kyiv, 1894). A second (offset) edition with a comprehensive commentary was produced by Mykola Krykun in 1996.

10. *Shchodennyky M. S. Hrushevs'koho (1904–1910 rr.)*, ed. I. Hyrych, *Kyivs'ka starovyna* (Kyiv, 1995), no. 1, p. 15 (entry for 18 December 1905), and p. 17 (entry for 28 July 1906: 'I walk around the garden endlessly, thinking how to organize subsequent topics in volume 6'), p. 18 (entry for 8 October 1906: 'I worked on vol. 6').

appeared in a second edition) and an eleven-year term (from 1895) as editor of the *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Annals of the Shevchenko Scientific Society), the first general Ukrainian scholarly periodical devoted to Ukrainian history, philology, ethnography, and other aspects of Ukrainian culture. In 1897, Hrushevsky became head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society and soon applied his energy and talent to transforming it into a virtual national academy, resembling those of the neighboring West and South Slavs. At his initiative, the society established its Archaeographic Commission, which published many sources and documentary materials from various periods bearing on the history and culture of the Ukrainian people. In addition, annually the extraordinarily hard-working and productive scholar published dozens of articles and source publications and scores of reviews and commentaries on monographs and research reports written by Polish, Russian, German, and other authors on topics of Ukrainian history and culture. It is no exaggeration to state that Hrushevsky's own scholarly production, extensive organizational work, broad academic perspectives, and scholarly objectivity in conducting research laid the foundation for future work in Ukrainian history and established it as a developed academic discipline within the European scholarly community.¹¹

The Revolution of 1905 in Russia and, especially, the lifting of censorship on Ukrainian publications in 1906 prompted Hrushevsky to transfer part of his publishing and organizational work to Kyiv, the political and cultural capital of the central Ukrainian lands. Another important factor was the Russian imperial government's decision in the revolutionary year of 1906 to place a heavy tax on Ukrainian-language books imported from abroad. At the same time it categorized these books as 'Russian,' thereby not recognizing the independent status of the Ukrainian language, though the imperial prohibition against Ukrainian books and periodicals had formally been revoked.¹² The transfer to Kyiv caused publishing difficulties, particularly in the editing and proofreading of volume 6, since Hrushevsky himself was still residing mainly in Lviv. The process of publishing the volume, which began in December 1906, took more than a year and caused the author to complain about various technical problems, typesetting errors, and delays. In volume 6, Kyiv and Lviv were named as places of publication. The volume was printed in Kyiv at the author's expense at the printshop of Petro Barsky; it was issued simultaneously in Lviv at the cost of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, where it appeared as volume 11 of its series *Zbirnyky Istoryko-filosofichnoi sektiï* (Collections of the Historico-Philological Section).¹³

In 1907, publication of the Shevchenko Scientific Society's popular-scholarly periodical, the *Liternaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (Literary and Scientific Herald), was transferred to Kyiv as well. Together with scholarly colleagues and supporters from Ukraine's eastern regions, Hrushevsky also founded the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kyiv (Ukrains'ke naukove tovarystvo v Kyievi), modeled on the Shevchenko Scientific Society.¹⁴ The new organiza-

11. For detailed discussions, see T. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto, 1987), and S. Plokhy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto and Buffalo, 2005).

12. See Hrushevsky's brief author's note to his volume 6, p. lxxii.

13. *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Pershyi prezident Ukraïny, akademik. Biobibliohrafiia (1885–2000 rr.)*, comp. B. Hranovs'kyi, 2d ed. (Kyiv, 2004), p. 163.

14. For literature on the Ukrainian Scientific Society in Kyiv, see: M. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Ukrains'ke naukove tovarystvo v Kyievi i ioho naukove vydavnytstvo,' *Zapysky Ukraïns'koho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyïvi* (hereafter *ZUNT*) (Kyiv), 1908, no. 1: 3–15, reprinted in M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvory u 50 tomakh* (Lviv, 2002–), 8 (2007): 177–84; I. Zhytets'kyi, 'Zakhody

tion's official publication was its own *Zapysky*. Alongside it Hrushevsky planned to continue publication of the venerable but faltering *Kievskaia starina* (Kyivan Antiquity) as a Ukrainian-language publication titled *Ukraina*. Four issues of this popular and scholarly periodical came out in 1907; thereafter publication was suspended and resumed only in 1914.¹⁵

* * *

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries historiography had not yet established the now standard triad in the periodization of Ukrainian history before the nineteenth century, namely, the princely period, the Lithuanian-Polish era, and the Cossack epoch. The concept of a separate Lithuanian-Polish period of historical development had begun to develop as early as the second half of the seventeenth century, when the Kyivan chronicler Teodosii Sofonovych, in writing the *Chronology from Ancient Chroniclers*, following the history of the princely era listed a 'Chronicle about the origins and name of Lithuania' and a 'Chronicle about the Polish land.'¹⁶ The Cossack chronicles of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries focused on the two 'most illustrious' pages of Ukrainian history—the Old Rus' period of the Kyivan and Galician-Volhynian states and Cossack history up to and including the Khmelnytsky era—and presented them as great flowerings of the national spirit and energetic state-building. The leading Ukrainian historians of the nineteenth century produced fundamental works on these two seminal historical periods: Panteleimon Kulish (1819–97), *Istoriia vossoedineniia Rusi* (History of the Reunification of Rus'; published in 1873–77) and *Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'shi* (Little Russia's Falling Away from Poland; 1888–89); Mykola Kostomarov (1817–85), *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky; 1884) and *Mazepa* (1882); and Mykhailo Drahomanov (1841–95), *Propashchyi chas: Ukraina pid Moskovs'kym tsarstvom, 1654–1876* (The Lost Time: Ukraine under the Tsardom of Muscovy, 1654–1876; 1880). Mykhailo Maksymovych (1804–73), in a well-known discussion with the Russian historian Mikhail Pogodin about the Kyivan Rus' inheritance, delineated the Lithuanian-Polish period as a separate subject in the investigation of Ukrainian history.¹⁷ Hrushevsky's former professor at Kyiv University, Volodymyr Antonovych, may not have regarded the Lithuanian—or Lithuanian-Polish—period before the Cossack era as an academic priority in his own work, but he did lay the foundations for the study of this

kolo orhanizatsii istorychnoho tovarystva v Kyievi,' *Ukraina*, 1929, no. 1: 23–30; V. Liakhots'kyi, 'Ukrains'ke naukove tovarystvo v Kyievi,' *Kyivs'ka starovyna* (Kyiv), 1998, no. 6: 16–21; T. Shcherban', *Fundatory Ukraïns'koho naukovo tovarystva* (Kyiv, 1992) (about Volodymyr Antonovych, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Pavlo Zhytetsky, and Volodymyr Vernadsky).

15. R. Maiboroda and V. Vrublevs'kyi, foreword to *Naukovyi chasopys ukraïnoznavstva 'Ukraina' 1907–1932: Pokazhchyk zmistu* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 3–5.

16. Feodosii Sofonovych, *Khronika z litopystsiv starodavnikh*, ed. I. Mytsyk and V. Kravchenko (Kyiv, 1992).

17. See M. Maksimovich (Maksymovych), 'O mnimom zapustenii Ukrainy v nashestvie Batyevy i naselenii ee novoprishlym narodom: Pis'mo k M. P. Pogodinu,' *Russkaia beseda* (Moscow), 1857, no. 8: 22–35; idem, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2d ed., vol. 1 (Kyiv, 1876), pp. 131–45; idem, *Kiev iavilsia gradom velikim...*, 3d ed. (Kyiv, 1994), pp. 179–90; idem, 'Pis'ma o Kieve k M. P. Pogodinu,' *Russkii arkhiv* (Moscow), 1868, first half-year, nos. 12–15, 17, and second half-year, nos. 6, 14, 20, 21, 26 (*Kievskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, 1869, no. 16: 544–53, and no. 19: 629–42), and separately, Moscow, 1869. Some of these articles recently appeared in: M. Maksymovych, *Vybrani tvory*, comp. and with an introduction by Viktor Korotkyi (Kyiv, 2004); idem, *Vybrani tvory z istorii Kyivs'koï Rusi, Kyieva, i Ukraïny*, comp. P. Markov (Kyiv, 2004); etc.

historical period as one shared by the Ukrainian and Belarusian people.¹⁸ Russian, Polish, and Belarusian scholars researched specific features of the political, economic, and legal systems of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania quite separately from historical processes occurring on the Ruthenian (Ukrainian) lands of Poland (in Galicia and Podilia) to the year 1569.¹⁹ It was in Hrushevsky's work that, for the first time in historiography, the eastern and western Ukrainian lands divided between Poland and Lithuania in medieval times were treated as a single, conjoined subject of historical research. For Hrushevsky, that subject's unifying factor was the Ukrainian people, which in the Lithuanian-Polish period preserved an 'organic continuation' from the princely period to the Cossack epoch.

In the Economic Orbits of West and East

Hrushevsky began volume 6 of his *History* with a survey of economic life in the Ukrainian-Ruthenian lands from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. At the outset he stated that it was impossible for him to give a full picture of economic circumstances, owing to the weak base of source materials and relevant historical studies,²⁰ and that therefore his research focused on particular aspects of the situation.

In the volume's opening pages Hrushevsky put forward his basic thesis that after the decline of the princely state on the Ruthenian lands, the 'center of gravity' in economic life of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries moved from city to village, and to agriculture in particular. Hrushevsky constructed a chronological bridge from this subsequent period back to the princely times of Old Rus', when it was urban life, with its merchant and artisan populations, that greatly influenced economic activity and society, especially in the central lands along the Dnipro (p. 2), with its urban centers of Kyiv, Chernihiv, Pereiaslav, etc. He noted, however, that the economic decline of princely Ruthenian cities was already in evidence in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and that by the thirteenth they 'went into deep decline.' In the later period, when the Ukrainian lands came under the authority of the Lithuanian and Polish states, the system of governance they experienced caused a further decline in urban life. The social and political interests of the privileged nobiliary order brought about the establishment of sociopolitical and economic relations centered on the interests of the private nobiliary manorial economy.

In the princely era and from the very beginnings of the Rus' state, Hrushevsky says, commerce was the engine or 'vital nerve' in economic life, the factor that 'set...into motion' and 'invigorated' other branches of the economy and culture. The Old Rus' city of Kyiv was the key location on the commercial route over river and sea 'from the Varangians to the

18. See, for example: V. Antonovich (Antonovych), *Istoriia Litovskoi Rusi: Litografirovannye lektsii* (Kyiv, 1877); idem, *Issledovanie o gorodakh v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii po aktam 1432–1798 gg.* (Kyiv, 1870), foreword to vol. 1, pt. 5 of *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*; idem, *O proiskhozhdenii shliakhetskikh rodov v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi* (Kyiv, 1867), foreword to vol. 1, pt. 4 of *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*; idem, 'Kiev, ego sud'ba i znachenie s XIV po XVI stoletie (1362–1596),' *Kievskaiia starina* 1 (1882): 1–48.

19. Hrushevsky surveyed the literature on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in his *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 5, subtitled *Suspil'no-politychnyi i tserkovnyi ustroi i vidnosyny v ukrains'ko-rus'kykh zemliakh XIV–XVII v.* (Lviv, 1905), pp. 619–34 (Notes 1 and 2), and the administration of the Ukrainian-Ruthenian lands of Poland, *ibid.*, pp. 634–42 (Note 3).

20. In a bibliographic addendum to this volume (Note 1, pp. 465–70), Hrushevsky gives an overview of most historical studies and source publications having to do with the economic situation in the Ukrainian lands in the medieval and early modern periods, including ones little known in scholarly circles. His historiographic investigations meant that, for the first time, historical research included an analysis of rare historical and documentary publications that were relevant to economic relations in eastern as well as western Ukraine.

Greeks,⁷ that is, from the Baltic to the Black Sea and on to Constantinople, which in the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands went by way of the Dnipro. After the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century, it was transformed into a intermediate station on a wayfaring route presided over by foreign merchants who pushed the local population out of profitable commercial activity. Moscow became the chief endpoint of these trade routes, and it was there that the majority of trade caravans from the eastern Ukrainian lands headed. During this period, the Black Sea trade became the most profitable, as Kyiv's monopolies were broken and trade itself fell to the Italians, especially the Genoese, who revived old urban centers and founded new trading factories along the northern Black Sea coast. The most profit was to be gained in the slave trade,²¹ which in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was conducted in massive numbers through the northern Black Sea ports to markets in Asia Minor, the Near East, and the Mediterranean region (pp. 16–18).

Trade in the west of Ukraine was conducted with more active participation by the local population than in the east, particularly after Kyivan trade declined. Hrushevsky draws parallels from princely times with the 'lively intercourse of the West Slavic and German lands with Rus' conducted from the ninth and tenth centuries and concentrated in Kyiv (p. 18). The vibrant princely centers of Halych and Volodymyr progressively took up the reins of trading operations from the hands of the central authority into their own, gradually eliminating Kyiv as an intermediary in trading relation with Byzantium and countries of the East. For the western Ukrainian lands two directions had the most importance, the Black Sea and the Prussian, which with the founding of a new capital city of the Galician-Volhynian state, Lviv, converged precisely there. Located along the borders of the Volhynian and Galician lands, watched over by the Ruthenian princes and then by Polish and Hungarian rulers, Lviv assumed the commercial roles of neighboring Halych and Volodymyr. As proof, Hrushevsky pointed to a Catalonian map of 1375 of the region that specified the city of Lviv and indicated that 'Oriental merchants came there and traveled on via the German [Baltic] Sea to Flanders' (p. 21).²²

In conducting trade to the east, the merchants of Lviv came up against the commercial interests of the merchant class of the capital of Cracow, which was striving to monopolize the westward direction of Polish trade, cutting off Lviv merchants' access to the west by establishing a staple right and compulsory travel restrictions. Hrushevsky describes in detail the lengthy dispute between the two cities during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries for commercial privileges, which in the end was won by the Cracovians, who essentially cut off the route to Silesia and Germany for their Lviv competitors and obtained preferential access to the eastern markets that were reached through Lviv (pp. 29–32). The patrician elite of Lviv imposed similar trade limitations on other Galician and Podilian cities, restricting international transit trade in this region to Lviv. Only Kamianets, the largest urban center in Podilia, was able to withstand to some degree the trade hegemony of Lviv, owing to support from Podilian nobles and magnates in their own economic interests.

21. The Italian slave trade in the Northern Black Sea Region is the topic of a relatively recent monograph based in part on Genoese and Venetian sources: D. Quirini-Popławska, *Włoski handel czarnomorskimi niewolnikami w późnym średniowieczu* (Cracow, 2002).

22. An analogous note about Lviv's role as an intermediary is included on a portolan of Angelino Dulcert of Majorca dated 1339. A portion of a map that evidently became the prototype for the Catalonian map of 1375 mentioned by Hrushevsky has recently been reproduced by Iaroslav Knysh. See *Istoriia Lvova*, ed. Ia. Isaievych, M. Lytvyn, F. Steblii, and L. Batrak, vol. 1 (Lviv, 2006); the reproduction appears between pages 56 and 57.

