

# OLD UKRAINE

ITS SOCIO-ECONOMIC HISTORY PRIOR TO 1781

**Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky**  
**Professor of Economics**  
**Seton Hall University**

**The Florham Park Press, Inc.,**  
**Box 225, Madison, New Jersey**

**Copyright, 1963 by The Florham Park Press, Inc.**

**Lithographed in the United States of America. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher.**

**To my three beloved sons,  
Leon, George and Andrew,  
that they may learn of the  
country of their ancestors.**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## PART I - INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

### CHAPTER

I	THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE.....	1
	The name, 1. The geographical and geo-political background, 4. The people, 8.	
II	THE BASIC TRAITS OF UKRAINIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.....	15
	Agricultural predominance, 15. The economy of moving frontiers, 16. Individualism, 17. Vitality, 20. Unevenness and irregularity of the socio-economic evolution, 23. Periods of Ukrainian socio-economic history, 25.	
III	THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HERITAGE OF THE PRE-HISTORIC PERIOD.....	28
	Origin of early political organizations, 28. Social structure, 35. Early economic development, 38. Agriculture, 42. Commerce, 45.	

## PART II - THE KIEVAN-GALICIAN PERIOD (860-1349)

IV	POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE.....	53
	Political growth, 53. Political structure, 57. Social classes, of "Ruska Pravda," 61. Nobility, 63. Peasantry, 66. Townspeople, 69. Slavery, 71. Churchpeople, 73. Foreigners, 74. The issue of feudalism in Old Ukraine, 76.	
V	EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES.....	79
	The over-all economic development, 79. Hunting and fishing, 81. Cattle raising, 83. Agriculture, 85. Mining, 91.	
VI	URBAN CENTERS AND THEIR INDUSTRIES.....	93
	Towns in Ukraine, 93. Crafts, 97, Metallurgy, carpentry and the construction industry, 99. Ceramics, textiles, tanning and the fur business, 103.	
VII	TRADE AND FINANCE.....	107
	Domestic trade, 107. Foreign trade, 109. The Byzantinian and Oriental trade, 112. The Northern and Western trade, 117. Finance, 118.	

### **PART III - THE LITHUANIAN-POLISH PERIOD (1349-1648)**

#### **CHAPTER**

- VIII POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE..... 129**  
**Political developments, 129. Ethnical changes, 135. Social classes, 139. Nobility, 141. Peasantry, 144. Townspeople, 148. Foreigners, 150. The feudal order, 152. Cossacks, 153.**
- IX EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES OF THE ECONOMY OF THE EUROPEAN FRONTIERS..... 157**  
**Economic growth, 157. Hunting and fishing, 161. Cattle raising, 165, Agriculture, 168. Mining, 174.**
- X THE INDUSTRIAL GROWTH**  
**Town, 177. Trades and crafts, 179. The food processing, textile and the leather industries, 186. Paper manufacturing and the printing industry, 193.**
- XI COMMERCIAL GROWTH..... 195**  
**Domestic commerce, 195. Foreign trade, 201. The trade routes and the import and export items, 206. Finance, 211.**

### **PART IV - THE COSSACKO-HETMANIC PERIOD (1648-1781)**

- XII POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE..... 221**  
**Political developments, 221. Ethnic and social changes, 227. Cossacks, 232. Nobility, 234. Peasantry, 236. Townspeople, 240. Foreigners, 242. Eastern and southern frontiers, 243. West Ukraine, 247.**
- XIII GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY, EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES..... 250**  
**The national economy of independent Ukraine, 250. The colonization process, 256. Agriculture, 259. Agricultural technology and organization, 263. Hunting, fishing and cattle raising, 268. Mining, 275.**
- XIV TRADES AND INDUSTRIES..... 283**  
**Mercantilism in Ukraine, 283. The city and its economy, 287. Trades and crafts, 296. Porcessing agricultural raw material, 300. Tobacco manufacturing, 307. Textile and leather production, 308.**
- XV TRADES AND INDUSTRIES (CONTINUED).....314**  
**Metallurgy and arms, 314. Chemical industries: potash and tar, 318. Glass and ceramics, 320. The paper and printing industries, 323. The construction industry and wooden manufacturing, 326.**

CHAPTER

XVI	COMMERCE.....	331
	<b>Transportation and communication, 331. Domestic commerce, 334. Chumaki, traveling traders, 338. Foreign trade, its development and composition, 340. Foreign trade policies, 347.</b>	
XVII	FINANCE.....	354
	<b>Money and credit, 354. Public finance, 358.</b>	
XVIII	UKRAINE AFTER 1781: A CAPTIVE NATION, A CONTIGUOUS COLONY.....	364
	FOOTNOTES TO ALL CHAPTERS.....	367
	INDEX OF NAMES.....	428

## PREFACE

Until recently, the history of Eastern Europe was usually viewed by the American people from a Russian perspective. Since the end of the 17th century—that is, since the creation of the Russian Empire by Peter the Great—Russia has dominated the history of that area. Hence, the interest of Western scholars and statesmen in East European matters has been concentrated on Russia. With a few exceptions, such as Hueldenstaedt, Marshall, Haxthausen, and Kohl, Western scholars have largely ignored the non-Russian nationalities in this area. On the other hand, the Russian imperial government has maintained a positive policy of identifying “East Europe” with “Russia,” thus minimizing the claims of these people to cultural, economic and political autonomy.

Furthermore, St. Petersburg desired to create an impression of the Russians as a monolithic, homogeneous people rather than the whole colonial empire of partially assimilated conquered peoples which in fact they are. Because the only historical sources available to Western scholars were for a long time primarily Russian, they tended to support this line of thought. Hence numerous descriptions of Russia, Russian political histories, Russian geographies, Russian social and economic histories, and various monographic works on Russia were written from the Czarist point of view. The Ukrainians, Byeloruthenians, Caucasians and the Baltic peoples were hardly mentioned.

This represented the major weakness of East European studies in the West, because a discussion of European Russia as a unit did not permit the proper evaluation of political, social, cultural and economic developments in terms of each constituent nationality. As a result, the West could not help but acquire an inaccurate concept of Russia and the Russians.

A change in East European studies on the part of Westerners was initiated by the time of the First World War. The world began to take note of the far reaching ethnical, national and cultural differentiations in European Russia. A radical change in this respect took place during the interwar period and continued after the Second World War. The growing threat of a world-wide Russian-Communist aggression, the creation of the Ukrainian, Byeloruthenian, and the Caucasian Soviet Socialist Republics as separate political entities within the framework of the U.S.S.R., the introduction of Ukraine and Byeloruthenia as autonomous [at least in theory] members of the United Nations, and the heroic struggle of the Ukrainians, Byeloruthenians, Georgians, Tartars, Kalmycs and other

nationalities and national communities of the Soviet Union for their freedom and independence, finally arrested the attention and concern of the world. Anti-Communist, non-Russian refugees from the U.S.S.R. also made great efforts to enlighten the West about the true state of East Europe. A number of writings and scholastic contributions appeared in Western Europe and the United States along this line. Furthermore, the interest in the elements of strength and weakness of the Soviet Union brought to light its grave problem of national minorities. Among those who added to our knowledge of East Europe were Manning, Chamberlain, Armstrong, Simpson, Smal-Stocky, Chubaty, Kononenko and some others. In addition, several works have been translated from East European languages and deal with the historical past of the non-Russian peoples in European Russia.

