

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ ТА ОГЛЯДИ

Андрій Блануца
Київ

[Огляд] Генрик Літвін. З народу руського. Шляхта Київщини, Волині та Брацлавщини (1569–1648) / Пер. з польськ. Лесі Лисенко. – К.: Дух і Літера, 2016. – 616 с.

As soon as the proposed Ukrainian translation of Henryk Litwin (now hold a rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Poland in Ukraine) represents the final work of the author of the last twenty years concerning the history of the Rus' nobility (szlakhta) in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from the time of incorporation into it of the three Rus' voivodeships – Kyiv, Volyn and Bratslav as a result of the Union of Lublin in 1569 and before the National Revolution of 1648 (according to H. Litwin – «National Liberation War»). Thus, 18 structural components of the book are presented to the reader, the bases of which are previously published essays and articles in reputable scientific editions since 1993. The focus of attention is the Rus' gentry in political, social and economic life as «the third equal partner in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth». In the preface to the Ukrainian edition, H. Litwin claims about the discrown of historiographical myths the alleged catholicization of the Rus' gentry after the Union of Lublin, the expansion of the Polish gentry to the East and the extra-power of great Polish landowners (magnates), the absolute domination of the princes over the nobility etc.

The structural subdivisions of the book are presented logically and as far as possible in chronological order. Thus, the first essay is the largest one and it concerns the of the First Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Here the author describes settled Polish peoples on the principle of territorial-legal communities: Great and Little Poland, Red Ruthenia, Mazovia, Royal Prussia, Livonia, Volhynia and Kyiv Regions (after 1569), the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the

personal union until 1569; according to the principle of linguistic and ethnic communities, communities of state building traditions, confessional communities, national communities, as well as other ethnic nations – Armenians, Jews, Tatars, Karaites, Gypsies, Germans, Volosh (immigrants from Italy), the Dutch, and Scots. As a conclusion to this section, H. Litwin noted the people who gave a rise for Commonwealth had the opportunity to take part in political power through the seimyky (local parliaments), and the aliens could create their own self-governing institutions and preserve their liberty of conscience.

The following essay gives us information about the political development of Ukrainian voivodships in the Commonwealth from the time of the Union of Lublin and the third partition of Poland. According to the author, the Ukrainian lands began to acquire features of the center of the state or quasi-state power only during 1648-1667 in the hetman power form. H. Litwin interprets the independent policy of the Zaporozhian Cossacks as autonomous tendencies, and their selfless campaigns in the Crimea and Turkey as robbery raids. Peasant Cossack uprisings at the end of the XVI – early XVII cc., according the author, were as private wars, and their consequences could not be interpreted as a Polish-Ukrainian confrontation. At the same time, H. Litwin characterizes the Polish policy of increasing the Cossack register as ill-conceived, which led to an increase in the number of Cossacks and the strengthening of its anti-state character. The period of «golden rest» for ten years before 1648 proved to be a prelude to the grandiose explosion, which marked the beginning of the decline of the First Rzeczpospolita. Thus, the first division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had important consequences for the Ukrainian lands, after which Red Ruthenia was incorporated to the Austrian Empire; the second and the third partitions the largest territory of Ukraine for a long time infused into the Russian Empire hands.

The third section of the book (the smallest and most general) is devoted to the Rus' community in the Commonwealth in 1569-1648. The Polish-Rus' contact, conflict and coexistence are shown as an exceptional situation on the background of the historical development of Europe at that time. The next article deals with the problem of the catholicization of the Rus' gentry and the assimilation processes in Ukraine of the First Rzeczpospolita. According to H. Litwin, the average nobility had double self-consciousness, whereas the political polonization of the boyars and the okolychna gentry progressed slowly due to the limited participation of these groups in seimyky (local parliaments) life. The same duality can be traced in the transition to the Polish language in conversation, which, in particular, quickly erased the Ruthenian language from private correspondence and the daily magnates communications, while the written Ruthenian language continued to dominate in the official clerical practice until the end of the XVI century. It was, in particular, the language of Volhynia metric.