In Volhynia, the former capital city of Volodymyr declined in terms of trade and economic activity in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Hrushevsky's view, this was a consequence of the demarcation of the new Polish-Lithuanian border, with its 'wedge' of the cumbersome 'Liuboml to Ratne "tooth"' (p. 38) to the city's northwest, which caused trade routes to be reoriented in part to the alternate Volhynian center of Lutsk. In general, this inconvenient change in political boundaries cost the Volhynian lands their commercial attractiveness, as merchant caravans from Kyiv went via Mazyr and Brest rather than by the old route westward across Volhynia. In addition, Volhynian trade, like Galician trade, suffered from implementation of staple rights and harsh competition from the Polish cities of Lublin and Poznań, although these cities did not enjoy an absolute staple right like that of Cracow, as Poland's capital city. Citing widely from documentary sources, Hrushevsky provides solid accounts of trade routes and destinations in the Ukrainian lands of that time, with separate attention to eastern Ukraine (the Kyiv region), Galicia, Volhynia, and Podilia.²³

In the context of contemporary liberal economic views, Hrushevsky criticizes the regulations and fiscal practices under which commerce was conducted on the Ukrainian lands in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. Fully in accord with the reality of the times is his assertion that administrative interference by the central authorities and local officials and nobles often had the effect of 'choking the spirit of free competition that could give life to industry and trade' (p. 56). Owing to royal privileges, heavy tolls appeared along trade routes like mushrooms after a rain, fertilized especially by the political policies of the nobiliary order. At times the nobility instituted absurd customs duties, for instance, at some cities of Volhynia a duty had to be paid by anyone entering the city to conduct trade (pp. 58–59). In the early seventeenth century, 174 collection points were placed on the route across Galicia to Jaroslav, certainly a severe handicap to any trading operation, especially for small-town merchants. The merchant elite in the large cities, by contrast, could obtain exemption from payment of these tolls through the purchase of privileges from the royal chancellery.

Hrushevsky severely criticized the 'internal mechanisms of trade' of that time, especially the staple right and compulsory travel restrictions adopted from German urban life. In the Ukrainian lands, these practices were accepted in weakened form and adapted to local conditions. Detrimental to trade in Ukraine was competition from the large Polish cities, which enjoyed the protection of the royal court. Even Lviv, the most economically developed Ukrainian city of the time, could not establish the 'strict' forms of the staple right that were in effect in the Polish lands.

In Hrushevsky's view, political factors, especially the nobility's dominance in political life, had an impact on the condition of cities and merchants in the Polish-Lithuanian state; in consequence, the desiderata of the nobiliary order itself bore on economic issues. These local circumstances did not allow Western economic models and standards to function. The vigorous and vibrant merchant stratum of western Europe was not shut out of political life, whereas in Poland the nobility placed cumbersome taxes, regulations, and restrictions on cities, thereby hampering entrepreneurial activities in them. The nobility's economic policies, which in Diet resolutions allowed nobles through their agent intermediaries to buy

23. Hrushevsky, who constantly kept the whole of Ukrainian ethnic territory in mind, did not make separate mention of other historical or ethnographic regions of Ukraine, such as Transcarpathia, Bukovyna, and so on. This can be attributed to a weak source base and the virtual absence at the beginning of the twentieth century of any scholarly work in this field.

foreign goods without paying duties and to export goods of their own manufacture without duty, led to the squeezing out of merchants from profit-making activities. In 1565 this culminated in the policy of the ‘closing of roads’ to urban merchants and a prohibition against their travel abroad to bring back foreign goods for resale, which was faulted for causing prices to rise.

Hrushevsky had a difference of opinion with the Polish economic historian Adam Szelągowski (1873–1961), who maintained that in closing the borders the Polish nobility sought to institute a policy of protectionism like that of other countries in Europe at the time.²⁴ Hrushevsky maintained that Szelągowski’s thesis was insupportable, given that the nobility applied these trade restrictions only to the burgher order, while permitting themselves, as privileged residents of the state, to sidestep the protectionist measures.

Also falling under strict regulation were fairs and markets, the traditional and venerable centers of commercial activity. The establishment of a town on the basis of German law was generally accompanied by the granting of the right to hold one or two fairs, a circumstance that cost the burghers a good deal. The regulation of fairs through the granting of privileges applied to royal as well as private cities and towns. In this way the central government strived to eliminate competition from closely situated major fairs by staggering the dates when they could be held. Hrushevsky described and characterized the particulars of the largest fairs on the Ukrainian lands, located primarily in the west of the country and along the Eastern trade route that included Lviv, Kamianets, Sniatyn, Sianik, and Iaroslav, all centers of international commercial exchange with a lively trade in various goods.

Trade was the most profitable occupation in the medieval Ukrainian town, and merchants were the most privileged group. They existed at the pinnacle of the urban social structure, which operated on a corporate or guild system and encompassed the whole population of the town or city. Corporate entities, brotherhoods, and guilds were formed not only by merchants and artisans but also by physicians, apothecaries, students, professors, musicians, and prostitutes (pp. 84–85). In Hrushevsky’s view, the foundation of the urban guild system was the battle with the competition: on the one hand, competition with nonprivileged workers (or bunglers) who did not belong to a guild but attempted to do the same work, and, on the other, competition among the brethren of each guild (every guild member was a brother in relations with others of status equal to his). Guild statutes resolved problems regarding not only competition but also regulation of professional activity, including responsibility and punishment for unethical acts.

The guild system, like German law and commercial regulations, was adopted from the German lands and gradually spread from west to east, eventually encompassing the whole of Ukrainian territory (p. 90). Through students’ training in guilds and journeymen’s travels, artisanal and commercial endeavors spread throughout the Ukrainian lands. Hrushevsky writes that the guilds guaranteed the lower ranks of society protection from pressures by the

24. A. Szelągowski, *Pieniądz i przewrót cen w XVI i XVII wieku w Polsce* (Lviv, 1902), pp. 84–89. The author wrote about the nobility’s distrust of the burgher stratum, which had taken shape long before, as a foreign element that at the time was comprised of Germans, especially in its higher echelons. Supposedly this led to anti-burgher attitudes at the end of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as well as to the exclusion of burghers from the country’s political life. Szelągowski noted a flaw in the protectionist efforts of the Polish nobility that was not present in such policies in the West, namely, the absence of government support for domestic manufacturing. Instead, the ruling nobiliary stratum aimed to secure and increase limitless exports so as to import foreign goods (*ibid.*, p. 278). See also a monograph on Polish and Russian commercial markets in the sixteenth through mid-seventeenth centuries: A. Attman, *The Russian and Polish Markets in International Trade, 1500–1650* (Göteborg, 1973).

privileged strata; they also fostered the material well-being of their members by eliminating competition and ensuring a market for their products (p. 91).

Simultaneously, however, Hrushevsky believed, the guilds were a 'double-edged sword' that their members put to use against the interests of society as a whole, and in the end the guilds fell into decline together with urban life as a whole. The closed nature of the corporate guild system, Hrushevsky maintained, revealed its dark side in progressive restrictions on guild membership (through increased guild entry fees, money spent on lavish banquets, fees connected to the production of complicated and costly trial pieces or 'masterworks'). By contrast, the sons and sons-in-law of guild masters enjoyed relatively lax entry requirements, as did any artisans who married widows of guild members—additional testimony to the exclusive nature of these professional organizations. In this context of restricted entry to a closed corporate structure, the admission of Ruthenians (Ukrainians) to guild membership was both exceptional and considered 'illicit' (p. 96).

In the Polish and Lithuanian states repressions emanating from the nobility were directed not only at the urban merchant stratum but also at guild artisans. At the Diets, representatives of the privileged order sought to control the prices of artisanal goods, which were to be set by the local nobiliary administration. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries there were even several prohibitions against the guild organizations' activities, though these were never actually put into effect. Hrushevsky evaluated the attainments of guild organizations in the Ukrainian lands quite negatively, noting that even in Lviv, the 'seedbed of craftsmanship' (*seminarium mechanicorum*), crafts were weakly developed and could not compete with goods made of cloth, metal, and the like that were imported from western Europe (pp. 102–3).

In the historian's view, the whole urban system was brought 'artificially' from Germany to the Ukrainian land. This artificiality, as well as connivance and falsity in economic relations, came about not through the fault of urban administrations, merchants, or craftsmen but owing to the policies of the nobility, which established fiscal duties in the interests of the lordly elite. In the German lands the urban population manifested its corporatism through the instruments of Magdeburg law and the guild system,²⁵ and it succeeded in protecting their interests, whereas in the Ukrainian lands, as well as the Belarusian and Polish ones, this 'spirit of association' was almost totally absent.²⁶ Paradoxically, Hrushevsky saw the reason for this as being the isolation or atomization of urban life, to the extent that even within city limits there existed a separation between the corporate orders (p. 107).²⁷ In discussing this, Hrushevsky obliquely referred to princely times, when cities were excluded from the districts

25. Hrushevsky set forth his views on Magdeburg law in vol. 5, chap. 4 (Ukr. 5: 222–37) of his *History*, where he concurred with the critical and skeptical assessments of the Kyivan scholar Mikhail Vladimirsky-Budanov: see M. Vladimirskii-Budanov, 'Nemetskoe pravo v Pol'she i Litve,' *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* (St. Petersburg), 1868, no. 8: 467–554; no. 9: 720–806; no. 11: 519–86; and no. 12: 772–833 (= M. Vladimirs'kyi-Budanov, 'Nimets'ke pravo u Pol'shchi i Lytvi,' in *Rozvidky pro mista i mishchanstvo na Ukraïni-Rusi v XV–XVIII st.* [Lviv, 1903–4], pts. 1 and 2).

26. On the substance of corporatism in west European cities in the context of the guild system, see J. Farr, *Artisans in Europe, 1300–1914* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 4–24, and B. Chevalier, 'Corporations, conflits politiques et paix sociale en France aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles,' *Revue historique* (Paris), 1982, no. 268: 17–44.

27. An interesting idea about cities is expressed by Fernand Braudel, who wrote that in medieval times cities were 'societies' in the present-day meaning of the word, with their own tensions and fratricidal wars—patricians against the bourgeoisie, and the poor against the rich. Nonetheless, that urban society, though divided from within, acted as a united front against external enemies, that is, against noblemen, rulers, villagers, and anyone not a citizen of their city. See Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Century*, vol. 1, *The Structures of Everyday Life*, trans. from the French by S. Reynolds (New York, 1981), p. 512.

of Rus' and constituted separate entities within the territorial organization. Also in this context, in his survey of the urban economy Hrushevsky put forward a thesis about the severing of Ukraine's direct economic ties with Europe, seeing this as one of the causes of the continuing cultural and economic decline of these lands. Hrushevsky took a totally negative view of the 'cultural mission' assumed by Poland and Polish culture after the break of Ukraine's direct ties with western Europe.

One marvels at Hrushevsky's acumen in constructing analytical structures for his research, in this instance, for assessing the economic and social foundations of the Ukrainian city in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries. He connected this problem with the concept of the princely city, and apparently that became a point of departure for his subsequent analytical considerations. Of course, he must have been influenced to some extent by the contemporary state of cities in the Austro-Hungarian and Russian Empires, in which the Ukrainian element was weak. In the territories of the old Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, he could trace this decline back to the Lithuanian-Polish period. Figuring in Hrushevsky's view alongside the chronological context was the comparative historical content, above all the German city in medieval and early modern times, which he took to be a certain standard for the classic development of urban life in the Ukrainian lands.

* * *

In his second chapter Hrushevsky analyzes the other side of the economic system of the Lithuanian and Polish states (after 1569, the Commonwealth), that is, the rural economy. The state's urban economy may already have been in decline,²⁸ but the rural one was experiencing vigorous growth, especially in the production and export of agricultural goods, particularly grain. Hrushevsky spoke forcefully about the progressive transfer of the economic core of the Polish-Lithuanian lands from the city to the lord's manor.

Nonetheless, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries rural economy as practiced of old, especially natural economy, remained part of everyday life.²⁹ In that period, a significant level of self-sufficiency and nonparticipation in monetary transactions continued to exist. Hrushevsky took hunting, herding, and foraging—including beaver hunting, falconry, fishing, horse-breeding, gathering wild honey, and the like—to be timeworn forms and components of that rural economy. As late as the fifteenth century, some villages in the western part of Galician-Volhynian Rus' were still obliged to catch a certain number of falcons or hawks, beaver or marten (by then already scarce in the forests), but tribute in natural products was gradually being replaced by monetary rents. Of tribute in grain, most significant was the payment in oats to feed the horses of military units, which at that time were predominantly cavalry.

The nature of this old form of rural economy, based on hunting and fishing and other archaic forms of economy rather than cultivation, is reflected in the contents of the First Lithuanian

28. In Polish historiography there is some debate about the beginnings of the economic crisis, for which various dates from the end of the sixteenth through the mid-seventeenth century have been proposed. See, for instance: A. Wyrobisz, 'Zagadnienie upadku rzemiosła i kryzysu gospodarczego miast w Polsce: Wiek XVI czy XVII?', *Przegląd Historyczny* (Warsaw) 58, no. 1 (1967): 132–38; A. Wyczański, 'W sprawie kryzysu XVII stulecia,' *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Warsaw) 69, no. 3 (1962): 656–72; J. Topolski, *Przełom gospodarczy w Polsce XVI wieku i jego następstwa* (Poznań, 2000).

29. Surviving old agricultural practices in the northern Ukrainian lands were the topic of one of Hrushevsky's articles, which also included source publications. See his 'Opysy Ratens'koho starostva z 1500–1512 rr.,' *ZNTSh* 26 (1898): 1–40. A reprinting with my commentary appears in Hrushevsk'kyi, *Tvory u 50 tomakh*, 6 (2004): 259–91, 594–96.

Statute of 1529 (pp. 128–29). There the nobiliary lawmakers imposed severe fines—up to and including the death penalty—on anyone who trespassed on others' trading or hunting grounds. The protection of hunting and foraging rights went to such lengths that it impinged on cultivation and harvesting. In one curious example, Hrushevsky cites a statute mandating that if during a beaver hunt one of the animals fashioned a new nest in a field or meadow, it was forbidden to 'till the land or mow hay or chop osier in the vicinity' (p. 129).

Wallachian law based on pastoralism was actively developed in the mountain and foothill regions of Ukraine. Hrushevsky believed that this system came into use no earlier than the fifteenth century and that the number of villages so established numbered no more than four hundred. He maintained that from the mid-fifteenth century the organizers and settlers of Wallachian-law settlements were Ruthenians and that they were frequently administered according to Ruthenian customary law with certain special practices and use of the term *kniaz'* for the settlement's chief.³⁰ The topic of Wallachian colonization of bordering Ukrainian and Polish lands has an extensive academic historiography in works by Ukrainian, Polish, Romanian, and Slovak scholars. In 1916, the Czech scholar Karel Kadlec compiled a list of 333 Wallachian-law settlements on the basis of published sources.³¹ Romanian scholars maintained that there were at least 400 to 500 settlements in Poland based on Wallachian law from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century.³² The quite recent investigations of Grzegorz Jawor show the difficulties involved in any simple count of Wallachian-law settlements, for often only fragmentary information is available for individual settlements. Jawor's research indicates a Wallachian manner of colonization, including echoes of Wallachian-law chiefs and chiefdoms (*kniazivstva*), a Wallachian-law manner of taxation (tribute in sheep, etc.), Wallachians as owners and inhabitants of villages, and some villages with a dual Ruthenian-Wallachian character of colonization. Overall, Jawor counted 292 settlements with Wallachian law in Ukrainian-Polish border areas during the medieval period.³³

Magdeburg law gradually spread to towns and villages, and its presence was often an indication of a weak connection between goods and money. As Hrushevsky wrote, 'The seigniors (*pany*) of that day had more than enough working hands as well as produce, but that labor and those goods had very little monetary value because there was little demand for the products of the agricultural economy' (p. 110). Over time, the closed nature of the economy changed as demand for the products of the agricultural economy increased in Western markets. This came about first in the demand for furs, honey, wax, and skins, exports of which can be traced back as far as princely times. Owing to the 'frightening away' of game, furs vanished as an export of the Ukrainian lands already in princely times, as the West was beginning to develop a need for forest products such as ash, tar, potash, and pitch, as well as domestic livestock and derivative goods.³⁴ The export of fish became a business enterprise in

30. See vol. 5, chap. 5 of the *History* (Ukr. 5: 377–80).

31. K. Kadlec, *Valaši a valašské právo v zemích slovanských a uherských* (Prague, 1916), pp. 302–14.

32. T. Holban, 'Români pe teritoriul polonez,' *Archiwa: Organul Societații istorico-filologice* (Iași) 40 (1931): 32; Ș. Meteș, *Emigrari românești din Transilvania în secolele XIII–XX* (Bucharest, 1977), pp. 24–27.