Your author intends that this socio-economic history of Ukraine shall contribute to this growing knowledge of East European affairs in their diversified national projections. There are at present several works on Ukraine in the American market, especially in the field of history and general description of the country. Among the best known books of Ukrainian history in English are: *A History of Ukraine* by Hrushevsky; *History of the Ukraine* by Doroshenko; *The Story of the Ukraine, Ukraine under the Soviets*, and *The Twentieth Century Ukraine* by Manning; *The Ukraine, A History*, by Allen; *The Ukraine* by Sands, and most recently, *History of Ukraine* by Nahayevsky, published in 1962.

Among the general descriptions of Ukraine, her geography, history, literature, civilization, and economy, are: *Ukraine and Its People*, by Chambers; *Ukraine, the Land and Its People*, by Rudnytsky; *The Ukraine*, a handbook prepared under the direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office in London; *Ukraine and Its People*, ed. by Mirchuk and others.

However, there is no social and economic history of Ukraine in the American market. As a matter of fact, no such work exists at all except some works in Ukrainian, which cover, however, only certain periods, and some Soviet volumes which in the majority of cases do not treat the subject matter beyond the scope of the Cossack and Russian periods. Most important, the Soviet books are not objective. Marxian dialectics, the Marxian materialistic interpretation of history, and the aggressively pro-Russian leanings of the Soviet editions largely detract from their scholarly value—if they do not destroy it.

The subtitle of this work is *Its Socio-Economic History* in order to emphasize the fact that there can be no reliable economic history written without taking a broad view of its socio-political background. Social classes largely originate as separate occupational and economic groups,



and as such they continue to develop throughout the history of the country. Each social group had to perform specific economic functions, and consequently economic evolution of any human society cannot be properly understood and evaluated without at least a little study of its social structure. The social and political structure provides the background for the growth of economic institutions, while economic development in its own way influences the social and political formation of a country.

The author has deliberately terminated this analysis at the time of the annexation of Ukraine by Russia for several important reasons. First of all, the socio-economic evolution of Ukraine prior to annexation was less known. This is due in part to the Czarist and Soviet regimes which wished to have the earlier centuries discussed as an integral part of the history of Russia. They did not want to recognize Ukraine as a separate nation at that time. Your author's intention is to fill this gap.

Secondly, in recent years a number of works were published in English and other languages dealing either directly or indirectly with the Ukrainian economy in the 19th and 20th centuries. These may serve their purpose well. But it was still important to write on the earlier eras to fill the gap. In particular, *Ukraine and Russia: A History of the Economic Relations between Ukraine and Russia between 1654-1917*, by K. Kononenko, and "Economic Life," by R. Dyminsky, in *Ukraine and Its People*, ed. by I. Mirchuk, may be successfully used as a continuation of the study of Ukrainian economic history.

Thirdly, the economic evolution of Ukraine as an independent nation, in most part in its pre-Russian era, was so diametrically different in its nature from that of Ukraine the captive nation that it required separate treatment. Fourthly and finally, the author's professional competence is greater in the area of ancient times.

Ukraine is the second greatest nationality and the second largest republic of the U.S.S.R. And she is, no doubt, the soft spot of Red Russia. The Ukrainian problem within the Soviet Union, as well as in its world-wide projection, is coincidental with the declining menace of Russian Communism. Hence, the study of the Ukrainian segment is doubtlessly of great importance to the West.

A knowledge of the general political history of the Ukrainian people is not as revealing as a knowledge of their social and economic past and present for a correct appraisal of the East European question. Such have been the immediate reasons for writing this study. In fact, your author has worked on this subject for many years. Already in 1938, as a law student at the Catholic University of Lublin, he began to compile the the source material. Then his dissertation for the degree of doctor of jurisprudence was written in approximately the same area. Thus, *Old*

*Ukraine* is the product of years of work. Its weakness is apparent, however, in some incompleteness of source material, much of which is not available in the West. Not all Soviet sources are accessible.

Finally, an important point is mentioned in direct connection with the preparation of this work for publication in English. It was necessary to make extensive use of bibliographical material in the Ukrainian, Polish, Russian and German languages, both in the main text and in the reference notes of this book. Hence it was also necessary to quote foreign titles, names, terms, and concepts. These were transliterated into English by following the most commonly accepted principles of transliteration, in an effort to avoid any misunderstanding.

In most cases of quoting whole paragraphs or sentences from foreign language source material, translations into English were made by the author. These were put in quotation marks, attempting to adhere most closely to the original thoughts of their authors.

In a few cases, the reader may find the same word spelled differently, such as the name Kluchevskii (Kluchevsky, Klutschevsky) or Mirchuk (Mirtschuk), because various translators of the works of Ukrainian and Russian authors into English, Polish and German used different spellings and transliterations. The present author, quoting these works, adhered to this pattern so that the reader could more easily find the source material.

N. L. Fr.-C.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express his deep appreciation and to make his grateful acknowledgment to Mr. Clarence L. Lewis, Professor of Seton Hall University, who aided him with most valuable advice in the preparation of his various publications in the past, and who again has painstakingly read this entire manuscript, and contributed to its editing. He thanks Mr. Roman Kocherzuk for preparing the maps of Ukraine for this publication, and Mr. Michael Skiro for his patience and skill in printing.

Many thanks are also expressed to Miss Mary P. De Piano, Mr. John Theroux, Mr. Edward T. Byrnes, Mr. John L. Botti, Rev. Joseph T. Shea, Dr. Harold C. Schweitzer, Mr. Stanley Strand, and Mr. Edward D'Alessio, all of Seton Hall, for contributing their time and effort to this publication.

N. L. Fr.-C.

Newark, 1963







**PART I**

**INTRODUCTORY MATTERS**

# CHAPTER ONE

## THE LAND AND THE PEOPLE

**The name - The geographical and geo-political background - The people**

**The name of the country is Ukraine; its people are called Ukrainians. These terms are ancient, yet their use to designate this particular land and people was for centuries controversial. The violent opposition to the acceptance of these appellations was politically motivated and had no logical justification. History reveals that the ethnic-national community which is identified in the 20th century as the Ukrainians bore in the past another ancient and traditional name, that of "Rus," a name used to designate both the land and the people.<sup>1</sup> Historians developed two major theories to explain the origin and the meaning of this archaic designation. The earlier speculation deduced the name "Rus" from the Norse who conquered Ukraine in the ninth century and who were known as the Varego-Rois; the latter attempted to derive the name of the whole country from the river Ros which flowed in the vicinity of Kiev, the capital of Rus-Ukraine. The latter seems to be correct since the name "Rus" was known in the Orient long before the arrival of the Northmen in Ukraine, and because Kiev and the banks of the Ros were cradles of the early political growth of the Ukrainian people.<sup>2</sup>**

**The original names of "Ukraine" and "Ukrainians," "Rus" and also "Rusichi," were translated into Latin and other foreign languages as "Ruthenia" and "Russia" to denote the country, and the terms "Ruthenians" and "Rusci" were employed to designate the people. The name "Russia" was used in two ways: as a synonym for Ruthenia and also to designate medieval Ukraine. The Ukrainian people, however, were called "Ruthenians" or "Rusci" in the numerous medieval papal and secular documents and other historical sources, but never Russians. The names of "Muscovy" and "the Muscovites" were reserved as political and national designations of the land and the people that we know today as Russia and**

the Russians. The individual Northern territories were denoted separately as Novgorod, Suzdal, and Rostov. The old chronicles contained no implications which would include the Russians in the concept of "Rus," reserving as they did the name "Rus" exclusively for the Ukrainian provinces.<sup>3</sup>

In the 13th century, it became customary to call the Duchy of Galicia and Volhnia (West Ukraine) "Russia Minor" or "Little Rus." However, this designation did not apply then to the entire Ukrainian territory. In the early 18th century, the government at St. Petersburg officially conferred the name "Russian Empire" upon the Czarism of Muscovy, and thus the latter became modern Russia. At a later date the Muscovites came to be called Great Russians; the Ukrainians (Ruthenians), Little Russians; and the third East European Slavic nationality, the White Russians (Byeruthenians). The entire Ukraine was officially renamed Little Russia. In 1713 and subsequently, Peter the Great issued imperial decrees to that effect.<sup>4</sup> This highhanded act of redesignation was characteristic of Czarist arbitrariness and had no established historical precedent.