The following essay sheds light on the system of land tenure of the Orthodox and Catholic churches in the Kyiv region on the basis of treasury and judicial documents. All conclusions are based on sources of secular institutions of the Commonwealth, while church archives were not involved by the author. The basis of calculations were tax registers of 1581, 1628 and 1640 of all-national level and several registers were fragmentary and used by the author as auxiliary ones. According to H. Litwin, the Eastern Rite Church owned a much larger number of estates than the Church of the Catholic Rite. Orthodox somewhat weakened its possessions after the small part of parishes transited to the Uniates after the Brest union (1596), but had a primacy. The Catholic Church expanded its landed property thanks to open-handed grants of private men. It is important, here and in the previous section, the author show the lists of surnames of different religions and churches land ownership.

Logically, the following essay is devoted to the legal status of the Orthodox and Uniate churches in the Commonwealth. Freedom of religion for the believers of the Eastern Church was provided by royal privileges and incorporation acts. According the author the Brest Union act did not violate such a principle and had rather the character of a synodal decision. At the end of the XVII century the Union received a privileged status, and the rights of the Orthodox were not formally narrowed. There are tables as a separate subdivision with lists of noble Rus' families according to confessional affiliation. Also, the author submits an article about the letter of the Kyivan khorunzhy Remiyan Yelets to the General Jesuit Vincenzo Carafi in 1647 about the plans to establish a university in Ksaveriv, Kyiv region. This information based on an interesting document from the Rome archives, published as an addition to the article in the original language and translated into Ukrainian.

The most extensive essays refer to the property and social status of the noble families of the Kyiv and Bratslav regions. The author analyzes in detail the estate status of the rich families (in separate appendix tables of landownership of the noble families), establishes such a connection with the public status in the Commonwealth. In the same perspective, a separate study has been conducted on the connection between the representatives of the elites of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kyiv region. H. Litwin reports on land tenure in the Kyiv region of such Lithuanian families as the Kmits, the Gornostaies, the Tishkevich-Logojksis, the Pronskis, the Kuhmistrovich-Dorogostayskies, the Khaletskies, the Sapięgs, the Frontskevich-Radziminskies, the Skuminov-Tishkeviches and the Sluzhkies.

H. Litwin also separately examines the Kyiv Voivodeship through the prism of the spatial structure of the territory and its influence on the political and social life of the local gentry. There is widely applied the principle of geopolitical influence, where the nobility, settled in the steppe royal lands, had much less opportunity to participate in events in the local political and civil arena. The

center of the political life of the voivodship was Zhytomyr, and not Kyiv, where the nobility gathered on voivodeship seimyks and there were according to the author's estimate for 79 years over 220 noble congresses. The author did not overlook the issue of economic nature. In particular, H. Litwin in the following essay analyzes credit transactions and «holdings» of the gentries' land of the Kyiv region through the concept of a client system, proposed by Antoni Mcjczak and developed by Urzula Augustyniak. According to H. Litwin's conclusions, such system works only in cases of prolonged financial-property relations of szlakhta (client) with magnates (overlord), the first one served as creditors of the last one.

The following few essays of the book are devoted to three Rus' voivodeships in the context of their incorporation into the Commonwealth, as well as the struggle of political groupings of the abovementioned voivodeships during the second period without king in 1574-1576, which resulted in taking power by King Stefan Batory. During his reign, H. Litwin has calculated and analyzed the representation of the gentry of Kyiv, Volhynia and Bratslav regions in the Diets.

Particular attention is paid to the analysis of the magnate factions structure in the Kyiv region. Thus, H. Litwin, taking as the basis the concept of the noble elite of Great Poland by Edward Opalinsky, enlisted to the magnates all local senators, the Rus' princes of the magnate group (according to the classification of Natalia Yakovenko), the local large landowners, as well as senators from other parts of the Commonwealth, who owned the estates or starostvas in the Kyiv region. The championship in political influence, according to H. Litwin, was held by the princes, whose groups and clans had formed the position of Kyiv region in central state assemblies.

The book is ended by a small essay on the formation of private ownerships of Ukrainian estates of the Crown great Hetman Stanisław Koniecpolski. H. Litwin addressed for this issue because of the erroneous assignment of Ivan Krypiakevich who wrote about S. Koniecpolski's huge possessions in the Eastern Podillia according to the data of the exaction registry of 1629. According to author's estimation the ownership of Koniecpolski in 1648 in the south Kyiv region had to include more than 1,000 households.

The book is completed by the detailed indexes of names and geographical terms; however the bibliography is presented at the end of each section.