33. See G. Jawor, *Osady prawa wołoskiego i ich mieszkańcy na Rusi Czerwonej w późnym średniowieczu* (Lublin, 2000), pp. 222–23; idem, 'Zasięg i charakter osadnictwa wołoskiego na Rusi Czerwonej w XIV–XVI ww.,' in *Druhyy mizhnarodnyi konhres ukraïnistiv. L'viv: 22–28 serpnia 1993 r. Dopovidi i povidomlennia*, vol. 1 (Lviv, 1994), pp. 34–36; idem (Iavor), 'Volos'ke osadnytstvo na terenakh Roztochchia u pizn'omu serednovichchi,' *Visnyk L'viv's'koho universytetu: Serii istorychna*, nos. 35–36 (2000), pp. 58–75.

34. On the particulars of the international trade in oxen, see I. Blanchard, 'The Continental European Cattle Trades, 1400–1600,' *Economic History Review*, n.s. 39, no. 3 (August 1986): 427–60. The author makes special note of a turning

the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries,³⁵ and large sums were invested into introducing the pond economy (pike and tench) not only in Galicia but also in Volhynia and Podilia, with raw goods (sturgeon, herring, carp, etc.) transported from the Danubian regions.

In investigating sources to discern the stages and scope of the export of various raw goods from the Ukrainian lands, Hrushevsky took a particularly negative view of the ‘rapacious’—to use his word—cutting down and incineration of forests not only in the more forested areas of Galicia and Volhynia but also in Podilia and eastern Ukraine by manufacturers of forest products in the first half of the seventeenth century. The maps of Guillaume Le Vasseur de Beauplan bore testimony to the effects of the mindless exploitation of the forest resources of the Ukrainian lands, already evident in the mid-seventeenth century.³⁶ The incredible fivefold rise in prices of forest goods over a fifty-year period—from the 1560s to 1620, as documented by Hrushevsky (p. 148)—spurred new agreements on their production.³⁷ In the 1640s this evolved to the point that potash and tallowed ash began to be supplied by the Hadiach district of the distant Trans-Dnipro lands.³⁸ The state’s efforts to bring the manufacture of forest products under its control were unsuccessful. By 1547, in an attempt to secure a state monopoly, the Lithuanian government had already put in place four customhouses along the most important river raft routes. Sub-market prices were established at these customs points, and the government aimed to earn considerable sums from this price difference. But the state was unable to maintain a ‘forestry’ monopoly, and in subsequent Diets the nobility would begin to press for their abolition, which was in fact instituted by 1554. Sources show that in

point after the conclusion of the Union of Lublin, which brought about a marked increase in the extent of the ox trade not only for Poland and Lithuania, but for Europe generally: ‘With the Polish annexation of the Ukraine (voivodships of Braclaw and Kiev) [and Volhynia as well—M.K.] under the terms of the Union of Lubin and the “Polonization” of the former Lithuanian territories, the whole fabric of the Polish, and indeed the European, livestock trading system was transformed. From 1569 the catchment area of the cattle trades was extended far to the east and the low-cost product of the Russian [Rus’—M.K.] steppe rapidly assumed a position of absolute dominance in the Polish trade—with dramatic effect. From 1569 “Reussische” [Ruthenian—M.K.] oxen led the vanguard of an advance which pushed Polish exports to unprecedented heights. The pattern of half a century was broken and exports, which had fluctuated between 20,000–40,000 animals a year, rose to 60,000 in 1569 and 80,000 in 1574’ (p. 441). See also the publications of Polish scholars on this topic: R. Rybarski, *Handel i polityka handlowa Polski w XVI stuleciu*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1958); M. Horn, ‘Handel wołami na Rusi Czerwonej w pierwszej połowie XVII w.’, *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych* (Poznań and Warsaw) 24, no. 1 (1962): 73–86.

35. For a study of this problem that includes new sources, see M. Urbański, ‘Gospodarka rybna okolic Lwowa w drugiej połowie XV i w początkach XVI wieku,’ *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* (Warsaw) 29, no. 2 (1981): 141–60.

36. See the modern English-language edition of the maps of Beauplan published together with his *Description d’Ukraine*: Guillaume Le Vasseur, Sieur de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, trans. and with an introduction by A. Pernal and D. Essar, vol. 2, *Maps* (Cambridge, Mass., 1993). See also the facsimile edition of his ‘special’ map: G. Le Vasseur de Beauplan, *Spetsial’na karta Ukraïny*, comp. M. Vavrychyn and O. Hol’ko (Lviv, 2000). In this most recent edition, the compilers have identified geographic names, including the number and names of forests appearing on this map. See also S. Hensiruk, ‘Istoriia lisiv i zminy lisystosti Ukraïny,’ in S. Hensiruk, O. Furdychko, and V. Bondar, *Istoriia lisivnytstva v Ukraïni* (Lviv, 1996), pp. 26–27.

37. During that time, monetary inflation and the price of goods rose two, three, or at most four times. For example, see annual price fluctuations in Lviv during this period: S. Hoszowski, *Ceny we Lwowie w XVI i XVII wieku* (Lviv, 1928); also the French translation, *Les prix à Lwow (XVI^e–XVII^e siècles)* (Paris, 1954). In comparison, between the years 1500 and 1650 inflation in England was 500 percent. See J. Goldstone, ‘Urbanization and Inflation: Lessons from the English Price Revolution of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,’ *American Journal of Sociology* 89, no. 5 (March 1984): 1122–23 (table 1).

38. Later Hrushevsky published separately an agreement, dated 15 November 1643, between the Polish magnate and Crown hetman Stanisław Koniecpolski and his servant Marcin Dłuski for lease of the district and city of Hadiach that included provisions about the supply of forest products. See M. Hrushevsk’kyi, ‘Hospodarstvo pol’skoho mahnata na Zadniprov’iu pered Khmel’nychynoiu,’ *ZUNTA*, 1908, no. 1: 25–43 (reprinted in idem, *Tvory u 50 tomakh*, 8: 76–89).

the 1560s new agreements for the sale of forest products were put in place, without restrictions as to transport and price.

The export of forest products paved the way for the export of grain. Following the vigorous urbanizing processes of the previous epochs,³⁹ western Europe could not produce sufficient grain for its own needs, and so its agents of trade turned their gaze to eastern Europe. Initially the north European countries and then England, France, Spain, and others became markets for grain from the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian state. The great trading center of Gdańsk on the Baltic coast, located at the mouth of the Vistula River and its transport route, developed a virtual monopoly over the export of grain. Through its system of waterways, especially its tributaries the Buh and the Sian,⁴⁰ the northwestern Ukrainian lands were connected to the Baltic route for grain export.

In discussing this topic, Hrushevsky places no emphasis on the growth of the domestic market for grain, though he does discuss the growing role of fairs and local markets in domestic trade. The domestic consumption of grain grew naturally, with the appearance of new cities and the increase in the urban population that came in the later medieval and early modern periods.⁴¹ Contemporary scholars have shown that 70 percent of grain produced by manorial and village households in the second half of the sixteenth century was sold on the domestic market. Concomitantly, in 1580 exported grain accounted for only 6 percent of the country's total grain production. The volume of grain exported through Gdańsk to Western markets was not very large, so Poland could hardly be considered the 'granary of Europe.' In the mid-sixteenth century Polish grain accounted for barely 2.5 percent of the total grain supply on the European market, sufficient to feed five hundred thousand to a million people.⁴²

In the final third of the sixteenth century all the northwestern regions of Ukraine, excepting the foothills of the Sian area and Pokutia, were involved to some degree in the export of grain. Grain took on a monetary value and was exported for sale, since there already existed European and local markets where demand and prices for grain were rising more quickly than inflation.⁴³ In Hrushevsky's assessment, 'this fact was of the utmost importance for economic life' (p. 154), as the previous natural character of the economy now receded into the past. The most evident result of these transformations became the rise in manorial estates of the nobility and the expansion of the service obligations of villagers—in essence, of their *corvée*. Hrushevsky writes about the brisk pace at which manorial estates were established, as not only nobles but also such 'nonprivileged' persons as *starostas'* servitors (*starostyns'ki sluhyy*),

39. J. de Vries, *European Urbanization, 1500–1800* (London, 1984); P. Hohenberg and L. Lees, *The Making of Urban Europe, 1000–1950* (Cambridge and London, 1985).

40. For more information about the route via the Buh, see: A. Wyrobisz, 'Szlak na Bugu w XVI i pierwszej połowie XVII wieku,' *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 32, no. 4 (1984): 471–90.

41. See: M. Bogucka and H. Samsonowicz, *Dzieje miast i mieszczaństwa w Polsce przedrozbiorowej* (Wrocław, etc., 1986); R. Szczygieł, *Lokacje miast w Polsce w XVI wieku* (Lublin, 1989). The population of Lviv in 1400 was about 5,500; by the first half of the seventeenth century it had grown to between 22,000 and 23,000. See my study, *Natsional'ni hromady L'vova XVI–XVIII st. (sotsial'no-pravovi vzaiemyny)* (Lviv, 2003), pp. 251, 254.

42. L. Zashkil'niak and M. Krykun, *Istoriia Pol'shchi* (Lviv, 2002), p. 107 (in a chapter by Krykun). These figures call for reassessment of the exaggerated role assigned in historiography to grain exported from Poland and its influence on the development of the manorial economy.

43. On cross-influences in the development of rural economy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, with particular emphasis on the reform of 1557 and how countries became involved in world economic processes though the 'commercialization of rural agriculture,' see K. von Loewe, 'Commerce and Agriculture in Lithuania, 1400–1600,' *Economic History Review*, n.s. 26, no. 1 (1973): 23–37. See also J. Rutkowski, *Histoire économique de la Pologne avant les partages* (Paris, 1927); idem, *The Distribution of Incomes in a Feudal System*, ed. J. Topolski (Wrocław, 1991).

village reeves (*sil's'ki viity*), and village heads (*soltysy*) founded new manorial economies.

Hrushevsky studied the process by which the manorial economy developed, which often proceeded in tandem with the expropriation and fragmentation of the villagers' land and allotments, on the basis of inspection reports of royal domains on Ukrainian lands in the mid- and latter half of the sixteenth century, largely ones he had published earlier in the *Zherela* series.⁴⁴ The economic reforms that were implemented in rural agriculture came at the cost, Hrushevsky believed, of the villagers' well-being. In the records he traced the rise in land-poor village households, that is, of the cottagers (*zahorodnyky*) or shanty-dwellers who formed a new stratum of the village proletariat (pp. 160–62). Occurring concomitantly was a rise in the service requirements of village households, which were obliged to devote more and more days to performing corvée on the nobles' manorial estates.⁴⁵

Hrushevsky engaged in discussion first with Polish historians, who had a somewhat different view of the process by which the manorial and corvée economy developed. For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century Szelaḡowski wrote that the 'monetary devaluation of the sixteenth century was one of the reasons for the switch from the payment of quitrents to performing corvée, that is, for the considerable deterioration in the circumstances of the peasant population.'⁴⁶ On the basis of the extensive source material he had studied, Hrushevsky maintained that a substitution of quitrent by corvée happened rarely and that the payment of quitrents and other dues by the taxed peasantry continued alongside the increase in corvée-performing days they were assigned. According to this logic of economic expediency, the nobility should have exchanged the payment of monetary quitrents for that of natural products, which would not have fallen in price; but that did not happen, and instead one sees evidence of the reverse process—the buying-out of agricultural products and service obligations with cash (pp. 162–63). Hrushevsky also did not agree with Szelaḡowski about the Polish-Lithuanian state's positive balance of trade in the first half of the seventeenth century, which supposedly resulted from the export of the products of the rural economy through Gdańsk to western Europe.⁴⁷

44. It is interesting that reviewers of the volumes of *Zherela* (1895–1903) criticized Hrushevsky for a lack of general statements ('synthesis') in his introductions to this source material. See, for example, Volodymyr Shcherbyna's review of *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy*, ed. M. Hrushevsk'kyi, vol. 1, in *Kievskaiia starina* 44 (1896): 37–41, and his review of the second volume in *ibid.*, 60 (1898): 25–27; a more complete evaluation appears in V. Tel'vak, *Tvorcha spadshchyna Mykhaila Hrushevskoho v otsinkakh suchasnykh (kinets' XIX–persha tretyna XX stolittia)* (Kyiv, 2008), pp. 52–53. Hrushevsky replied that gathering a wealth of factual material was in itself insufficient reason to rush to general conclusions: see his introduction to *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 3 (Lviv, 1900), p. 2. In writing volumes 5 and 6 of his *History*, Hrushevsky evidently believed it was time to generalize and present conclusions based on the materials he had gathered.

45. In volume 5 of his *History*, Hrushevsky writes in detail about the juridical and legal aspects of the conditions and practice of corvée as they developed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (chap. 3; Ukr. 5: 136–37, 161–75).

46. Szelaḡowski, *Pieniądz i przewrót cen*, p. 14.

47. Present-day scholars side with Hrushevsky unequivocally in this debate about the balance of trade in the first half of the seventeenth century, though they see the balance as positive in the sixteenth century. Ukrainian and Polish historians agree, however, that problems with it developed in the first decades of the seventeenth century. See, for instance, A. Mączak, 'Eksport zbożowy i problemy polskiego bilansu handlowego w XVI–XVII w.,' in *Pamiętnik X Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków Polskich*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1968), p. 183, and Zashkil'niak and Krykun, *Istoriia Pol'shchi*, p. 112 (in a chapter by Krykun). Dariusz Kołodziejczyk has written that money flowed in constantly across the western and northern borders of Poland as a result of the grain export, while a large portion of ready cash ebbed out through the southeastern borders: see D. Kołodziejczyk, 'Eksport srebrnej monety z Rzeczypospolitej na ziemię imperium Osmańskiego i problem bilansu handlowego,' in *Mapa Mundi: Studia in honorem Jaroslavi Daškevič septuagenario dedicata* (Lviv, etc., 1996), p. 254.

In the 1950s Jerome Blum discussed within a broad comparative perspective the problem of the appearance of the *corvée* system in eastern Europe.⁴⁸ He pointed to four specific characteristics of its development in the region that included the Polish-Lithuanian state, Hungary, Russia, Silesia, and the Czech lands, that is, all the lands east of the river Elbe: 'Why was the fate of the rustics east of the Elbe so different from that of the Western peasantry?... The answers to these questions are provided, I believe, by four developments in Eastern Europe that went on contemporaneously and that were interrelated in a manner unique to this vast region. These four developments were: first, the increase in the political power of the nobility, and especially of the lesser nobility; second, the growth of seigneurial jurisdictional powers over the peasantry living on their manors; third, the shift made by lords from being rent receivers to becoming producers for the market; and, finally, the decline of the cities and of the urban middle class.'⁴⁹

Hrushevsky completely disagreed with Szelągowski and some other Polish economic historians in their assessment of the development of economic production in the Ukrainian and Polish lands. With the exception of salt-making in the Subcarpathian lands (Drohobych, Stara Sil, Dolyna, etc.), which supplied salt to the markets of neighboring states such as Hungary, large-scale manufacturing was in general poorly developed and oriented almost exclusively on the domestic market.⁵⁰ Ore-processing, glass-making, milling, brewing, and other forms of manufacture were, by and large, small-scale and marginally profitable businesses in which relatively little was invested. Various restrictions coming from the nobiliary order or from the state generally—for instance, monopolies on the milling of flour and the production of beer, honey, vodka, and so on—had a negative effect on the development of industry. Hrushevsky made a close connection between the development of manufacturing and the nobiliary economy. The very structure of his work reflected that dependency, for Hrushevsky placed his discussion of manufacturing after a survey of the peasant economy rather than the urban one. And, in fact, certain branches of the economy—forestry, glassworks, ore-processing, and, in part, milling and tavernkeeping—did evolve along the peripheries of the main branch of the peasant economy. Noblemen regarded manufacture as providing supplementary revenue, while the land adjacent to the ore often had greater value and economic importance than the ore itself. Other forms of manufacture—milling, brewing, distilling, and the like—developed even in cities with monopolies of the nobility or the state (in the royal domains) over such undertakings and consequently were subject to various pressures and limitations.