Apparently it was in the interest of Russian expansionism to confuse hopelessly the national designations of certain Eastern European areas and peoples in order to obliterate the existence of three separate nationalities therein, and to create a false impression of homogeneity in the new Russian empire. The Ruthenians reacted by accepting a new and distinct name, one with some historical tradition, in order to emphasize their national identity and to oppose the denationalization campaign of the Czarist government. The name "Ukraine" was their spontaneous choice. It was soon adopted throughout the nation. At first, "Ukraine" did not designate the whole country and people but rather, according to its ethnological sense, "Borderland" or "Frontierland," and its inhabitants. Actually the term "Ukrainia" or "Vkraina" meant in the Ukrainian language about the same as "borderland."<sup>5</sup> Already in 1187 and 1189, historical documents employed the designation "Ukraine" for Galicia and the eastern province bordering on the Cuman territories. The western districts, Berest, Vereshchin, Stolpne and Uhrovensk, were also called Ukraine by the 13th century. In the 16th and 17th centuries, the name "Ukraine" was first used in official documents and literature to designate the whole country. However, Galicia was at that time virtually excluded from the concept, and was consistently called "Ruthenian District." Finally,



in the 19th century the appellation "Ukraine" became the national name of the entire ethnic territory populated by the Ruthenian stock.<sup>6</sup>

The renaming of medieval "Rus" (Ruthenia) as the modern "Ukraine" was an interesting although not isolated historical phenomenon produced by significant geo-political developments in East Europe. For example, Ukraine was the historical "borderland" of Western civilization. The historical mission of the Ukrainians was to intercept Asiatic nomadic invaders of Europe in almost constant warfare. Since the seventh century the Ukrainians battled the Avars, Khazars, Bulgars, Cumans, Turks, and Tartars. Their awareness of their mission and their sense of destiny found expression in Ukrainian folklore, folksongs, and poetry, and led to the adoption of the term "Borderland" or "Ukraine" as the distinct national name of the area.

Gradually the name was adopted by the Ukrainian scholars and politicians since, first of all, the new name contributed so much toward a clear-cut differentiation of Ukrainians from Russians and Byeloruthenians and, secondly, because the name "Ukraine" had been a symbol of the national separatism and independence movement since the time of the Cossack national wars against Poland and Muscovy-Russia.

The Ukrainian independence movement and national separatism were unacceptable to Russia and Poland, both of which claimed the Ukrainian territories. Since the term "Ukrainian" had become a symbol of that separatism, the official and scholarly circles in Warsaw and St. Petersburg made every possible effort to suppress first the name, then the Ukrainian national movement itself. The Poles were determined to retain at all costs the old name "Ruthenian" because it seemed to them to be neutral, hence less dangerous. The Russians tried to enforce the usage of the term "Little Russian" since this implied a national unity existing between the Great Russian and the Little Russian ethnic stocks. Thus, largely because of Russian and Polish hostility to the new name, the designations "Ukraine" and "Ukrainian" have only recently become acceptable to the free world's academic and political circles. During World War I when the national aspirations of the Ukrainian people were in accord with the political interests of the German and Austrian-Hungarian Empires, Warsaw and St. Petersburg dismissed Ukrainian nationalism as just another Prussian intrigue lacking any real political significance. This attitude contributed considerably to the delay in the general acceptance of the new name.<sup>7</sup>

Objection has often been raised to the change of the national name from "Ruthenia" to "Ukraine" as unwarranted by any historical precedence. There is justification, however, for such a change. History reveals many changes of the national names of peoples and countries. New political developments, social and cultural changes, and new geo-political conditions may require a change in national designation from Muscovy to Russia, Gallia to France, Persia to Iran, Serbo-Croatio-Slavonia to Yugoslavia, and Wallachia and Moldavia to Rumania. A people have a right to decide what name they want to be called, just as they have a right to whichever form of government they prefer.

**The Geographical and Geo-Political Background.** The growth and development of any nation or people have always been conditioned by the geographical character of their homeland. The Ukrainian people are no exception. Their national growth, the development of their national culture and civilization, and the evolution of their own social, political, and economic institutions were largely a consequence of the geographical characteristics of their terrain and soil. Although Ukraine's geo-political position was unfavorable for herself, her proximity to the borders of Europe and Asia, her location in a straight wide gateway extending from the South Siberian lowlands to the heart of Europe, was highly beneficial to the West. As a buffer state standing between two great civilizations, Occidental and Oriental, Ukraine absorbed much of the force of repeated tides of armed invasions. The centuries-long struggle between the Orient and the Occident in religion, culture, politics, and warfare usually extended into the Ukraine and projected with violent impact into the history of the Ukrainian people. Since the earliest times the Ukrainain territory has been the avenue for migrations of countless peoples, for the great marches of the Huns, Arias, Avars, Turks, and the Mongols of Ginghis-Khan. Ukraine has no natural defensive fortifications such as great lakes, seas, mountains, or marshes, except the Black Sea and the Azov Sea in the South and the Polesian Marshes in the North. This lack of defenses made the area a classic commercial and military route from East to West, and vice versa, and has obviously influenced Ukraine's historical development.

As if to compensate the Ukrainians for their highly vulnerable frontiers, Divine Providence provided them with a land rich in natural resources, a favorable climate, fertile soil and many min-

erals.<sup>8</sup> Throughout the ancient period when nomadic cattle raising, hunting, and fishing were the foundations of the primitive economy, Ukraine, with its well developed water system, afforded outstanding opportunities for the economic growth of early communities. When agriculture became the leading medieval industry, Ukraine's black, fertile soil proved to be one of the richest in Europe. Slabchenko quotes 16th century West European travellers as saying that the fertility of this soil was so great that abundant crops were possible without fertilizers and with very little toil.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, this fertile farmland was so abundant that it could be acquired by a simple act of homesteading and exploiting.

In addition, conditions for the development of commerce were highly favorable in Ukraine. Major trade routes extending from East to West and from North to South converged on Ukrainian territory. Moreover, the appreciable productivity of Ukraine's own economy could itself contribute substantially to an extensive volume of international trade.<sup>10</sup> When the 19th century finally ushered in the industrial revolution, the rich mineral resources in the Donestet Basin, the Krivyi-Rih and Zaporizha districts, and in West Ukraine, made possible such a rapid industrial development of the Ukrainian national economy that the whole territory assumed great international economic importance.<sup>11</sup>

Consequently, the Ukrainian people experienced constantly moving frontiers throughout their history. The core of their ethnographical territory was in the Northwest and included southern Polesia, Volhina, and the Kiev and Chernihiv districts, the very locality where the ancient name "Rus" and the modern name "Ukraine" had their origins. From there, ethnographic expansion through colonization continued whenever the political atmosphere was favorable. But whenever external political events developed unfavorably, the Ukrainian ethnic territory had a tendency to contract to its original ancient boundaries in the Northwest. Even by prehistoric times, the ethnographical territory of the Ukrainian people had expanded to the Carpathian mountains and the Black Sea steppes. At the time of the Kievan Empire, between 860 and 1240, the Ukrainian ethnographical territory was very large, and the political power of the Ukrainians was at such a peak that the Empire included in its borderlands numerous national minorities, such as the Ugro-Finnic and Russian tribes in the distant North-east, the Byeloruthenian tribes in the North-west (towards Lithuania and the Baltic littorals), and numerous nomadic tribes (of

Turko-Mongol extraction) in the steppes of the Black and Azov Seas and in the Don-Volga Basin.