Hrushevsky's general evaluation of the Polish nobility in the Ukrainian lands was both negative and categorical: 'At a time when the cities and the burgher class, driven out of manufacturing and agriculture and weighed down by all kinds of restrictions and prohibitions, were withering and in decline for lack of any basis for economic life and development,

48. J. Blum, 'The Rise of Serfdom in Eastern Europe,' *American Historical Review* 62, no. 4 (July 1957): 807–36. See also R. Millward, 'An Economic Analysis of the Organization of Serfdom in Eastern Europe,' *Journal of Economic History* 42, no. 3 (September 1982): 513–48. For a survey of Polish and Western literature on this theme, see J. Kochanowicz, 'The Polish Economy and the Evolution of Dependency,' in *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe: Economics and Politics from the Middle Ages until the Early Twentieth Century*, ed. D. Chirot (Berkeley, 1989), pp. 92–130.

49. Blum, 'Rise of Serfdom in Eastern Europe,' p. 822.

50. On salt-making in Subcarpathia, see: J. Rutkowski, *Z dziejów żup ruskich za Zygmunta Augusta* (Lviv, 1925); W. Osuchowski, *Gospodarka solna na Rusi Halickiej od XVI do XVIII wieku* (Lviv, 1930); 'Żupy starostwa dolińskiego i drohobyckiego z XVI–XVIII wieku: Rewizje, lustracje, inwentarze i kontrakty z XVI–XVIII wieku,' ed. P. Kurowski and F. Zacny, *Studia i Materiały do Dziejów Żup Solnych w Polsce: Wieliczka* 20 (1997): 131–90; Ia. Isaievych, 'Solevarinnia v Drohobychi ta ioho okolytsiakh u XVI–XVIII st.,' *Drohobyts'kyi kratezhnavchyyi zbirnyk* 7 (2003): 108–20.

agriculture and manufacture controlled by the nobility served as a stimulus to the endless destruction of the natural wealth of the land and the limitless subjugation of the peasant stratum' (p. 183). As might be expected, Polish historians—among them Karol Szajnocha (1818–68), Aleksander Jabłonowski (1829–1913), and Michał Bobrzyński (1849–1935)—held different views and in Polish colonizing policies they saw the 'acquisitions of the Polish plow.'⁵¹

The 'Balance' in National and Cultural Life

In turning from an economic overview to a consideration of ethnic and cultural relations in the Lithuanian-Polish era, Hrushevsky proceeded to examine what he called a 'national balance' in that context. For the first time in Ukrainian historiography, a historian set out to analyze the national composition of all orders of Ukrainian society: nobles, burghers, clergy, and peasants. Earlier historians had written about their polonization and catholicization in the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries—among them Kostomarov, Kulish, and Antonovych—but it was Hrushevsky who identified regions of the Ukrainian lands where national processes took place variously owing to different political, economic, colonizing, and other circumstances, in particular: western Ukraine (Galicia), the Buh region (Podlachia), Volhynia, western and eastern Podilia, the Kyiv region, and the Left Bank. In the lands of western Ukraine, the first to be taken over by Poland, the privileged stratum of affluent boyardom lost its national identity, with minor exceptions, already in the fifteenth century, as Hrushevsky illustrated with numerous examples from the source records of the time. He dwelled in more detail on the petty nobility, which retained its Ukrainian national and cultural self-identity throughout the medieval and early modern periods, and he traced its part in Bohdan Khmelnytsky's Cossack war in the western Ukrainian lands and in the national rebirth of the nineteenth century (pp. 192–93). Historically, the situation developed differently in the Belz and Kholm regions and in Podlachia, where the petty nobility lost its ethnic and confessional identity by the fifteenth century.⁵²

Until the beginning of the seventeenth century Ukrainian noblemen and magnates in Volhynia stood steadfast 'like an impenetrable wall,' but then they began gradually to lose the vital cultural strength necessary to their continued development. Hrushevsky enumerates in detail the Polish Catholic magnate and noble families who made their way into the Volhynian nobility, often through mixed marriages, even though the laws of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania protected the landed estates of the local nobility from 'intrusions by the Kingdom of Poland.' In Hrushevsky's view, the unification of Volhynia with the Kingdom of Poland brought about by the Union of Lublin (1569) opened the doors wide to Polish expansion. There were few local nobiliary families in the Kyiv and Bratslav regions and on the Left Bank; hence, following the Union of Lublin, the rapid colonizing activity of Volhynia's Ruthenian princely families (the Ostrozkys, Vyshnevetskys, Koretskys, etc.) and Polish

51. K. Szajnocha, *Zdobycze pluga polskiego* (Warsaw, 1912).

52. In writing about the impact of Polish land law on this process, Hrushevsky expressed the hope that a future researcher would undertake an analysis of the legal status of the various strata of the population remaining under Ruthenian law and those going over to Polish law (p. 194). To date, however, no such analysis has been undertaken. Elsewhere the historian spoke of the need for better research of source records of land grants to the nobility and the colonizing process overall in the Siverian region in the first half of the seventeenth century. Petro Kulakovsky has published a monograph devoted to the topic that Hrushevsky proposed nearly a century ago: P. Kulakovskiy, *Chernihovo-Sivershchyna u skladi Rechi Pospolytoi (1618–1648)* (Kyiv, 2006).

magnate families (the Potockis, Kalinowskis, Koniecpolskis, etc.) alike quickly changed the ethnic composition of the privileged order.

In general, present-day Ukrainian historiography does not contradict Hrushevsky's assessments, but there are efforts to consider other aspects of the topic on the basis of new source materials and methodological approaches. For instance, in her studies of the nobility Natalia Iakovenko has shown, on the basis of statistical data on the nobility in the Ukrainian palatinates of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the first half of the seventeenth century, that the influence of the Polish nobility in eastern Ukraine was not all that important, and that in the regions around Kyiv and Bratslav colonization was implemented first of all by local nobiliary families. Polish landownership was 'between approximately one-fourth and one-third of the area's agrarian land, usually held by about ten magnate latifundia, whereas the estates of the petty and middle nobility of non-local origin accounted for barely 6 percent.'⁵³ At the present time, however, evaluations of the colonizing activity of the nobility in the Ukrainian lands during the times of the Kingdom of Poland and the Commonwealth are in fact divided into two opposing camps, with Ukrainian and Russian historiography on the one side and Polish historiography on the other. In the apt characterization of Andrzej Janeczek, they in turn have created 'black' and 'white' legends of nobiliary colonization. The main arguments of both sides were voiced in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, on one side by Volodymyr Antonovych and Mykhailo Hrushevsky and on the other by Karol Szajnocha and Aleksander Jabłonowski.⁵⁴

According to Hrushevsky, the change in the ethnic composition of the nobiliary order in Ukraine was not as significant as the 'profound polonization' of the administrative structure and social relations and the introduction of different cultural models that seeped even into personal relations in the nobiliary milieu (p. 219). Present-day historiography, Ukrainian and Polish alike, does not assess the denationalization of the Ukrainian nobility in this period so dramatically.⁵⁵ Natalia Iakovenko shows the complex and multifaceted nature of the process

53. N. Iakovenko, *Narys istorii seredn'ovichnoi ta rann'omodernoï Ukraïny*, 2d rev. ed. (Kyiv, 2005), p. 251. In another publication, Iakovenko notes that productive lands were highly concentrated in the hands of just a few owners. Prior to the Khmelnytsky era, for instance, in the Kyiv palatinate, which encompassed vast stretches of land on the Left and Right Banks of the Dnipro, twenty-six landowning magnate families possessed two-thirds of all nobiliary lands, though the bulk of available land remained 'in the hands of representatives of the lordly order of local origin' (N. Iakovenko, 'Skład shliakhty-zemlevlasnykiv Kyivs'koho voievodstva naperedodni vyzvol'noï viiny 1648–1654 rr.,' in *Feodalizm na Ukraïni* [Kyiv, 1990], pp. 82, 90). Cf. P. Kulish, 'Pol'skaia kolonizatsiia Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii,' *Vestnik Evropy* (St. Petersburg), 1874, no. 3: 5–35; no. 4: 483–552; O. Baranovych, *Zaliudnennia Ukraïny pered Khmel'nychchynoiu* (Kyiv, 1931); Z. Guldon, 'Badania nad zaludnieniem Ukraïny w XVII w.,' *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej* 13, no. 3 (1965): 561–66; H. Litwin, *Napływ szlachty polskiej na Ukraïnę: 1569–1648* (Warsaw, 2000); N. Starchenko, 'Mizh tsyfroi i bukvoiu, abo trokhy pro perevahy i nedoliky kvantyfikatsii,' *Ukraïns'kyi humanitarnyi ohliad* 3 (2000): 89–106 (a review of the preceding monograph).

54. K. Szajnocha, *Zdobycze pluga polskiego* (Warsaw, 1912), p. 131; A. Jabłonowski, *Historia Rusi południowej do upadku Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej* (Cracow, 1912), p. 89 et passim. A brief analysis and outline of research directions based on study of the Belz palatinate was provided by A. Janeczek in *Osadnictwo pogranicza polsko-ruskiego: Województwo bełskie od schyłku XIV do początku XVII w.*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1993), pp. 69–72. A good study of statistical data on the colonizing activity of the Polish nobility is Litwin, *Napływ szlachty polskiej na Ukraïnę*. In analyzing colonizing activity by the magnate stratum and the middle and petty nobility, Litwin notes a large proportion of nobles without permanent places of settlement who held land through impermanent agreements of various kinds with its owners, a group that is difficult to identify in the sources.

55. See: O. Mal'chevs'kyi, 'Polonizatsiia ukraïns'koï shliakhty, 1569–1648,' *Ukraïna v mynulomu* 1 (Kyiv and Lviv, 1992): 37–53; H. Litwin, 'Katolizacja szlachty ruskiej, 1569–1648: Stosunki wyznaniowe na Kijowszczyźnie i Braclawsczyźnie,' *Przegląd Powszechny* 10 (1985): 58–70; idem, *Napływ szlachty polskiej na Ukraïnę* (Warsaw, 2000); idem, 'Struktura wyznaniowa szlachty kijowskiej 1569–1648,' in *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce* (Warsaw) 48 (2004): 199–220; N.

of assimilation; for instance, she gives detailed analyses of the religious conversion of Ukrainian magnate society, whose religiosity differed considerably from generally accepted conceptions.⁵⁶ She maintains that the distinctive attitude of Ukrainian magnates in matters of faith and confession consisted of protecting various religions on their estates and equanimity toward a different faith held by a spouse, servants, clients, or others.⁵⁷

Ukrainian burghers, like the nobility, were especially susceptible to assimilating influences. In many cities their situation in life was made worse by the granting of Magdeburg law, which excluded them from taking part in city administration. Through local land grants and the transfer of existing legal practices from the Polish lands, at a time when only Catholics were considered burghers with full legal standing, restrictions on the Ukrainian population were being put into place, limiting their engagement in trade and entry into artisan guilds, which had the effect of decreasing the number of burghers and promoting their progressive assimilation.⁵⁸ Especially painful were harassments of a religious nature that touched upon the 'most idealized sentiments,' including prohibitions against the construction of churches,⁵⁹ public processions with lighted candles, the ringing of bells, and so forth. Among the peasantry, in contrast to all other orders and strata of society, the Ukrainian element dominated across nearly all the ethnic territory. It also proved capable of absorbing small groups wandering there from ethnically Polish lands. In this assessment Hrushevsky again challenged the views of Michał Bobrzyński and Aleksander Jabłonowski, whose hypotheses allowed for rather intensive colonizing movement from the Polish lands to eastern Ukraine. Hrushevsky rejected their hypotheses, owing to the lack of any documentary information about such demographic processes (pp. 228–29).

In the spheres of culture and everyday life, Ukrainians began to value family ties more than they had in princely times. Hrushevsky writes that during this epoch connections to family became markedly strong, as social and political interests dwindled in direct consequence of the loss of statehood and absorption within the structure of another country. In analyzing the testaments of Ruthenian nobles and magnates, Hrushevsky recognized the prevalence of practicality and materialism alongside caring concern for both immediate and more distant relatives. Behind the chancellery style in which personal testaments were written, the historian noted the sincerity and generosity that must have governed family relations. In this regard Hrushevsky followed the work of the Kyiv scholar Orest Levytsky (1848–1922), who wrote in detail about family connections.⁶⁰ Special importance in contemporary social consciousness

Iakovenko, *Paralel'nyi svit: Doslidzhennia z istorii uiavlenn' ta idei v Ukraïni XVI–XVII st.* (Kyiv, 2002).

56. N. Iakovenko, 'Relihiini konversii: Sproba pohliadu zseredyny,' in idem, *Paralel'nyi svit*, pp. 13–79.

57. Iakovenko, 'Relihiini konversii,' p. 53.

58. Using the Belz palatinate as an example, Andrzej Janeczek presented a demographic vignette that showed the Ukrainian population in cities during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries as a slight majority, particularly in the smaller urban centers (*Osadnictwo pogranicza polsko-ruskiego*, p. 297).

59. Hrushevsky engaged in a discussion with the Polish historian Antoni Prochaska on the situation in Drohobych in the first half of the sixteenth century—when the Orthodox community there was expressly forbidden to build a church—that appeared on the pages of *ZNTSh* in 1899; see the publication of these articles, with commentary by Leonid Tymoshenko, in Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvory v 50 tomakh*, 6: 292–99, 596–98. See also *Narysy z istorii Drohobycha vid naidavnishykh chasiv do pochatku XXI stolittia*, ed. L. Tymoshenko (Drohobych, 2009).

60. See, for instance, O. Levitskii, 'O semeinykh otnosheniakh v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi v XVI–XVII vv.,' *Russkaia starina* 11 (1880): 549–74; idem, 'Iuzhnorusskaia zhenshchina v XVI–XVII vv.,' in *Illustrirovanyi sbornik Kievskogo literaturno-artisticheskogo obshchestva* (Kyiv, 1990), pp. 108–122; idem, *Cherty semeinogo byta v Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi v XVI–XVII vv.* (Kyiv, 1909) (= 'Predislovie,' *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, pt. 8, vol. 3); O. Levytskyi, 'Nevinchani shliuby na Ukraïni v XVI–XVII st.,' *Zapysky Ukraïns'koho naukovoho tovarystva v Kyïevi* 3 (1909): 98–108.

was allotted to marriage and marital relations. Hrushevsky, following Levytsky, idealized the institution of marriage in the Ukrainian lands; for instance, he cited a woman's supposed freedom to choose a marriage partner as being guaranteed by the Lithuanian Statute. Natalia Starchenko, a contemporary historian of gender relations, notes the actual absence of voluntary choice in the marrying off of girls and women in nobiliary society.⁶¹

In surveying cultural relations, Hrushevsky writes about the weak development of schooling and desultory study of manuscript books in Cyrillic. Ruthenian bookmen modeled their literary works on those of their Slavic neighbors, the Serbs and Bulgarians, as translations of a modest number of their liturgical and secular manuscript books began to appear in Rus'. Local 'learned men' occupied themselves with a medieval style of editing and compiling imported manuscripts, such as the 'Emeralds' (collections of moralistic writings and proverbs), 'Homiliary Gospels,' and the like. Hrushevsky attributed the relative paucity of creative literary work to the absence prior to the 1580s of a broad religious movement that could have stimulated such activity. Only in the 1580s did polemical works begin to appear in Ukrainian letters, in reaction to the religious developments preceding and following the Union of Brest. Until then, cultural and national activists defended the rights and needs of the Orthodox Church not with polemical treatises but with petitions, fabrications of charters supposedly granted by Prince Lev Danylovych, pseudo-Old Rus' 'Scrolls of Iaroslav,' and apocryphal annotations on the Gospels recording grants and donations to church institutions.⁶²

Many topics of literary and historical development in the Lithuanian-Polish period that are presented by Hrushevsky in volume 6 of his *History of Ukraine-Rus'* were subsequently reworked and amplified in his multivolume study of Ukrainian literature published in the 1920s.⁶³ In that synthesizing work the historian included within the Ukrainian cultural context, in addition to a second wave of South Slavic influence⁶⁴ and the impact of the 'Judaizers,'⁶⁵ echoes of the Bogomil movement, the Western penitence movement, and, in particular, the Czech national and religious movement known as Hussitism.⁶⁶

In contrast to literature, art did not undergo any significant innovations at the end of the sixteenth century in the Ukrainian lands but continued to evolve gradually under the influence of preceding tendencies. According to Hrushevsky, this artistic production was 'wholly

61. N. Starchenko, 'Mizh cholovichym dyskursom i sotsial'nymy praktykamy: Mistse zhinky v shliakhets'komu sotsiumi. Volyn' kintsia XVI st.,' in *Chetvertyi mizhnarodnyi konhres ukrainistiv, 26–29 chervnia 1999 r.: Dopovid ta povidomlennia. Istorii*, vol. 1 (Odesa, Kyiv, and Lviv, 1999), pp. 137–43; idem, 'Shliubna stratehiia vdiv i kil'ka problem navkolo nei: Shliakhets'ka Volyn' kintsia XVI st.,' *Kyiv's'ka starovyna*, 2000, no. 6: 58–74; 2001; no. 1: 42–63.

62. Hrushevsky noted the semiapocryphal nature of these Gospel annotations and cast doubt on their authenticity (pp. 278–79). Yet in 1607 the Commonwealth's Diet resolved to regard these annotations as fundaments of the church, albeit with certain limitations. See: *Volumina Legum*, ed. J. Ohryzko, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1859), p. 439.

63. Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi, *Istorii ukrains'koi literatury*, vols. 1–3 (Lviv, 1923), vol. 4 (Kyiv, 1925), vol. 5, pt. 1 (Kyiv, 1926); vol. 6 was recovered and published in the mid-1990s.

64. Present-day conceptualizations of Ukrainian literature in the late medieval period are presented in Iu. Peleshenko, *Ukrains'ka literatura pizn'oho seredn'ovichchia: Druha polovyna XIII–XV st. Dzherela, systema zhanriv, dukhovni intentsii* (Kyiv, 2004).

65. In historiography a heated debate has developed about the actual character of the 'Judaizer' movement and its leader Zacharia, who came from Kyiv. See M. Taube, 'The Kievan Jew Zacharia and the Astronomical Works of the Judaizers,' *Jews and Slavs* 3 (1995): 168–98.

66. See Hrushevsky's subsequently written article devoted to the influence of Hussitism: 'Vplyvy ches'koho natsional'noho rukhu XIV–XV st. v ukrains'komu zhyttii i tvorchosti iak problemy doslidu,' *ZNTSh*, nos. 141–43 (1925): 1–13. For a modern-day study of the topic, see S. Bylina, 'Les influences hussites en Pologne et sur les territoires ethniquement russiens du grand-duché de Lithuanie,' *Ricerche slavistiche* 41 (1994): 163–77.

incapable of rising above the level of apprenticeship or feeble imitation of foreign master craftsmanship For them entry into guilds was made difficult or even completely closed, so that training at home posed many obstacles' (p. 289). The guild system, obliged to stretch so as to include goldsmiths, painters, and representatives of other artistic professions, had a negative effect on the intensity of artistic life. In general, Hrushevsky seriously criticizes the guild organization, which under specific economic conditions began to deteriorate quite rapidly. Guild membership did not guarantee the new entrant schooling or the artisan more extensive recognition. Also, for instance, Lviv had both painters' and goldsmiths' guilds, but membership in them was prohibited to Ukrainians. Hrushevsky associated the spread of Western artistic models of painting within the Ukrainian lands with the activity of craft guilds and craftsmen's travels to the West (p. 292).

Having fallen under the sway of Western influences, Ukrainian artists—jewelers, painters, goldwork embroiderers, architects—nonetheless showed their mastery in original features that combined those influences with local artistic traditions. In Hrushevsky's view, Polish art frequently produced mechanical and rote copies of Western models, even when these items were technically more accomplished than Ukrainian-produced ones. For that reason he placed Ukrainian artistic production on a higher level than book printing, which blindly followed the dictates of the West. In doing so, Hrushevsky noted the frescoes of Ruthenian artists in the Sandomierz Cathedral and the Holy Cross Chapel of Wawel Castle in Cracow, funded by the Polish kings, as examples of the illustrious accomplishments of Ukrainians.⁶⁷

Ukrainian art, with its union of Eastern and Western influences,⁶⁸ was highly regarded by contemporaries. Hrushevsky cited the enthusiastic response of the Syrian traveler Paul of Aleppo to the new icons created in eastern Ukraine during the Khmelnytsky period (p. 295). Another example of the synthesis between East and West in artistic style was the famed sculpture in the Dormition Cathedral of the Kyivan Monastery of the Caves that was the tombstone of Prince Kostiantyn Ostrozky.⁶⁹ In the Ukrainian lands Armenians were the conveyers of models of authentic Eastern—that is, Turkic and Persian—goldwork embroidery, weaving, rug-making, and the ornamentation of military goods such as swords, sabers, belts, and horse harnesses, superimposed on Byzantine and Old Rus' artistic techniques. In the Lithuanian-Polish period the church music tradition derived from Old Rus' was modified by cross-contacts with Greek (Athonite), Serbian, Bulgarian, and Western models.⁷⁰ According to Hrushevsky, later in the seventeenth century the new musical

67. Modern scholars have confirmed the Ruthenian provenance of frescoes in the Wiślica collegiate church and the Holy Trinity Chapel of Lublin Castle. See: M. Walicki, 'Malowidła ścienne kościoła św. Trójcy na zamku w Lublinie 1418 r.,' *Studia do Dziejów Sztuki w Polsce* (Warsaw) 3 (1930): 1–89; A. Różycka-Bryzek, 'Bizantyńsko-ruskie malowidła ścienne w kolegiacie wiślickiej,' *Folia Historiae Artium* (Cracow) 2 (1965): 47–82; idem, 'Bizantyńsko-ruskie malowidła ścienne w kaplicy Świętokrzyskiej na Wawelu,' *Studia do Dziejów Wawelu* (Cracow) 3 (1968): 175–287; idem, *Bizantyńsko-ruskie malowidła w kaplicy zamku lubelskiego* (Warsaw, 1983); idem, *Freski bizantyńsko-ruskie fundacji Jagielly w kaplicy zamku lubelskiego* (Lublin, 2000).

68. In his publications the Ukrainian art historian Volodymyr Aleksandrovych details the progressive evolution of church painting in the context of Western influences of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. He analyzes specific works, their creators, and the network of professional centers existing at the time. See V. Aleksandrovych, 'Ukraïns'ka mystets'ka kul'tura XVI st.: Pershi kroky do zakhidnoievropeis'koï tradytsii,' in *Dialoh kul'tur: Materialy Pershykh naukovykh chytan' pam'iaty Dmytra Chyzhevs'koho. Kirovohrad–Kyiv, 17–19 zhovtnia 1994 r.* (Kyiv, 1996), pp. 99–109, and idem, *Zakhidnoukraïns'ki maliari XVI st.: Shliakhy rozvytku profesiinoho seredovyshcha* (Lviv, 2000).

69. For more on this sculpture, see O. Sydor-Hybelynda, 'Nadhbrobok kniazia Kostiantyna Ostroz'koho v Uspens'komu sobori Kyievo-Pechers'koï Lavry,' *ZNTSh* 236 (1998): 279–93.

70. Among later and more detailed studies, see M. Antonovitsch (Antonovych), *Ukrainische geistliche Musik: Ein Beitrag zur Kirchenmusik Osteuropas* (Munich, 1990); N. Gerasimowa-Persidskaia, 'Die ukrainische Kultur und Musik im 16. und

‘chants’ and polyphonic ‘part’ singing in harmony that developed in the Ukrainian lands spread as far as Muscovy.⁷¹

Hrushevsky closed his summary of the national and cultural ‘balance’ of the Ukrainian lands with a brief description of the everyday lives of the Ukrainian and Polish nobility. His overall evaluation of the highest social levels of the time was not at all flattering: he found it characterized by ‘material luxury, extravagance, and vanity’ and a nearly total lack of any deeper cultural interests. Other than documents of record, such as wills, property titles, and the like, Hrushevsky based his critique of the social defects of the time on the polemical invectives of both Ukrainian and Polish writers, such as Ivan Vyshensky and Mikołaj Rej, as well as the works of west European authors, among them the papal nuncio Giulio Ruggieri and the cartographer and engineer Guillaume Le Vasseur de Beauplan. From the standpoint of his populist worldview, Hrushevsky passed judgment on the antithesis between ‘the nobles’ paradise and the villeins’ hell’ that overlay the national and cultural and religious divides (pp. 319–20).

The Cultural and National Movement and the Religious Polemics of the Sixteenth to Early Seventeenth Centuries

In Hrushevsky's view of things, sixteenth-century Poland experienced a ‘golden period’ in cultural development. The humanistic breath of the European Renaissance and, simultaneously, the Reformation reached the Polish lands and bore fruit. Literature in particular experienced a cultural and social renaissance: shedding the shackles of scholastic Latin, it turned to developing the Polish vernacular, which had been neglected to that time. In the mid-sixteenth century there began to evolve in Polish nobiliary society a broad social movement aimed at ‘fixing’ the state, that is, at battling the abuse of authority by the king and the magnates. Marvelous exemplars of prose with social and political content began to appear in Latin and Polish, written by Stanisław Orzechowski (Stanislav Orikhovskyy), Mikołaj Rej, and others. At this same time, ideas of religious reform initiated by the sermons of Martin Luther began to enter Poland from the neighboring German lands; they had broad appeal in social and spiritual life and literature as well. From the latter half of the sixteenth century, Reformation ideas spread on a massive scale through the Polish and Lithuanian lands, taking hold first in the most prominent magnate and nobiliary families (p. 324).

This sociocultural and spiritual movement had resonance in the Ukrainian lands, yet in Hrushevsky's view that resonance was more negative than positive. For an extended time, in the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries, Polish culture held no particular attraction for Ukrainians. Hrushevsky altogether rejects the idea of Poland's ‘cultural mission’ in the Ukrainian lands. Indeed, he regarded Poland at that time as a ‘backwater, or hinterland, of western Europe.’ The Polish element had primacy over the Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) on account

17. Jahrhunderts,’ in *Altrussische Musik: Einführung in ihre Geschichte und Probleme*, Grazer musikwissenschaftliche Arbeiten, 10 (Graz, 1993), pp. 125–32; Iu. Iasynovs'kyi, *Ukraïns'ki ta bilorus'ki notoliniini irmoloï XVI–XVIII st.: Kataloh i kodykologichno-paleohrafichne doslidzhennia* (Lviv, 1996); A. Rabus, ‘Geistliche Gesänge des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in Polen-Litauen als Zeugnisse interkultureller Kommunikation,’ in *Lithuania and Ruthenia: Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)*, ed. S. Rohdewald, D. Frick, and S. Wiederkehr (Wiesbaden, 2007), pp. 331–49.

71. On the evolution of choral art and singing, see: O. Tsalai-Iakymenko, ‘Vzaiemodiia “Skhid–Zakhid” i Beresteis'ka uniiia v stanovlenni muzychnoho baroko v Ukraïni,’ in *Beresteis'ka uniiia i ukraïns'ka kul'tura XVII st.*, ed. B. Gudziak and O. Turii (Lviv, 1996), pp. 65–127; idem, *Dukhovni spivy davn'oi Ukraïny* (Kyiv, 2000).

of its 'physical' strength as a state and 'protected position.' Ukrainians had the feeling that standing behind them was a 'phalanx' of the Rus' princes and magnates, which Hrushevsky called 'a "slumbering host" that even in the midst of political and cultural stagnation still dreamt of the glorious days of old and maintained the proud conviction that their nobility and glory would prevent anyone from assuming preeminence over them' (p. 321).⁷²

In contrast to Hrushevsky's view, the modern-day historian, Byzantinist, and Slavist Ihor Ševčenko has proposed that Poland had positive significance for cultural development in the Ukrainian lands, writing that 'for Ukrainians Poland became the window to the West.'⁷³ During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Ukrainian writers and polemicists often made use of the Polish chronicles and wrote in good literary Polish, while struggling against Polish influences. In Ševčenko's view, without Polish as an intermediary the Ukrainian elite would not have been able to access the accomplishments of Western culture, particularly in the Reformation and Baroque periods. Scholars today do not support Hrushevsky's other discursive assertion of the weak resonance of Reformation tendencies in the Ukrainian lands (pp. 327–28).⁷⁴ In his later works Hrushevsky did accept Drahomanov's view of the positive reception of Protestant movements in the Ukrainian lands, though he still expressed regret that there had not been a 'serious Reformation movement' fostering the development of critical views and progressive ideas in Ukrainian society in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.⁷⁵ Among the positive results of Reformation influences, Hrushevsky dwelled in particular on translations into the vernacular of the Bible and religious teachings. Curiously, though, in dealing with publications of the Bible by Frantsysk Skaryna in the first decades of the sixteenth century, Hrushevsky does not point to any evidence of Reformation influences (in his forewords to biblical texts, for instance) in the works of that famed printer of Polatsk.⁷⁶

In the second half of the sixteenth century, following the Council of Trent, other waves of change began to flow over Ukraine, namely, Catholic reforms and Counter-Reformation influences. Hrushevsky wrote about the ready groundwork for the acceptance of Western

72. Natalia Iakovenko, following in the historiographic tradition founded by Hrushevsky, writes that after the loss of statehood in the Old Rus' period, the princely stratum of Ukraine-Rus' 'symbolized the concept of political independence (as understood at the time).' See N. Iakovenko, *Ukraïns'ka shliakhta z kintsia XIV do seredyny XVII st.: Volyn' i Tsentral'na Ukraïna*, 2d rev. ed. (Kyiv, 2008), p. 85.

73. I. Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West: Essays in Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century* (Edmonton, 1996), p. 119 (a Ukrainian translation, *Ukraïna mizh Shkhodom i Zakhodom: Narysy z istorii kul'tury do pochatku XVIII stolittia*, appeared in Lviv in 2001).