The impact of the Mongol-Tartar invasion in 1240 liquidated the Kievan Empire, and imposed Mongol rule over the Ukrainian people. The Ukrainian ethnographical territory was contracted at that time, especially in the South and in the East, and was reduced to its ancient and original territorial core. Thereafter, seeking safety in the northwestern forests, the population left the unsafe southern steppes which were continuously exposed to the harassing and oppressing warfare and plundering expeditions of the Tartars.

After the invasion by the Golden Horde, the Galician-Volhynian Duchy in the Northwest was a strictly national Ukrainian state, which geographically shifted toward the West and the centers of Western civilization. The Lithuanian period in the following centuries experienced a new southward and eastward expansion of the Ukrainian ethnical area, made possible by the slowly declining power of the Mongols. The reconquest of the Ukrainian steppes lasted throughout the Polish and the Cossacko-Hetmanic period, and until the second half of the 19th century, and culminated in an enormous expansion of Ukrainian territory. Soon the Donetz and Don steppes became part of the Ukrainian national area, and filled the ethnic vacuum resulting from the disintegration of the Golden Horde. The political organism of the Ukrainian Cossack state was never able to cover more than two-thirds of the entire Ukrainian ethnographical territory, nor did the Ukrainian National Republic or the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic ever include the entire Ukrainian national ethnic area. In the first half of the 19th century the Ukrainians were already populating areas as far away as the foot of the Caucasian mountains and the Volga steppes. In the 20th century, as a result of policies of genocide and Russianization applied by the Bolshevik government of the USSR, the Ukrainian ethnographical territory again contracted both in the East and in the West.

Since the political boundaries of Ukraine did not include all the Ukrainian ethnical territories in any historical period except that of the Kievan Empire, it seems more fruitful to study the social and economic history of the Ukrainian people than the history of the Ukrainian state. The latter approach might well be interpreted as an artificial political restriction of the scope of such a study as this present analysis to the territorial limits of the contemporary Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. A study undertaken along such lines, since it would automatically exclude other Ukrainian

ethnic territories, would result in an inadequate treatment of the Ukrainian historical past.

For the sake of comprehensiveness this analysis should include the development of various segments of the Ukrainian people under different conditions—some within the political framework of the Ukrainian State, and others within the framework of the political organisms of such foreign powers as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania. This analysis should also include that large part of the Ukrainian ethnic territory under Russian rule during the 19th century, the smaller fragment under Austrian domination at the same time, and the peculiarities of both. The regional differences of the Ukrainian social, political, economic, and cultural evolution in the past had their origin in the artificial differentiations brought about by artificial political barriers and the distinctive political environments which resulted from the influence of foreign rulers. These differentiations often resulted in interprovincial antagonisms and animosities among the southern and northern, eastern and western divisions of the Ukrainian people, making the overall process of building the national state all the more difficult. Nevertheless, these regional peculiarities, together with the developments in the central Ukrainian districts produced through the centuries that most interesting socio-economic mosaic known as the Ukrainian people, an ethnic group determined to preserve its common cultural heritage in spite of formidable forces working to the contrary end.

Today the ethnographical Ukrainian territory covers the southern part of East Europe. More specifically, it extends approximately from 22° to 44° east longitude, and from 45° to 53° north latitude. This compact area excludes the ethnically mixed borderlands, and covers approximately 277,000 square miles of normally broad lowland north of the Black and Azov Seas. During the 20th century the Ukrainian ethnic area underwent a considerable contraction, especially after World War II, because of the forced deportation and compulsory recolonization of its population in its eastern and western borderlands. Because Soviet vital statistics are suspected of politically motivated distortions, the population of the smaller area can be estimated only at a maximum of 35,000,000. Many more Ukrainians live in South Siberia, Kazakhstan, Turkestan, and the distant districts of the Amur region, as a result of compulsory migration induced by the Russians, but since these Ukrainians have been separated from the ethnic-national core by great territorial distances, which have made it impossible for them to contribute to the organic evolution of the Ukrainian ethnic community, they are not included in the present analysis.<sup>12</sup>

**The People.** The earliest information concerning the ancient Slavic tribes in Ukraine came from some Arabic travelers and merchants, such as Masudi, Ibn Rusta, and Ibn Jacob; the Greek Emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus; the legendary Ukrainian monk, Nestor (in his chronicle entitled "The Story of the Old Times"); the Hypathian and Laurentian chronicles of uncertain authorship; and many other, perhaps lesser known, authors and their written documents of the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries.<sup>13</sup> Nestor's "Story of the Old Times," apparently the oldest Ukrainian chronicle, contains much information about the ancient Slavs, their settlements, their religious beliefs, their way of life, and the beginnings of the Kievan Empire, the first large-scale state organization of the Ukrainian Slavs, which as early as the 11th century included all Eastern Slavs in its political framework. The chronicles enumerate several Slavic tribes inhabiting the East European area, and along with them, seven southern Slavic tribes, which according to the later historical studies, merged, and in the course of an ethnico-cultural evolution fused into a new national concept of the Ukrainian people. These Ukrainian tribes were the Polianians, Siverians, Khorvatians, Derevlians, Dulibians, Ulichians, and Tiverians. The Polianians settled on the banks of the river Ros and down the right bank of the river Dnieper. The Siverians populated the area on the banks of the rivers Seim, Desna, and upper Vorskla. The Khorvatians were located on the banks of the upper Dniester and toward the foot of the Carpathian Mountains. The Dulibians populated the western, and the Derevlians, the eastern part of Volhynia. The tribal area of the Ulichians extended along the banks of the lower Dniester, and the Tiverians settled in the area between the lower Dniester and Pruth rivers. The other Eastern Slavs, such as the tribes of the Dregovichians, Radimichians, Polotsians, Krivichians, Viaticians and Slovinians, lived in the northern part of East Europe, on the banks of the River Priet and Berezina, and on those of the middle and upper Dniepr, in the Volga-Klazma-Oka river system, and farther westward, toward the Baltic Sea. These Northwestern and Northeastern branches of the East Slavs, in later history, gave rise to two other Slavic nationalities, the Byeloruthenians and the Russians.

Since prehistoric times the Ukrainian southern Slavs were under potent influence of the Hellenic and Iranian civilizations. The Hellenic colonies on the northern coasts of the Black Sea (Pontus) radiated Greek culture across southern Ukraine as early as the

8th century before the Christian era. The ancient peoples of Ukraine, either the Scythians, the Sarmatians, or the immediate predecessors of the seven Ukrainian Slavic tribes, the Antes, were considerably influenced by the spiritual and material civilizations of ancient Greece through their commercial and social contacts with Hellenic colonies. Iranian culture influenced Ukraine from the time of Mithradates throughout the period of the Bosporan kingdom. Historical documents and archaeological studies distinctly established the influence of the Hellenic and Iranian civilizations on the cultural climate of Ukraine as a result of Slavic domination of Eastern Europe in the sixth and seventh centuries.<sup>14</sup> Then began the process of cultural differentiation among the East Slavs, which process resulted in the formation of a distinctive Ukrainian culture quite different from the Russian. The spiritual origin of the latter culture must be sought in the Ugro-Finnic and Mongol elements of the European Northeast. Although Shakhmatov, Vozniak, Kuziela, and other Ukrainian and Russian students of East European history, languages, folklores, and literatures are convinced that the evolution of the Ukrainians, Byeloruthenians, and Russians into three separate ethnic groups was practically completed by the 11th century, the beginning of this process of differentiation no doubt took place in prehistoric times, certainly at a time prior to the migration of the Slavs to Eastern Europe.<sup>15</sup>

The seven Ukrainian tribes were assimilated into the new national-ethnic concept of the Ukrainian people in the course of the 10th and 11th centuries, usually in a peaceful manner and without any considerable influx of foreign ethnic elements. The Ukrainians are relatively pure Slavic since they intermingled only very slightly with the Bulgar, Khazar, and Magyar rulers who dominated them from the 8th to the 10th centuries. The Khazars, for example, only levied a duty on the Eastern Slavs, and otherwise interfered but little in their tribal matters.<sup>16</sup>

In the 10th century the Ukrainian tribes, with the help of Norse warriors, created the Kievan Empire. The original ethnic cell which initiated the growth of the Kievan state was the tribe of the Polianians. The political creation of the Ukrainians greatly advanced their national evolution in such areas as language, folklore, religion, and social, legal, and economic institutions. Minor tribal differences which formerly existed in customs, habits, and social institutions blended under the unifying influence of a common political organization. The Kievan Rus, however, soon experienced

an enormous territorial and political growth as a result of the superior organizational skill of the Northmen who conquered Novgorod the Great and then Kiev. But, because of its extremely favorable location, and because the Northmen co-operated with the more civilized Ukrainian Slavs in building the Empire, Kiev in a very short time assumed complete leadership and imposed a semi-colonial status upon the northern area. After Kiev had conquered and dominated vast areas of East Europe, and especially the European Northeast, the Empire lost all ethnical and racial homogeneity, and became a political melange of numerous nationalities, races, and religions. The Ukrainians amounted to at most a third of the entire population of the Kievan state, the total population of which at that time might have been some seven and a half million people.<sup>17</sup> Historians are agreed that there were very few Northmen in Kiev. The Byeloruthenian tribes, Russian tribes, the Mordvins, Merias, Cheremisians, Chuds, Volga-Bulgars, and many other tribes of prevalingly Ugro-Finnic and Mongol extraction, constituting a considerable portion of the population of the Ukrainian-Kievan state, were forced by the power of Kiev to join the Empire. Nevertheless, the southern Ukrainians retained and intensified their national individuality because of the following circumstances: the uniform living conditions, including geographic and climatic environment, of their compact ethnical mass; the strong commercial relations with Byzantium; the immediate influence of Byzantine civilization; the considerable political and cultural connections with the West; the common language and religion; and the great distance which separated them from direct contact with the Ugro-Finnic ethnical communities. Moreover, the Ukrainians conducted themselves everywhere in the Empire as an elevated ruling caste, having little in common with the primitive subjugated tribes and clans. Shelukhin quotes much evidence of an antagonistic attitude especially of the northern Slavic (pre-Russian) communities toward the ruling and administrative elements immigrating from the South that were generally called "Rus."<sup>18</sup>

After the liquidation of the Kievan state by the Mongol-Tartar invaders of the 13th century, the process of crystallization of the Ukrainian nationality was continued within the political framework of the Galician-Volhinian Duchy. The Galician-Volhinian state was a purely Ukrainian political entity which covered the Ukrainian cultural area to the exclusion of other ethnic groups. Because of the territories lost to the Mongols, this area was much smaller than that of the Kievan Empire. As rulers of this territory, the



Galician-Volhinian dukes, in the 13th and 14th centuries, accepted and used the title of "duces totius terrae Russiae," in order fully to express the national character of their duchy and to distinguish it from the Northeastern areas of Suzdal, Rostov, and Vladimir. By these elements the ethnic origin of the Ukrainian nationality was fully completed. Later developments, such as the Lithuanian-Polish rule, the increasing Western cultural influences, and the new political environment following the collapse of the Galician-Volhinian Duchy, merely westernized the Ukrainians to a greater extent.<sup>19</sup>

Although the above account of the over-all ethnic national evolution of the Ukrainian people is comprehensive though brief, it is the specific subject matter of this analysis. Russian historians have given such a diametrically opposed interpretation of the ethnical developments of the medieval European Northeast that this account cannot be completed without a brief review of the Russian opinion on Ukraine as well as some notice of the origin of the Russian nationality, in order to clarify the controversy. As a matter of historical fact, three different ethnical-national processes developed in the Kievan Empire, resulting in the crystallization of three distinct nationalities: in the South, the Ukrainian people; in the Northwest, the Byeloruthenian people; and in the northeastern borderland of the Empire, the Russian people. The tribes of the Dregovichians, Radimichians, and Plotsians formed the Byeloruthenian nationality. The Byeloruthenian people have an historical past similar to that of the Ukrainians. The latter, however, were influenced by the Hellenic-Iranian civilization to a greater degree. After the collapse of the Kievan Empire, the Byeloruthenians soon joined the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, while the Ukrainians lived in their own Galician-Volhinian state. Nevertheless, a century later both East Slavonic nationalities were merged in the political framework of the Polish-Lithuanian Empire.

Quite different was the third ethnic process which brought about the crystallization of the Russian nationality in the far-distant forest areas of the Volga-Oka and Klazma regions. The Hellenic-Iranian influence did not directly extend to the ancestors of the modern Russians, whose culture, as a result, remained rather underdeveloped. These pre-Russian Slavic tribes of the Krivichians, Viaticians, and Slovinians very early in pre-historic times came into contact with the Ugro-Finnic tribes in the area. The living conditions in the Northeast were very difficult. At first the

Slavs fought the Ugro-Finns, but later they intermingled with their enemies in order to survive. This intermingling facilitated the process of amalgamation of Slavs and Ugro-Finns. The Northern Slavs and Finnic tribes found a common interest in their hostility toward their rulers, the more civilized southern "Rus." In the process of assimilation the Slavs gained a predominance, but the characteristics of the new ethnic alloy progressively alienated them from the Ukrainian South and the Byeloruthenian Northwest. The peculiarities of the severe climate and environment, especially the very hard struggle for economic survival in the poor forest areas of the Northeast, the great distance from the cultural centers of medieval Europe, and the impact of the Finnic ethnic characteristics produced the future Great Russian nationality. Outstanding Russian scholars and historians, like Shakhmatov, Platonov, Presniakov, and Pokrivskii, recognize to the fullest extent the role of the northern climate and of the Finnic ethnic element in the development of the Russian people, and accept the 11th and 12th centuries as the time in which the process of the formation of the Russian nationality was completed. But, as it will be noted below, official Russian historians offer a different explanation.

By and large, the different ethnic processes, under completely different geographical and historical circumstances, culminated in the creation of three distinct East European Slavic nationalities, each possessing different national characteristics. Slavic Ukrainians, developing under more favorable conditions in the South, influenced by the free atmosphere of the steppes, and having been in the orbit of the Hellenic-Iranian spiritual radiation, became more individualistic, less ready to submit to authority, sometimes even anarchistic, and always broadly democratic-minded. Since they lived under less pressure from their natural environment, with its more favorable geographic and topographical conditions, they became, in contrast to the Russians, less consistent in thought and action, and at that time less stubborn, less cruel, and less determined to realize their ideas without regard for others, and without regard for the price to be paid for an eventual realization of those ideas.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, the hardships of the northern life and the Ugro-Finnic national elements caused the Russian psychology to be more collective-minded, very well disciplined and ready to submit to authority, very consistent in thought and action, and cruel and inconsiderate in the realization of its own ideas. The autocratic system of Russian government throughout the centuries, a system never friendly to any democratic innovations, was a direct

result of the nature of the people and of the adverse conditions under which they lived. The national characteristics of both peoples, the Ukrainians and the Russians, became even more profoundly different in consequence of the Mongol invasion in the 13th century. The Ukrainians were but briefly under Mongol rule. The Slavic Ukrainians, strongly influenced by Western civilization, did not develop a close relationship to their Mongolian conquerors. Moreover, the Mongol rule of Ukraine was of short duration. The Russians, on the other hand, already part Mongolian due to their absorption of Ugro-Finnic elements, collaborated more closely with the invaders of Gingham Khan. Then, too, Mongol rule extended over a longer period of time and resulted in considerable assimilation of Mongol blood by the Russian people. All classes of Russian society—aristocracy, country gentry and peasants—received an influx of Mongolian blood, either in the later period of the rule of the Golden Horde, or in the period which followed. All Russian national life, including social processes, governmental and administrative institutions, legal and financial systems, developed under the strong impact of Mongol institutions. These developments completed the evolution of the Russian national characteristics. That the Muscovite-Russians accomplished the building of their great empire is attributable to their Mongolian psychological characteristics. Some students of Russian history estimate that the Russians are eighty percent Mongolian. This might be an exaggeration, but no serious scholar could ever afford to deny the great significance of the Mongols in the development of the Russian nation and the Russian Empire. 21