74. On widespread reverberations of the ideas of the Reformation in the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands, see: G. Williams, 'Protestants in the Ukraine during the Period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2, no. 1 (1978): 41–72; no. 2 (1978): 184–210; M. Dmitriev, *Pravoslavie i reformatsiia: Reformatsionnye dvizheniia v vostochnoslavianskikh zemliakh Rechi Pospolitoi vo vtoroi polovine XVI v.* (Moscow, 1990); V. Liubashchenko, *Istoriia protestantyzmu v Ukraïni* (Lviv, 1995); V. Zema, 'Prychynok do pravoslavnoi polemiky doby Kontreformatsii,' *Kovcheh* 5 (2007): 73–99. In this context, Valerii Zema in his most recent publication rejects the Russian scholar Mikhail Dmitriev's idea that sixteenth-century Russian 'free-thinkers' like Feodosii Kosoi had considerable influence on Belarusian-Ukrainian social consciousness (*ibid.*, pp. 79–82).

75. In his later work *Z istorii relihiinoi dumky na Ukraïni* (Lviv, 1925), Hrushevsky presented the effects of the Reformation on the Ukrainian lands more clearly; for instance, he included brotherhoods in his analysis. This shift may be ascribed to the solicited nature of the publication, which was organized by Vasyl Kuziv, pastor of a Ukrainian Protestant church. For more on this, see: L. Bykovs'kyi, *Vasyl' Kuziv i Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Vzaiemovidnosny, 1921–1927* (Winnipeg, 1968); I. Hyrych, 'Lysty M. Hrushevs'koho do Vasyliia Kuziva,' *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk* 32, nos. 1–2 (1995): 199–203.

76. For literature on the publishing activity of Frantsysk Skaryna, see V. Tumash, *Five Centuries of Skoriniana, XVI–XX*, Byelorussian Academy of Arts and Sciences Bibliographic Series, 3 (New York, 1989).

culture within Ukrainian society that accompanied the establishment of the first Jesuit collegiums. Nobiliary society pragmatically recognized the need for Latin-Polish education as it faced the new realities that emerged after the Union of Lublin. Social and cultural expectations were such that every 'decent' citizen of the Commonwealth was obliged to know Latin in order to obtain the 'stamp' of an educated person. The first Jesuit schools appeared in Vilnius and Iaroslav at the turn of 1569–70, and they quickly became the most prestigious educational institutions there. Later, in the first half of the seventeenth century, the Jesuits established a far-flung network of schools and collegiums in Ukraine, including ones in Lutsk, Lviv, Kamianets, Vinnytsia, and Bar.⁷⁷ In general Hrushevsky responded critically to these Jesuit influences, regarding them as 'not positive' ones, which in education, in particular, did not lead to the development of spiritual values but to a superficial form of academic scholasticism (pp. 349–50).

Paralleling the spread of Jesuit schooling was the initial missionary work of the Society of Jesus among the Orthodox population of the Commonwealth, beginning with the written word. The polemical works of Piotr Skarga and Benedykt Herbest were extremely harsh and often disdainful of the Rus' Church and its faithful. Of the Jesuit polemicists Hrushevsky writes that their 'sharp attacks and contemptuous treatment of the Orthodox faith and the Rus' nation made the blood of every more conscious person boil and demanded a response, a defense, a revanche' (p. 356). In 1583–84, the issue of adopting the Gregorian calendar in the Orthodox lands of the Commonwealth prompted, as Hrushevsky put it, the first combative reaction and revitalization among the Orthodox, not only in original polemical literature but also within broad circles of society, that is, among the nobility and the burghers. It was in the 1580s that polemical works like Herasym Smotrytsky's *Key to the Kingdom of Heaven* (*Kliuch tsarstvii nebesnoho*) and Vasyl Surazky of Ostrih's *Booklet: On the One True Orthodox Faith* (*Knyzhytsa: O iedynoi ystynnoi pravoslavnoi v'ir'i*) appeared. In 1580–81 the printer Ivan Fedorov published a Slavonic translation of the Bible,⁷⁸ the work of a collective in Ostrih led by Herasym Smotrytsky, thus signaling the founding of a new center of learning—the Ostrih Academy.⁷⁹ Hrushevsky described the literary and publishing activity of the eminent members of that collective: besides Smotrytsky and Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky, they included Khrystofor Filalet and the Cleric of Ostrih. But before much time had passed, after the death of Prince Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky in 1608,⁸⁰ followed by that of his

77. For specific information about Jesuit schooling in a work based in part on Vatican archives of the Society of Jesus that were inaccessible to Hrushevsky, see: T. Shevchenko, *Jezuïts'ke shkyl'nytstvo na Ukraïns'kykh zemliakh ostann'oi chverty XVI–seređyny XVII st.* (Lviv, 2005); K. Puchowski, *Jezuickie kolegia Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów: Studium z dziejów edukacji elit* (Gdańsk, 2007).

78. On this masterpiece of publishing activity and editorial erudition, see: R. Mathiesen, 'The Making of the Ostrih Bible,' *Harvard Library Bulletin* 29 (1981): 71–110; G. Freidhof, *Vergleichende sprachliche Studien zur Gennadius-Bibel (1499) und Ostroger-Bibel (1580/81)*, Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik, 21 (Frankfurt am Main, 1972). See also a recent edition of the Ukrainian translation of the Ostrih Bible published together with a facsimile of the sixteenth-century monument: *Ostroz'ka Bibliia*, ed. and trans. by Hieromonk and Archimandrite Rafail (R. Torkoniak) (Lviv, 2006).

79. On the Ostrih collective and its publishing and educational activity, see: I. Myts'ko, *Ostroz'ka slov'iano-latyns'ka akademiia (1576–1636)* (Kyiv, 1990). An updated survey of the literature on this theme appears in B. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998; a revised and expanded Ukrainian translation, titled *Kryza i reforma: Kyïvs'ka mytropoliia, Tsarhorods'kyi patriarkhat i heneza Beresteis'koi unii*, appeared in Lviv in 2000).

80. Hrushevsky judged Prince Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky quite severely as a person who was indecisive, uncertain about his capabilities, and lacking in initiative and energy. More recent works view the prince from different perspectives. See: T. Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrozki (ok. 1524/1525–1608), wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi Wołyńskiej* (Toruń,

son Janusz [Ianush] in 1620, this publishing activity withered away, and in 1636 the Ostrih Academy itself ceased to function (the prince's granddaughter opened a Jesuit collegium there) (pp. 384–85).

In Hrushevsky's view, the call of Western civilization, in the form of Reformation and, later, Counter-Reformation influences, and the direct, frequently confrontational contact with ideas presented in brilliant polemical form prompted two contradictory responses in Ukrainian sociocultural thought: the conservative and the progressive. On the one hand, an instinct for national self-preservation fostered a conservation of old religious practices and the traditions of the Orthodox Church, not allowing the cultural movement of the time to develop reformist forms. On the other hand, Ukrainian social consciousness regarded education and scholarship highly, as a means of emerging from its deep cultural and spiritual crisis.⁸¹ These tendencies were best represented by Ivan Vyshensky, the ascetic and monk of Mt. Athos, and by the unknown member of the Lviv Brotherhood who wrote the *Warning (Perestoroĥa)*, which Hrushevsky cites extensively (pp. 366–67). In the first half of the seventeenth century, particularly in the time of Metropolitan Petro Mohyla, the 'progressive' tendency won, as Ukrainian society acknowledged the need to foster schooling on the new foundation of Western scholarship. Nonetheless, Hrushevsky criticized the Kyiv Mohyla school and collegium established by the metropolitan for a lack of true learning and for practicing a rudimentary scholarly bookishness that blindly copied Western models (pp. 369–70).

According to Hrushevsky, the height of the Ukrainian national and cultural movement of the sixteenth century was the self-organization of a 'third estate,' namely, burgherdom. The burghers succeeded in lifting national and cultural awareness to a higher level and in creating an original form of lay brotherhoods. Hrushevsky saw progenitors of the brotherhoods in the tribal society of pre-Christian times, which had developed the basis of brotherhood organization. A dearth of documentary sources prevented him from substantiating this view, however; it is also the reason that his general theory skips over many historical periods.⁸² In Hrushevsky's view, the granting of true stauropegial status to the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood in 1586 constituted a reform of the brotherhood organization that expanded the scope of its activities from the ecclesiastical and charitable to the educational, publishing, and sociopolitical; also, it was a development dictated by the needs of the time. Still, a 'pronounced ecclesiasticism and conservatism' defined the brotherhood from the very beginnings of the reform process, that is, from the end of the sixteenth century. In explaining the motivation behind this, Hrushevsky wrote: 'The circumstances of the moment channeled all the energy and strength of the brotherhood organization into the narrow limits of religious polemics and defense of the rights and traditions of the Orthodox faith. The harsh struggle that had to be waged for the religion exhausted its capabilities and energy' (p. 416). And once the rights of the Orthodox Church were defended, the brotherhoods played no important role. Hrushevsky detected yet another problem with the reformed brotherhoods: the ability their members acquired to control priests and even bishops. On the one hand, that acquired control

1997); K. Jaworska, 'Książę Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogi wojewoda Kijowski a unia brzeska,' *Drohobyt's'kyi kraiezhavchyi zbirnyk* 4 (2000): 83–95. See also the recently published literature cited in the editor's addition to Hrushevsky's bibliographic Note 12 (pp. 504–5).

81. Hrushevsky writes in detail about the condition and crisis of the Orthodox Church during that time in volume 5, chapter 6 of his *History* (Ukr. 5: 488–503).

82. The views of Oleksandra Iefymenko (1848–1918) had a certain impact on Hrushevsky's 'tribal' theory. See my 'Istoriografiiia L'vivs'koho Uspens'koho bratstva,' *Ukraïna v mynulomu*, 1992, no. 1: 65.

weakened the brotherhoods' cultural and educational initiatives because conflicts developed, particularly in Lviv, while, on the other, it propelled 'Orthodox bishops onto the Uniate path.'⁸³

Hrushevsky continually touched upon religious matters on the pages of his volume 6, in his discussions of art, literature, education, and everyday life in the Ukrainian lands. In the Lithuanian-Polish era, he said, people continued to observe the traditions of a godly religious life that were followed in princely times in order to satisfy their own personal needs. Ruthenian princes and princesses continued to found and support Orthodox churches and monasteries, and in their later years many took up monastic life, which was considered a prestigious act of devotion (pp.243–44). Religious life remained the domain of a person's own inner spiritual world, whereas religiosity was public and daily testimony of his worldview. Still, the changing political, social, and cultural conditions of the time did not create fertile ground for the development of the Orthodox Church, which in the Lithuanian-Polish state lost the primary and dominant status it had had in the princely era. Of the Orthodox Church Hrushevsky insightfully writes: 'Beyond comfort in matters of conscience—fostering "man's peace with God," to quote one Ukrainian theologian—it could to some measure satisfy an individual's national sentiment. Yet even as it provided opportunity to demonstrate personal allegiance to one's own national tradition, awareness of the sociopolitical abasement and cultural inferiority of this national church (which, in fact, served as the sole national symbol) made it a chronically painful wound to national ambition and consciousness' (p. 258). In general, the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were a period of cultural and educational decline and weakening of the Orthodox Church, which became especially evident in the spread of Reformation and Counter-Reformation ideas. The openly anti-Orthodox and pro-Uniate propaganda of the newly established Jesuit centers forced Ruthenian bishops and Orthodox social consciousness to seek a way out of this difficult situation.

In volume 5 of his *History*, Hrushevsky described the course of events leading up to and following the Union of Brest, including preparations, negotiations, and the competing demands of the Uniates and Orthodox. In volume 6, he deals in detail with the polemical literature as well as the battle in politics and at the Diet over Uniate ideas in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Some scholars have pointed out that Hrushevsky assessed the Union of Brest in terms of the successes or failures of the Ukrainian cultural and national movement of those two centuries. He believed that the Union created a division among the Orthodox, causing them to reorient and expend their cultural and spiritual energy on a battle within their own ranks.⁸⁴ At a time when the Ukrainian cultural and national movement was ascending, religion and the church should have stood as consolidating factors. But the opposite happened: a deep chasm appeared, and 'two Rus' were created. For a long time afterwards, they could find no common language in the midst of the thunder of mutual polemical invectives.⁸⁵

83. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*; Ia. Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton and Toronto, 2006). See also two other recently published monographs: B. Lorens, *Bractwa cierkiewne w eparchii przemyskiej w XVII i XVIII wieku* (Rzeszów, 2005); and S. Lukasheva, *Miriane i tserkov': Religioznye bratstva kievskoi mitropolii v kontse XVI veka* (Moscow, 2006).

84. L. Tymoshenko, 'Beresteis'ka uniiia v otsyntsi Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 33, nos. 1–4 (1996): 195, 197–98. However, Hrushevsky makes no such harsh assessment of the Union and the Uniate Church in writing of the cultural and national initiatives of the Uniate clergy and its role in the national rebirth of the nineteenth century. See Hrushevsky, *Tvory v 50 tomakh*, 9 (2009): 233–38.

85. The Ukrainian historian Iaroslav Dashkevych assessed the Union similarly from the viewpoint of the national interest

Immediately following the synods of 1596 in Brest, both the Uniate and the Orthodox sides began an animated religious polemic conducted by their foremost literary and religious authorities. On the Orthodox side were, among others, 'Khrystofor Filalet' (a pseudonym for Marcin Broniewski, in fact probably a Protestant), and Ivan Vyshensky; on the Latin and Uniate side were Piotr Skarga and Ipatii Potii. Hrushevsky presents both sides of the argument with scholarly dispassion and objectivity, endeavoring not to sympathize with one side or the other.⁸⁶ Waged along with the literary polemic was an actual political battle over the Union at the local nobiliary dietines and the Diet of the Commonwealth, in the form of judicial decisions and threats of use of force. At the close of the sixteenth century Orthodox circles led by Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky even entered into an alliance with the Protestants, so as to create a single anti-Catholic camp and jointly defend the interests of both confessions by political means.⁸⁷ As stated by Leonid Tymoshenko, Hrushevsky generally depicts the religious confrontation as a battle against the Union, though at the time there was as yet insufficient source material available for scholarly use to support that depiction. Also, though the religious impulse at the end of the sixteenth century did cause confessional divides in Ukrainian society, it also called forth a remarkable surge in national consciousness and gave the Cossack movement in Ukraine a cultural and religious character. About Ukrainian Cossackdom itself, the phenomenon that opened a new page in national life, Hrushevsky would speak in detail in the subsequent, seventh volume of his *History*.

After Volume Six of the History: Twentieth-Century Historiography on the Lithuanian-Polish Era

After volume 6 of the *History* appeared in print, Hrushevsky published two popular works based on it, one dealing with economic themes⁸⁸ and the other with cultural and national

and groups within Ukrainian society: see Ia. Dashkevych, 'Uniia ukraïntsiv ta uniia virmeniv: Porivnial'ni aspekty,' in *Beresteis'ka uniia (1596–1996): Statti i materialy*, ed. M. Haikov's'kyi, V. Haiuk, O. Hryniv, Ia. Dashkevych et al. (Lviv, 1996), pp. 74–86. From the historical perspective, however, one can point to positive aspects of the Union of Brest for Ukrainian national identity. For one thing, it halted the eastward flow of Polish Catholicism; also, when the Cossack Hetmanate fell under the control of the Russian state, Catholics of the Eastern Rite became a bulwark against the assimilation of Ukrainians by Orthodox Russians.