Russian official historiography, however, eventually came to an entirely different conclusion. At first it fully disregarded the existence of three distinct nationalities of Slavonic descent in East Europe, and accepted a theory of only one Russian people composed of three ethnic communities, namely, Great Russians, Little Russians, and White Russians. Before long this nationalistic historiography could not come to terms with the idea that the Kievan Empire was created by the Little Russians (Ukrainians). Finally, Pogodin and Sobolevskii elaborated a new approach, which was popularized by Kluchevskii, to the effect that the Kievan region since prehistoric times was populated by the Russians, and that during the Mongol invasion the Russians first emigrated to the Northeast, seeking safety, and that the Ukrainians only then came from the West and settled down in the Dniepr and Kiev area. Of course, any basic cultural and national differences between the

Ukrainians and Russians were not admitted by Russian official historiography. Since there were no objective historical indications of any mass movements of population from the Kievan regions to the Volga-Oka areas at the time of the Mongol invasion, the Pogodin-Sobolevskii hypothesis proved to be a mere speculation. The hypothesis about the Northern emigration of the original Kievan Russians has been fully discredited by Maksimovich, Hrushevsky, and Presniakov, and at least doubted by others like Prokovskit and Golulbiev.<sup>22</sup> But from the standpoint of Russian imperialism, it was undesirable to admit any national differentiation of European Russia. First of all, Russian aggression in Ukraine and Byeloruthenia, followed by Russian rule, could not easily be justified. Recently the Soviets have resorted to a new theory of prehistoric Russian nationality, which supposedly created the Kievan Rus, Muscovite Grand Duchy, and the Russian Empire. According to this theory, the Great Russian people were the direct successors of the traditions of a pre-Russian nation, while the Ukrainians and the Byeloruthenians having split from the Russian core under the Lithuanian and Polish rule, were declared to be a later product of the 14th and 15th centuries. Furthermore, the official view declares that there is a natural and organical trend among the three brotherly nationalities of the Russians, the Ukrainians, and the Byeloruthenians, to dissolve and to merge again into one homogeneous nation and people. This time, however, Soviet-Russian historiography is referring to one Soviet people. Although this theory is refuted by the fact of ethnical-national differentiation in East Europe—a process which began in prehistoric times—it received the official approval of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR on January 12, 1954, as the only one consistent with the Party Line.<sup>23</sup>

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE BASIC TRAITS OF UKRAINIAN SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**Agricultural predominance - The economy of moving frontiers - Individualism - Vitality - Unevenness and irregularity of the socio-economic evolution - Periods of Ukrainian socio-economic history**

**Agricultural Predominance.** Agriculture has predominated throughout Ukrainian economic history, and has profoundly affected the formation and development of Ukrainian cultural, social, and political institutions. In every period of Ukrainian history, farming, together with cattle raising, hunting, and fishing, was the basis of economic growth and the source of material wealth. Historians, however, have been somewhat confused by the highly commercialized economic growth of the Kievan Empire, so that Kluchevskii, Rozhkov, and certain others came to the conclusion that trade and commerce were actually the leading industries in Kievan Ukraine and formed the basis of her medieval economy, and that agriculture was only secondary.<sup>1</sup> This hypothesis is not supported by the facts. First Grekov and then the majority of modern historians denied Kluchevskii's view. They stated that historical documents proved the predominance of agriculture in the national economy of the Kievan Empire.<sup>2</sup>

Of course, trading and commerce were important to Kiev and they also developed in Ukraine in the later periods of her history. The late 17th century even witnessed a growth of modern manufacturing. These industries, however, were always secondary in importance.

There were two reasons for the predominance of agriculture: geographic environment and foreign aggression. In the first place, the extremely fertile soil and favorable climate were conducive to an agricultural economy. In the second, Ukraine's tremendous industrial potential of minerals, power, and labor could not be developed because of the intervention of external political and military factors. The Russian Czarate, which for a hundred and fifty years ruled Ukraine, pursued a consistent policy of keeping the country agricultural, as a source of raw materials for an all-Russian market.

Thus, the predominance of an agricultural economy shaped the development of the Ukrainian people as did no other single factor. Country life, close to nature, influenced their character toward a deeply religious life, a strong faith in God, strict moral principles, consideration of others, and extreme individualism.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps these qualities weakened the ability of the Ukrainians to resist the ruthlessness and cruelty of neighbors who repeatedly attempted to conquer their riches. It is enough to cite the Mongol raids, Russian inspired famines, and German genocides in Ukraine. The frequency of such invasions emphasized that the agricultural predominance of Ukraine's economy was indissolubly interwoven with its characteristic of being an economy of moving frontiers.

**The Economy of Moving Frontiers.** Since prehistoric times Ukraine has been a borderland, a frontier country. In the South and in the East stretched vast, largely unpopulated steppes, which, by their very character, invited settlement and colonization. The exposed position of the country constituted a door which swung in both directions; this facilitated both the expansion of the Ukrainian ethnic area and the invasion of Ukraine by her neighbors.

As a result, colonization of the borderlands took the form of voluntary, semi-military organizations and associations, which continuously conquered new areas for civilization. The voluntary character of these associations greatly strengthened the growth of individualism and the love of freedom among the Ukrainians.

This armed colonization movement was a permanent feature of the political and economic development of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people throughout their earliest history and throughout the eras of the Kievan Empire and the Galician-Volhinian Duchy, when the Black Sea steppes were penetrated by the Rus in the face of opposition from the Asiatic Cumans. Furthermore, the entire Cossack period of Ukrainian history was an unrelenting process of armed colonization of the Black Sea steppes and the Donetz Basin which lasted three hundred and fifty years.<sup>4</sup> After the liquidation of the Cossacks by the Russian Czarate, the colonization of southern and eastern Ukrainian frontiers continued into the second half of the 19th century. The existence of vast, almost empty areas just beyond the borders had important repercussions on the entire history of the Ukrainian people. First of all, the bondage of serfdom seems to have been less oppressive in Ukraine than in central and western Europe, where because there were no frontiers the serfs had no opportunity to escape. The serfs of Ukraine, therefore, were treated better by the feudal lords and gentry than were

those of the neighboring countries, just as the lot of the worker in early America was better than that of his European counterpart.<sup>5</sup> Thus the Ukrainian frontier existed as an alternative to servitude, and indirectly resulted in better treatment and higher wages even for those who did not accept its invitation. With the growing burden of bondage, peasants abandoned their homes and farms and escaped into the broad steppes in quest of greater freedom. The harsh punishment of recaptured fugitives did not prevent a continuous and ever increasing stream of illegal emigration to distant frontier lands. Serfdom and bondage did not exist in the frontier lands until the organized expansion of the state reached these borderlands. Then the process repeated itself, as successive waves of fugitive peasants escaped the bondage of recently organized and "civilized" areas, and penetrated the even more distant frontiers. They created by this process the Ukrainian ethnographical territory, which continued to expand until modern times.