86. Today other scholars maintain that he tended to side with the Orthodox: see Tymoshenko, 'Beresteis'ka uniia v otsyntsi Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' p. 197. Tymoshenko says, among other things, that Hrushevsky indicates that Ipatii Potii's argumentation was weaker than Khrystofor Filalet's; that he presents an account of the 'murderous' invective of Ivan Vyshensky against the Union and bishops; that he is less apt to note the justness of the Uniates' stand; and that he does not distinguish between the interests and goals of the Latins and the Ruthenian Uniates. Another scholar who speaks of the historian's lack of objectivity in evaluating the Union is Isydyr Patrylo: see his 'Vidobrazhennia tserkovnoho zhyttia v Istorii Ukraïny-Rusy Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho i suchasni istoriohrafichni doslidzhennia,' in *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' i materialiv Mizhnarodnoi iuvileinoi konferentsii, prysviachenoï 125-ii richnytsi vid dnia narodzhennia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho* (Lviv, 1994), pp. 178–79.

87. For more specific information about this, see: D. Oljančyn, 'Zur Frage der Generalföderation zwischen Protestanten und Orthodoxen in Wilna 1599,' *Kyrios* (Königsberg) 1 (1936): 29–46; L. Jarmański, *Bez użycia siły: Działalność polityczna protestantów w Rzeczypospolitej u schyłku XVI wieku* (Warsaw, 1992); T. Kempa, *Wobec kontrreformacji: Protestanci i prawosławni w obronie swobód wyznaniowych w Rzeczypospolitej w końcu XVI i w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku* (Toruń, 2007).

88. M. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Studii z ekonomichnoi istorii Ukraïny,' *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (Kyiv and Lviv) (hereafter *LNV*), 1907, no. 38: 225–37, 414–28; no. 39: 43–61, 265–83; no. 40: 24–38. This lengthy article on economic development in the Ukrainian lands in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is an abridged version (without references) of passages excerpted from volume 6 of the *History* (pp. 141–209). A second edition appeared in an anthology similarly titled *Studii z ekonomichnoi istorii Ukraïny* (Kyiv, 1918), which contained an additional article: 'Hospodarstvo pol'skoho magnata na Zadniprov'iu pered Khmel'nychchynoiu,' *ZUNT*, 1908, no. 1: 25–43.

ones.⁸⁹ Whereas Hrushevsky's socioeconomic views remained unchanged, the scholar's conception of the cultural and national movement of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not in final form. At the time he was completing volume 6, that conception seemed to be in flux: the first evidence of this was the changing chronological boundaries of that movement in his later works. In his treatment of the brotherhood movement Hrushevsky opted not to proceed beyond the sixteenth century. But not long afterwards, he reconsidered and reformulated this conception in a popular edition of essays, presented as lectures in Kyiv in 1908 and published that same year in a series titled 'The Cultural and National Movement in Ukraine in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century.'⁹⁰ Added to their republication in 1912, under the revised title *The Cultural and National Movement in Ukraine from the Sixteenth to the Seventeenth Century*, were four essays that went beyond the sixteenth century: 'Cossackdom in Defense of Church Affairs,' 'The Transference of Cultural Matters to Kyiv,' 'The Kyiv Brotherhood and the Organization of National Forces,' and 'The New Hierarchy.'⁹¹ These were based on his new, seventh volume of the *History*. The endpoint of the cultural and national movement in this work was 1620, the year when the Orthodox hierarchy was re-established and the Cossacks actively joined the national cause. In writing his *History of Ukrainian Literature*, Hrushevsky gave the fifth volume the added title *Cultural and Literary Currents in Ukraine during the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries and the First Rebirth (1580–1610)*; previously, he had reserved use of the term 'rebirth' (*vidrodzhennia*) to the nineteenth century.⁹² About that rebirth, he wrote: '[It] became not so much the start as the herald of the coming actual rebirth...the two centuries that separate the first rebirth from the new, true rebirth of the nineteenth century differ fundamentally and deeply from the two centuries before the first rebirth [in the sixteenth century]. From the broader perspective, placing the Kyivan-Galician era on one side, and the nineteenth century on the other, this whole intervening period... emerges as a transitional time...'⁹³ This generalization regarding culture in the transitional era also had an effect on Hrushevsky's scheme of periodization. He does not clearly identify specific criteria that would allow classification of the cultural and religious situation in Ukraine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Instead, he examines historical and cultural events, social and economic relations, and national and religious processes in syncretic fashion, as mutually dependent phenomena that influenced one another.

89. M. Hrushevskyi, 'Kul'turno-natsional'nyi rukh na Ukraïni v druhii polovyni XVI viku,' *LNV*, 1908, no. 41: 282–96, 491–506; no. 42: 87–107, 438–58; no. 43: 208–28, 428–50.

90. As in n. 89. A revised version of the work, titled *Kul'turno-natsional'nyi rukh na Ukraïni v XVI–XVII vitsi*, was published in Lviv in 1912; it was republished in Kyiv in 1919. This last edition was reprinted in Kyiv in 1994, in the anthology *Dukhovna Ukraïna: Zbirka tvoriv*, ed. I. Hyrych, O. Dziuba, and V. Ulianov'skyi. Hrushevsky himself commented on the work's publication history (*Dukhovna Ukraïna*, p. 138n.).

91. 'Kozachchyna v oboroni tserkovnoi spravy'; 'Perenesennia kul'turnoi spravy do Kyieva'; 'Kyïvs'ke bratstvo i orhanizatsiia natsional'nykh syl'; and 'Nova ierarhiia.'

92. This was Hrushevsky's usage, for instance, in several editions of his popular *Ilustrovana istoriia Ukraïny* (which appeared in 1911, 1912, 1913, 1917, 1918, and 1921).

93. M. Hrushevskyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*, 3d ed., 6 vols. in 9 bks. (Kyiv, 1993–95), 1: 115. Oksana Rybak introduced the new concept of an 'unrealized rebirth' in order to convey Hrushevsky's idea in condensed form: see O. Rybak, 'Mykhailo Hrushevskyi i ioho viziia periodyzatsii istorii ukrains'koi kul'tury,' in *Mykhailo Hrushevskyi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' i materialiv Mizhnarodnoi ùvileinoi konferentsii, prysviachenoi 125-ii richnytsi vid dnia narodzhennia Mykhaila Hrushevskoho* (Lviv, 1994), p. 109. Unacceptable, however, is Rybak's supposition that Hrushevsky emphasized 'the priority of culture over economics and politics' in his works (*ibid.*).

* * *

The Polish scholarly community reacted to Hrushevsky's volumes on the Lithuanian and Polish era with coolness, if not hostility.⁹⁴ Following his arrival in Lviv in 1894 and the appearance of his first works as the nineteenth century was drawing to a close, Polish historians responded sympathetically in critiques and reviews to his initial writings, geared to promoting scholarly discussion.⁹⁵ But quite soon it became evident that Hrushevsky's relations with the Polish scholarly world had deteriorated. The Polish establishment was aware of his active role in Lviv society and his popular public appearances, which were clearly directed at undermining the dominance of Polish influences in Galicia.⁹⁶ In 1908, the Polish historian of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania Ludwik Kolankowski (1882–1956), having surveyed the sociopolitical views expressed in Hrushevsky's publicistic cycle 'The Liberation of Russia and the Ukrainian Question' ('Osvobozhdenie Rossii i ukrainskii vopros'), called him a true Ruthenian and Ukrainian patriot but also, simultaneously, a 'mortal enemy of the Polish nation.'⁹⁷ In 1913, the same Polish scholar wrote a negative review of the Lithuanian-Polish cycle in Hrushevsky's *History*.⁹⁸ Despite the great erudition Hrushevsky displayed in weaving his narrative of Ukrainian history, Kolankowski alleged that there were erroneous interpretations and bias in his work. The Polish reviewer did not accept Hrushevsky's criticism of the 'Polish cultural mission' as a harbinger of the economic and cultural decline of the Ukrainian population. In all the richness of Polish-Ruthenian relations in the Jagellonian period (1385–1572), Kolankowski maintained, Hrushevsky searched out traces of a mutual struggle 'that did not exist.' Also, in Kolankowski's view, the strain in Polish-Ukrainian relations at the beginning of the twentieth century had a negative impact on Hrushevsky's views, for he put the beginnings of Polish-Ruthenian animosity back as far as princely times.⁹⁹

Kolankowski pointed to some factual imprecisions in Hrushevsky's text, for instance, in his interpretation of Andrei Kurbsky's letter to Kostiantyn-Vasyl Ostrozky about the polemical work by the anonymous 'Motovylo.' From the methodological viewpoint, the reviewer found two fundamental errors in the structure of the Lithuanian-Polish volumes of the *History*. The first had to do with not separating Polish and Ukrainian 'local' societies in dealing with cultural processes, as when Hrushevsky without hesitation cites 'our' (the Poles') Mikołaj Rej and, simultaneously, 'their' (the Ruthenians') Ivan Vyshensky. Hrushevsky also appropriates the cultural attainments of Belarusian society in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania,

94. There seems to have been no Russian response to volume 6, for no reviews of it have been found in Russian historical literature. Russian historians were more interested in Hrushevsky's views of Kyivan Rus' and the Cossack era than of the Lithuanian-Polish period in Ukrainian history.

95. See V. Tel'vak, 'Postat' Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho v pol'skii istoriografii (kinets' XIX–XX st.),' *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2006, no. 5: 68–70. There were constructive discussions with such well-known Polish scholars as Oswald Balzer (on the Normanist theory about the origin of Rus') and Antoni Prochaska (on the prohibition against building churches by the Orthodox). See n. 59.

96. See the new edition of Hrushevsky's publicistic works, arranged thematically and chronologically, in the series *Suspil'no-publitsystychni tvory*, which encompasses the first four volumes of the fifty-volume edition of his works (Lviv, 2002–7).

97. L. Kolankowski, 'Pomysly i idee ukrainskie prof. M. Hruszewskiego,' *Świat Słowiński* (Cracow) 4, no. 37 (January 1908): 28.

98. See L. Kolankowski's review of volumes 4 to 6 of Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy* in *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 27, nos. 3–4 (1913): 348–65.

99. Kolankowski's review, p. 357.

including in his survey of the history of Ukraine-Rus' such important Belarusian figures as Frantsysk Skaryna.¹⁰⁰

Following the traditions of Polish historiography, Kolankowski presented a critique of the three most sensitive and significant periods and themes in Ukrainian-Polish relations: Casimir III's conquest of the Galician-Volhynian principality and his attitude toward the Ruthenians, the consequences of the Union of Lublin, and the aftermath of the Union of Brest. Kolankowski disagreed with Hrushevsky's view of the evolution of social, economic, and cultural relations in the Ukrainian lands between the demise of Rus' statehood at the end of the fourteenth century and the economic and cultural rebirth of the second half of the sixteenth century. Kolankowski saw Poland's influence as positive. The turning point in the process was the Union of Lublin, which in his estimation gave 'the eastern Ruthenian provinces the possibility of agrarian development, gave the uninhabited lands people, and the people—bread.'¹⁰¹

In the early twentieth century Polish historians and publicists rejected Hrushevsky's views and works in several waves.¹⁰² Hrushevsky did not actually respond to this criticism; instead, he limited himself to a very critical review of one of Kolankowski's works, on the political activity and life of the prince (later grand duke of Lithuania and king of Poland) Sigismund Augustus to 1548, in a survey of works on the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.¹⁰³ In the review Hrushevsky asserts that the topic 'slipped through Kolankowski's fingers' and that his work did not constitute a full treatment of the subject. By no means, however, did Hrushevsky react negatively to all Polish historiography, even when it did not agree with his views. For instance, in the same survey Hrushevsky made a generally positive assessment of the views of the Polish historian Jan Jakubowski (1874–1938) on national relations in Lithuania prior to the Union of Lublin.¹⁰⁴ In contradiction to the analysis set forth in volumes 5 and 6 of the *History*, Jakubowski endeavored to show that the Lithuanian ethnic element was not numerically weak. He argued that, in fact, in the mid-sixteenth century it embraced nearly half the population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; that by wielding the balance of political power, ethnic Lithuanians also gained cultural preeminence over the Ruthenians; and that their national identity was honed in Lithuanian chronicle-writing. Hrushevsky concluded that Jakubowski's work 'carries the visible mark of the research abilities of the author, and though in coming out against accepted views he does, as frequently happens, bend the rod in the opposite direction, [his] corrections and admonitions will in any case benefit scholarship.'¹⁰⁵

In contrast to Polish historiography, Czech and Ukrainian historiography acclaimed Hrushevsky's work. The noted Czech historian Karl Kadlec, who compared Hrushevsky to the founder of modern Czech historiography, František Palacký, reviewed volume 6 very

100. Kolankowski's review, p. 351.

101. Kolankowski's review, pp. 355–56.

102. See F. Rawita-Gawroński, 'Profesor Hruszewskij i jego Historia Ukrainy-Rusi: Kilka słów, kilka uwag,' *Świat Słowiński* 7 (1911), no. 77 (May): 337–56; J. Kamiński, *Przyczynek do charakterystyki szkoły historycznej prof. Hruszewskiego* (Lviv, 1909); Dr. Czeń (C. Frankiewicz), *Poglądy historyczne prof. M. Hruszewskiego w 'kwestii ukraińskiej' w świetle krytyki naukowej* (Lublin, 1916). For an analysis of this and other works, see also V. Tel'vak, 'Postać Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' pp. 70–73.

103. M. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Noviisha literatura po istoriï V[elykoho] kn[iazivstva] Lytovs'koho: Krytychnyi ohliad,' *Ukrains'kyi naukovyi zbirnyk* (Moscow), 1916, no. 2: 36–39 (reprinted in idem, *Tvory u 50 tomakh*, 8: 299–302).

104. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Noviisha literatura,' pp. 28–32 (reprinted in idem, *Tvory u 50 tomakh*, 8: 292–95). The work reviewed was J. Jakubowski, *Studia nad stosunkami narodowościowymi na Litwie przed Unią Lubelską* (Warsaw, 1913).

105. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Noviisha literatura,' p. 28 (reprinted in idem, *Tvory u 50 tomakh*, 8: 292).

positively,¹⁰⁶ and he described Hrushevsky's work as among 'the most distinguished products of Slavic literature of the last decade.'¹⁰⁷ In Ukrainian historiography, Hrushevsky's views and historical perspective on the Lithuanian-Polish period were accepted unequivocally.¹⁰⁸ Already in 1916, Mykola Vasylenko (1866–1935), in his 'Essays on the Histories of Western Rus' and Ukraine,' supported Hrushevsky's conceptualization.¹⁰⁹ Vasylenko presented data in accord with Hrushevsky's analysis and carried his discussion forward to the mid-seventeenth century, that is, the time of the Khmelnytsky Uprising, while simultaneously paying tribute to the 'statist school' then emerging in Ukrainian historiography. In fashioning a synthesis of Ukrainian history and producing its textbooks, representatives of the statist school—some of them Hrushevsky's students—did not alter the essential tenets of his interpretation of the economic, national, and religio-cultural evolution of the Ukrainian lands in the Lithuanian-Polish period.¹¹⁰

During the 1920s, Hrushevsky oversaw the work of the professorial chairs and institutions that functioned under the umbrella of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Ukraine. He also supervised the work of students who were researching the Lithuanian-Polish era from the same perspective as his own. Oleksander Hrushevsky (1877–1943) and Volodymyr Shcherbyna (1850–1936) continued to work on the economic and urban themes that they had begun to examine before the revolution.¹¹¹ Mykhailo Karachivsky (1899–?) wrote about Kyivan craftsmen's guilds.¹¹² Oleksii Baranovych (1892–1961) wrote about the manorial estate and corvée economy,¹¹³ and Pylyp Klymenko (1887–1955) studied guilds and brotherhoods.¹¹⁴ The 1920s were simultaneously a time when the Marxist interpretation of this period, with its emphasis on a sociological approach and class structure, was being developed and vaunted as an alternative to Hrushevsky's ideas.¹¹⁵ In the 1930s, Hrushevsky's name

106. K. Kadlec, 'Hruševskij M. Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy (6 svazek, Lvov, 1907) a Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes (1 sv. Lipsko, 1906),' *Sbornik věd právnických a státních za účastenství členu české fakulty právnické* 9 (1909): 298–305; idem, 'Mychajlo Hruševskij,' *Slovanský přehled* 1 (1909): 163–67.