Another consequence of this process of expansion was the development of the free Cossack, who passionately loved his individual independence.<sup>6</sup> The Cossacks became the symbol of national heroism for the Ukrainian people. Thus the Cossacks' faults and virtues soon became Ukrainian national characteristics.

**Individualism** had a profound influence on the development of the history of the Ukrainian people, particularly on the growth of their political, social, and economic institutions.<sup>7</sup> Throughout their history the Ukrainians had been predominantly peasants. The soil was the principal source of their wealth and material growth. From love of the soil came the inspiration for Ukrainian art and culture. Even the upper classes, the old aristocracy and the modern intelligentsia, felt a strong attraction to the land. Always individualistic, the Ukrainian peasant relied on God, on nature, and on himself. Upon his farm or estate, the farmer or nobleman considered himself a sovereign lord, and resented any outside intervention or intrusion even in the form of communal activities for his own benefit.<sup>8</sup> The institution of the Ukrainian "hromada" was a voluntary and loose association of individuals who were ready to cooperate towards the realization of a definite goal. The hromada never resembled the Russian "mir," that compulsory collective body to which the rights of individual peasants were subordinated. The mir was an organically collective institution whereas the hromada was a flexible organization without any sovereign rights.<sup>9</sup>

Wide steppes, fertile soil, abundant space, and the remote Hellenic traditions inspired the individualistic philosophy of the Ukrainian people. This individualism, perhaps, was an indirect obstacle to the construction of the Ukrainian national state. The individualism of the Galician-Volhynian aristocracy indirectly contributed to the political collapse of that Ukrainian state organization. The developments in the Galician-Volhynian Duchy were very much like the social-political situation in England at the time of the adoption of the Magna Charta. However, the insular character of England, which discouraged foreign intervention enabled the English noblemen to establish the foundation of their parliamentarism and democracy. The unfavorable geo-political position of the Galician-Volhynian realm brought about its downfall. A foreign intervention utilized to its full extent the struggle between the despotic tendencies of the Galician rulers and the parliamentary tendencies of the Boyar aristocracy. Had it not been for the Polish and Lithuanian intrusion, the Galician noblemen would probably have succeeded developing parliamentarism, and then democracy, by way of a slow and organic evolution. The democratic arrangements in the Cossack period two and a half centuries later represent the real political trend of medieval Ukraine, although the individualism and love of independence of the Cossacks sometimes accentuated semi-anarchistic features that ruined the nation even while it was under construction. Appropriate examples are easily found in the history of Hetmanic Ukraine.<sup>10</sup> The recent history of the Ukrainian people shows some negative consequences of over-exaggerated individualism on political thought and action, in the attempt to establish a Ukrainian national state. In order to overcome the extremities of individualism, and to avoid at the same time the economically and socially destructive consequences of Communism, a strong nationalist movement was organized in Western Ukraine during the interwar period. However, because of the inborn Ukrainian individualism, and also because of the Russian-German intrigues, the strong national independence movement soon split into several fragments and immediately lost its initial power.<sup>11</sup>

The most clear-cut economic projection of traditional Ukrainian individualism lies in the two principles of private property and individual initiative, which are inherent in the philosophy of the Ukrainian people. They always recognized and respected to the fullest extent both personal property and real property. The traditions of Hellenic civilization and Roman Law, which so deeply affected and influenced the early Ukrainian national development, contributed heavily to that feature of the social and economic evolution of the



Ukrainians. The old Ukrainian code of laws, whether it was the official or private compilation of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, reflected very well the social and economic conditions of that time. The generally accepted name of this code was "Rus 'ka Pravda". Rus'ka Pravda specifically recognized the institution of private property and established its legal defenses.<sup>12</sup>

Because of the individualist psyche of the ancient Ukrainians, the disintegration of the clan system in Ukraine had been almost accomplished in late prehistoric times. In early times, land had been held as private property by the free peasants, who acquired their lands after the disintegration of the communal clan ownership, by way of free physical occupation. The highly uneven distribution of land holdings among the peasants in Kievan Rus' seems to indicate very clearly that the process of appropriation had been brought about by individual initiative, without any organized communal action.<sup>13</sup> Remnants of the ancient commune could be found in Kievan Ukraine only in the form of meadow, wood, and fishery rights. Shortly afterwards, the formation of the large-scale private landholdings of the Boyar nobility and gentry developed, and gave rise to a Ukrainian type of quasi-feudalism.<sup>14</sup> At the time of the Mongol invasion, communal property and communal economy revived in Ukraine. But it was a rather short-lived phenomenon, and it might be considered as an emergency measure organized to withstand the very difficult living conditions that accompanied foreign domination. After the situation improved, at least a little, holding of private property by peasants became the rule again.<sup>15</sup>

Under Polish rule, however, the Ukrainian economic picture experienced change. As the early Polish economy was based on large-scale land holdings and serf labor, the growing power of the Poles in Ukraine eliminated peasant ownership of land. Yet basically, the Polish social and economic constitution was individualist, and not collectivist like the Muscovite. The Ukrainian national revolution of 1648 resulted in a slow revival of peasant private property rights, and in a recognition of the importance of soil as the main source of subsistence of the rural population. The Revolution partially destroyed the artificial Polish social order in Ukraine. For example, the latifundia of the Polish aristocracy and the landholdings of the gentry became free for peasant occupation and appropriation. But during the entire Cossacko-Hetmanic period, a struggle between the principle of free peasant land holding and the principle of serfdom continued. Peasant property rights were tolerated, but their extent was subject to change, as a result of the growth of a social struc-

ture that was essentially a rigid class system. Thus the Cossack aristocracy and gentry, like the old Polish nobility, attempted by every means to restrict the individual rights of the peasants, and to turn the peasants into serfs.<sup>16</sup>

In the political framework of Czarist Russia, semifeudalism and serfdom prevailed, while the rural communities were collectively organized in the form of the so-called "mir". Practically speaking, not much room was left for the rights of the peasant to private property under Russian rule. Deficiencies of the collectivist "mir" seemed to be overcome by Stolypin's reform, which aimed to abolish the communal-collectivist nature of the "mir" and the entire Russian agriculture, and to introduce individual farming. The reform was enthusiastically hailed in Ukraine, where it was considerably expedited. The ethnically Russian provinces, however, gave little support to the reform, since it was alien to the Russian collectivist psychology.<sup>17</sup>

A major clash between this collectivist philosophy of the Russians and the individualism of the Ukrainians first took place after the Bolshevik Revolution in the Russian Empire in 1917. The individualistic Ukrainians could not adjust to the idea of nation-wide collectivism, and their resistance to the socialization was so resolute and strong that the Kremlin resorted to an artificial famine in 1932 and 1933, primarily for the purpose of breaking down peasant opposition. This famine resulted in the death of six million peasants and crushed opposition to the collectivization of agriculture. The Ukrainian peasant had paid a terrible price for his individualism. The urban population, a minority of the Ukrainian people, who did not display the same degree of individualism, were partially saved from starvation.<sup>18</sup>

**Vitality.** History offers distinct proof of the enormous vitality of the Ukrainian people. In the course of their heroic past they have had periods of grave national tragedies, caused by their three deadly enemies: the Asiatic nomads, who settled in the South and East, in the Black Sea and Don-Volga steppes; the Poles, who settled in the West; and the Muscovite-Russians in the North. The Avars, Cumans, and Mongol-Tartars were the most hostile neighbors of the Ukrainian people. Under the impact of the Cuman attacks the Kievan Empire was weakened considerably. The Mongol invasion administered the *coup de grace*.