107. Kadlec, 'Hruševskij M. Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy,' pp. 301–2.

108. Shortly after volume 6 of the *History* appeared, Ukrainian scholars published several analytical reviews of the study: M. Zaluzniak reviewed the volume in *LNŮ*, 1908, no. 38: 582–85; V. Domanyts'kyi in *Bukovyna* (Chernivtsi, 1908), no. 63: 1–2, and no. 64: 2; S. Tomashivs'kyi in *Dilo* (Lviv), 1908, no. 92: 7.

109. N. Vasilenko (M. Vasylenko), 'Ocherki po istorii Zapadnoi Rusi i Ukrainy,' in idem, *Vybrani tvory u tr'okh tomakh* (Kyiv, 2007), 1: 25.

110. I. Kryp'iakevych, *Korotka istoriia Ukraïny* (Kyiv, 1918); D. Doroshenko, *Narys istorii Ukraïny*, 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1932; an abridged English-language version appeared as *History of Ukraine* in Edmonton in 1939; an updated edition by Oleh Gerus titled *A Survey of Ukrainian History* was published in Winnipeg in 1975); B. Krupnyckij, *Geschichte der Ukraine* (Leipzig, 1939); I. Kryp'iakevych, B. Radzykevych, M. Holubets', S. Charnets'kyi, and V. Barvins'kyi, *Istoriia ukráïns'koï kul'tury* (Lviv, 1937); etc.

111. O. Hrushevs'kyi, 'Luts'ke mishchanstvo v XVI st.,' *Istorychno-heohrafichnyi zbirnyk VUAN* (Kyiv) 1 (1927): 1–12; idem, 'Mishchans'ki pidrakhunky v reviziiakh XVI st.,' *ibid.*, 1929, 3: 1–8; V. Shcherbyna, 'Dokumenty do istorii Kyieva, 1494–1835,' *Ukráïns'kyi arkhoeohrafichnyi zbirnyk*, 1926, no. 1: 1–49; idem, 'Boro't'ba Kyieva za avtonomiiu,' in *Kyiv ta ioho okolytsia v istorii ta pam'iatkakh* (Kyiv, 1926), pp. 168–216.

112. M. Karachivs'kyi, 'Arkhivna spadshchyna kyïvs'kykh tsekhiv,' *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Vseukráïns'koï akademii nauk* (hereafter *ZIFV-VUAN*) (Kyiv, 1927), no. 11: 262–86; idem, 'Kyïvs'ki tseky za lytovs'ko-pol's'koï ta rann'oï moskovs'koï doby,' *Kyïvs'ki zbirnyky istorii i arkhoeohii, pobutu i mystetstva*, 1931, pp. 138–49.

113. See O. Iurova, 'Doslidzhennia O. I. Baranovychem mahnats'koho gospodarstva Volyni XVI–XVIII st. na tereni Naukovo-doslidnoi katedry istorii Ukraïny v Kyievi (1924–1930),' *Ukráïns'kyi istoryk* 33, nos. 1–4 (1996): 314–18.

114. P. Klymenko, *Tseky na Ukraïni*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 1929) (the volume was both the first and the last); idem, 'Zapysova knyha Liublins'koho Spas'koho bratstva 1551–1637 rr.,' *ZIFV-VUAN*, 1929, nos. 21–22: 297–310.

115. See, for instance: M. Iavors'kyi, *Narys istorii Ukraïny*, pt. 2 (Kyiv, 1924); O. Savych, *Narys z istorii kul'turnykh rukhiv na Ukraïni ta Bilorus v XVI–XVIII st.* (Kyiv, 1929) (= *ZIFV-VUAN*, no. 90).

vanished from the pages of historical works written in Ukraine, and criticism by the Communist Party proscribed his historical legacy and branded the historian himself a 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalist.' Yet in many aspects the Marxist interpretation of the historical processes of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries coincided in part with the analogous commentaries of Hrushevsky. Soviet historical textbooks and scholarly works published in the 1930s to 1980s with any relation to the late medieval or early modern period borrowed an enormous amount of factual material from Hrushevsky's *History*, together with the historian's specific populist judgments, for instance, in regard to the manorial estate and corvée economy, the subjugation of the peasantry, German colonization, and the like.¹¹⁶ Cast aside, however, was the balanced, unified synthesis of economic, cultural, and national factors in the historical past of the Ukrainian people formulated by Hrushevsky, in favor of the primacy of economic and class interests. In addition, Soviet authors inappropriately and at every juncture referred to a 'primordial' striving by the Ukrainian people toward 'reunification' with the Russian people. In tandem, Ukraine's cultural and economic ties with the Muscovite lands were exaggerated, while corresponding ties with the West and the Ottoman Empire were marginalized and their connections overall were reduced to a minimum.

As the twentieth century unfolded, Ukrainian and Polish scholars continued to investigate various themes in the economic, cultural, and ethnic history of the Ukrainian lands from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century. Monographs and studies appeared on such specific topics as the structure of guilds and particular guilds of craftsmen (in Lviv and Peremyshl), manufacture (metalworks, glassworks, paper-making), cultural and educational establishments (the Ostrih Academy, the Kyiv Mohyla Academy), important cultural figures (Meletii Smotrytsky, Ivan Vyshensky), as well as Ukrainian theater, music, painting, and so on (new literature is presented in more depth in the editor's additions to the volume's bibliographic Notes 1, 3, 6, 7, and 8). The scholars producing these works presented new source materials that were unavailable to the author of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. In doing so, they broadened the range of research topics and included in Ukrainian historical discourse the territories of Transcarpathia, Bukovyna, and the Crimea that are part of present-day Ukraine.

Twentieth-century scholars, beginning with the historian of literature and philosophy Dmytro Čyževskij (1894–1974), introduced Western periodization into the study of the cultural history of the Ukrainian lands: the Renaissance, Reformation, Baroque, Classicism.¹¹⁷ Historians of culture examine the development of humanistic and reformist ideas to the Ukrainian lands,¹¹⁸ and they also research cultural processes in Ukraine within broad com-

116. See: K. Huslysty, *Narysy z istorii Ukraïny*, vyp. 2, *Ukraïna pered lytovs'kym panuvanniam i zakhoplennia її Pol'shcheiu* (Kyiv, 1939); V. Holobuts'kyi, *Ekonomichna istoriia Ukraïns'koï RSR: Dozhovtnevyi period* (Kyiv, 1970); *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï RSR*, vol. 1, bk. 1, *Druha polovyna XIII–persha polovyna XVII st.* (Kyiv, 1979); *Istoriia narodnoho hospodars'tva Ukraïns'koï RSR u 3-kh tomakh 4-kh knyhakh*, vol. 1, *Ekonomika dosotsialistychnykh formatsii* (Kyiv, 1983).

117. D. Chyževs'kyi (Čyževs'kyj), *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï literatury: Vid pochatkiv do doby realizmu* (New York, 1956). See also D. Čyževs'kyj, *History of Ukrainian Literature*, ed. G. Luckyj (Littleton, Colo., 1975; 2d ed., New York, 1997).

118. See: G. Gajecy, 'Church Brotherhoods and Ukrainian Cultural Renewal in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' in *Millenium of Christianity in Ukraine* (Ottawa, 1987); I. Paslavs'kyi, *Z istorii rozvytku filosof's'kykh idei na Ukraïni v kintsi XVI–pershii tretyni XVII st.* (Kyiv, 1984); *Filosofiiia vidrodzhennia na Ukraïni*, ed. M. Kashuba (Kyiv, 1990); V. Nychyk, V. Lytvynov, and Ia. Stratii, *Humanistychni i reformatsiini idei na Ukraïni: XVI–pochatok XVII st.* (Kyiv, 1990); *Ievropeiske Vidrodzhennia i Ukraïns'ka literatura XIV–XVIII st.* (Kyiv, 1993). George G. Grabowicz, however, has expressed skepticism about how well the ideas of the Renaissance and Reformation fared in the Ukrainian lands, saying that they failed to spark discourse owing to their weak presence in the institutions of the time: see H. Hrabovych (G. Grabowicz), 'Do ideolohii Renesansu v Ukraïns'kii literaturii: Kasiiiana Sakhovycha "Virshii na zhalosnyi pohreb zatsnogo rytsera Petra Konashevycha Sahaidachnoho,'" in idem, *Do istorii Ukraïns'koï literatury: Doslidzhennia, ese, polemika*

parative contexts, including consideration of what Western authors wrote about Ukraine in those times.¹¹⁹ Ukrainian historians studying national and cultural processes construct schemes of the Ukrainian national and cultural rebirth of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries on the basis of Hrushevsky's ideas.¹²⁰ Worthy of special mention is the rich literature on the Union of Brest,¹²¹ as well as on the polemical literature,¹²² topics that have intrigued researchers of various scholarly disciplines and different national and historical schools. The methodology for the study of intellectual history established in the West is applicable to the Ukrainian lands in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹²³ In postwar historiography it has served well in the study of cultural, political, and religious relations as represented by the paradigm 'Ukraine between East and West,'¹²⁴ especially for Ukrainian-Polish cultural and religious relations.¹²⁵

* * *

The transitional Lithuanian-Polish period in Ukrainian history, in comparison to the period of statehood in the Cossack era and the Cossack Hetmanate's autonomous life as a state, was probably the most difficult for Hrushevsky to conceptualize. The historian found it difficult to divide the sociopolitical and economic history of the Lithuanian and Polish states into

(Kyiv, 1997), pp. 278–83.

119. D. Nalyvaiko, 'Retseptsiia Ukraïny v Zakhidnii Ievropi XVI–XVIII st.,' *Suchasnist'* (Kyiv), 1993, no. 2: 94–109; idem, 'Ukraïna v retseptsiakh zakhidnykh humanistiv XV–XVI st.,' in *Ievropeis'ke Vidrodzhennia i Ukraïns'ka literatura XIV–XVIII st.*, pp. 3–39; idem, *Ochyma Zakhodu: Retseptsiia Ukraïny v Zakhidnii Ievropi XI–XVIII st.* (Kyiv, 1998).

120. On the national rebirth, see: I. Kryp'iakovykh, 'Do pytannia pro natsional'nu samosvidomist' Ukraïns'koho narodu v kintsi XVI–pochatku XVII st.,' *Ukraïns'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1966, no. 2: 65–74; F. Sysyn, 'The Union of Brest and the Question of National Identity,' in H.-J. Torke, F. Sysyn, and A. Brüning, *400 Jahre Kirchenunion von Brest, 1596–1996* (Berlin, 1998), pp. 5–17. Cf. Serhii Plokh'y's constructivist and simultaneously revisionist approach to the existence of premodern East Slavic nations in his *Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge, 2006), especially chap. 5, 'The Making of the Ruthenian Nation' (pp. 161–202). There Plokh'y writes: 'Ruthenian identity was not loyalty to the ruler (as in Muscovy) but the rights of individual institutions, estates, and nations' (p. 202). On the cultural rebirth, see *Istoriia Ukraïns'koï kul'tury*, vol. 2, *Ukraïns'ka kul'tura XIII–pershoï polovyny XVII stolit'* (Kyiv, 2001), pp. 477–88 (chap. 4: 'Ukraïns'ka kul'tura na perelomi: Druha polovyna XVI–persha polovyna XVII st. Kul'turno-natsional'ne vidrodzhennia').

121. See: O. Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)* (Hamden, Conn., 1968); Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*; M. Dmitriev, *Mezhdū Rimom i Tsar'gradom: Genezis Brestskoi tserkovnoi unii 1595–1596 godov* (Moscow, 2003). These monographs also present the most important literature and source material on the subject.

122. B. Waczynski, 'Nachklänge der Florentiner Union in der polemischen Literatur zur Zeit der Wiedervereinigung der Ruthenen im 16. und am Anfang des 17. Jahrhunderts,' *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 4 (1938): 441–72; I. Kakridis, 'Byzantinische Unionspolemik in den Ostroger Drucken des ausgehenden 16. Jahrhunderts,' *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 52, no. 1 (1992): 128–49; I. Ševčenko, 'Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarusian Lands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,' *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17, nos. 1–2 (1992): 45–58. See also the editor's addition to Note 6, pp. 482–84 of the present volume.

123. Iakovenko, *Paralel'nyi svit*; N. Starchenko, 'Publichnist' iak dominantna kul'turnoï tradytsii (Volyn' druhoï polovyny XVI stolittia),' *Mediaevalia Ucrainica: Mental'nist' ta istoriia idei* (Kyiv) 5 (1998): 68–81.

124. See several studies with similar titles: I. Rudnytsky, 'The Ukraine between East and West,' in *Das östliche Mitteleuropa in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Acta Congressus historiae Slavicae Salisburgensis in memoriam SS Cyrilli et Methodii anno 1963 celebrati* (Wiesbaden, 1966), pp. 163–69; Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West*; N. Iakovenko, 'Early Modern Ukraine between East and West: Projectories of an Idea,' in *Regions: A Prism to View the Slavic-Eurasian World. Towards a Discipline of 'Regionology'*, ed. K. Matsuzato (Sapporo, 2000), pp. 50–69; an expanded version appeared (in Ukrainian) in idem, *Paralel'nyi svit*, pp. 333–65.

125. This is reflected in articles appearing in: *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton and Toronto, 1980); *On the Frontier of Latin Europe: Integration and Segregation in Red Ruthenia, 1350–1600*, ed. T. Wünsch and A. Janeczek (Warsaw, 2004); *Lithuania and Ruthenia: Studies of a Transcultural Communication Zone (15th–18th Centuries)*, ed. S. Rohdewald, D. Frick, and S. Wiederkehr (Wiesbaden, 2007).

Ukrainian (Ruthenian), Polish, and Lithuanian components; similarly difficult was distinguishing the Belarusian from the Ukrainian component in the joint cultural heritage of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Commonwealth. To this day historians strive to evaluate this common heritage that cannot be regarded as belonging to one side or the other.

Hrushevsky wrote the *History* during a time when, as Miroslav Hroch put it, Ukrainian national awareness was in the cultural phase of its development. Ideas about the continuity of the historical process and the integral unity of all the Ukrainian lands that Hrushevsky presented as scholarly postulates and that formed part of the research paradigms of his work became focal points of scholarly discourse. Subsequent Ukrainian historians have utilized and modified these ideas, and they continue to rework them in creative ways.¹²⁶ In central and eastern Europe, the era of 'national' historiography during which the *History* was written has passed. Nonetheless, for historians the work of Hrushevsky, especially the sixth volume published here, has remained not only an accomplishment of distinguished erudition and professional scholarship but also a source of intellectual inspiration, structure, and hypotheses, as well as a master narrative of social, cultural, religious, and national history. One cannot imagine the intellectual underpinnings of scholars today studying the late medieval and early modern history of Ukraine, Belarus, Lithuania, and Poland without the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Both the reception and the critique of Hrushevsky's conceptions have been of great and continuing importance in fostering deeper and broader analysis of the critical, transitional period in Ukrainian history that was the Lithuanian and Polish era.

Translated by Uliana M. Pasicznyk

126. Most interesting in this regard is Natalia Iakovenko's conception of the role of the princely stratum as the 'living relic' of the princely era. Until the early seventeenth century that stratum continued to hold influence and importance in social consciousness in the central Dnipro region and Volhynia, as a 'barrier of irrational and mythic background' distinguished from the rest of nobiliary society. See Iakovenko, *Ukraïns'ka shliakhta*, pp. 85–86.