The constant warfare and plundering of the Mongols devastated

the entire country over and over again in the course of the 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries. These merciless raids threatened the entire Ukrainian nationality with extermination, and forced the Ukrainians during the 14th and 15th centuries to give up large portions of their southern and eastern territories. Only the enormous biological vitality of the Ukrainian people, their very high birth rate and amazingly large families, enabled them to overcome the catastrophic death rate resulting from the frequent bloody struggles in this area of the European frontier. There was, though, one important historical instance which greatly contributed to the national survival of the Ukrainian people. The Mongols were racially, religiously, and culturally so different from the Slavic, Orthodox, and westernized Ukrainians that there was no need for the latter to fear denationalization pressure from the Mongols or from the Moslems, Asiatic Tartars, and Turks. This preservation of their national identity helped the Ukrainians to become the victors in their struggle against the invaders. They soon rebuilt upon the ruins of national economy, and also recaptured the lost ethnographical territories by means of armed colonization.

The Poles at the peak of their political power had also once represented a deadly threat to the integrity of the Ukrainian people. The Polish people, being Slavic, were culturally close to the Ukrainians. Denationalization rather than physical extermination threatened the Ukrainians under the rule of the Polish Crown. The Ukrainian western borders were shortened and pushed to the East by the pressure of Polish political and territorial expansion. Many square miles of Ukrainian ethnical territory were lost in this expansion.<sup>19</sup> Under the influence of the Polish denationalization policies, almost the entire upper class of the Ukrainian society - both nobility and gentry - abandoned their fidelity to their country, people, and religion, and became Polish. Only a few remained Ukrainian. Several factors helped the Ukrainians to preserve themselves as a separate political nationality. First of all, the stock of the Ukrainian people, the peasantry, did not denationalize. The Orthodox Church and the Uniat Ukrainian Catholic Church, both somewhat different from Roman Catholicism (the ruling religion in the Polish kingdom), helped the Ukrainians to retain their national individuality and identity. Furthermore, the biological vitality of the lower classes again accounted for the ability of the whole people to withstand the influx of Polish culture. The lower classes produced a new Cossack nobility and gentry, and gave the people new leaders. The national state was reestablished after the National Revolution of 1648, and the Ukrainian people resumed their social and economic growth.

The Russians proved to be the most dangerous of all the enemies of Ukraine for many reasons. The Russians and the Ukrainians had a common national origin in the framework of the Kievan Empire. Also, from the second half of the eighteenth century up to the present day, both nationalities have been compelled to join the same political organization, either under the name of the Russian Empire or under the name of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Both nationalities have lived too long together in the framework of the same state organizations. Furthermore, both nationalities have been prevalingly Orthodox, and have been influenced by Byzantine culture. The Czarist government used its Orthodox church very extensively to denationalize the Ukrainians. Then the Russians, without any historical justification, appropriated the Ukrainians' name, history, and civilization, and tried to reduce them to the ethnic status suggested by the term "Little Russians." Again, as in the past, the majority of the Ukrainian upper class denationalized but this time became Russian. The eastern Ukrainian ethnical frontiers contracted under the impact of Russian imperialism. In the first half of the 19th century, it seemed that Ukrainian nationality would be eventually absorbed by Russianization.<sup>20</sup> Police terror was also widely invoked in the form of deportation of Ukrainians, compelled to colonize Asiatic Russian possessions. As a matter of fact, the Czarate in 1876 thought that it had realized its goal of total liquidation of the "Ukrainian Problem." Any official use of, or any printed publication in, the Ukrainian language was prohibited. However, a Ukrainian national rebirth came, again initiated by the Ukrainian peasant class, and again deriving its power and vitality, both physical and spiritual, from the native soil. The Ukrainian National Revolution of 1918, and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, proved that the Ukrainian people had again vigorously resisted the forces which aimed at their destruction and annihilation.

The Soviet regime then changed its tactics. Having profited by Czarist experience, which showed that the Ukrainian question could not be settled politically as long as the Ukrainian people survived physically, the Soviets launched an extensive genocide policy in Ukraine. Mass murder, mass deportation to Siberia and Kazakhstan, two famines (1921-22 and 1932-33), and mass executions were aimed at depopulating Ukraine. The whole countryside, with its thousands of villages, was thus affected. Economic exploitation was carried out with great precision. Nevertheless, during the Second World War, in defiance of all Communist-Russian measures,

the Ukrainian Insurgent Army started a war for independence throughout the nation, against both Russian and German invaders. The biological and spiritual vitality of the Ukrainian people overcame the genocide.<sup>21</sup>

In the course of history, Ukraine was greatly depopulated and its economy severely impaired during the Mongol invasion in the Middle Ages, during the National Revolution in the 17th century, during the Turkish wars in the 18th century, and under the Russian-Communist rule in the 20th century. Each time the population increased again, the lost ethnical areas were recovered, and the economy was rebuilt to such an extent that the country was able not only to care for its own needs, but also to reenter foreign trade. The importance of this vital participation of Ukraine in foreign trade and commerce was evident during the Kievan Empire, under the Polish rule, in the Cossacko-Hetmanic state, and in the framework of Czarist international trade. Yet, despite this considerable commercial activity, a great deal of national energy was repeatedly directed toward rebuilding, again and again, social and economic growth. The Ukrainians were never discouraged, but as a result of such continual developments, the Ukrainian state survived only a relatively short time as a political sovereign unit.

**Unevenness and Irregularity of Socio-economic Evolution.** As pointed out several times, there was a completely different course of events in the social and economic developments of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples. Their historical destinies have been diametrically distinct. Here the point must be stressed again, that the growth of the Russian nation was amazingly consistent and even.<sup>22</sup> The Mongol invasion was certainly a major disturbance. However, from the middle of the 13th century, when Moscow seized the national leadership, until the Bolshevik revolution in the 20th century, the growth of the Empire was regular, nationally organic, and according to the established trends. This pattern is in sharp contrast to the uneven and irregular social and economic development of the Ukraine.

The evolution of the Ukrainian social and economic system began in the 9th century when Ukraine entered the historical-political arena of medieval Europe. This social and economic evolution continued in the Kievan Empire and in the Galician-Volhinian Duchy until 1349, the year of the liquidation of the Duchy by Polish and Lithuanian intervention. This event and the Mongol invasion brought to a violent end the organic evolution of Ukrainian parliamentary monarchism, the growth of the social classes, and the development

of a predominantly agricultural economy and flourishing trade. After the Mongol invasion, a new phase of socio economic evolution began. A primitive economy of cattle raising, fishing, and hunting by the self-sufficient communal households followed in the second half of the 13th century, and in the 14th century and succeeded the highly developed agriculture, trade, and commerce of the economically flourishing Kievo-Galician era. Moreover, primitive clan arrangements followed the strong state organization of Kiev, which was of an imperial stature. It was not one, but many steps backward in the overall evolutionary process.<sup>23</sup> The new period in the social and economic development of the Ukrainian people had still another distinct feature; namely, it was no longer purely Ukrainian nationally. The impact of Polish and Lithuanian social, political, legal, and economic institutions and influences on Ukrainian national life was enormous and challenging. Polish and Lithuanian institutions replaced many that were traditionally Ukrainian, or, at least, modified them considerably. The entire period featured a semi-feudal socio-economic constitution of Ukrainian society, based upon serfdom and strict division into social classes. Transition from one class to the other was difficult, and eventually was legally prohibited. This lack of vertical mobility was distinctly a characteristic of the Polish socio-economic and political institutions, which by the end of this period had already reached a relatively high stage of development in Ukraine.

The national revolution of 1648 to 1650 initiated a new national period of the social and economic history of Ukraine. The rule of the Polish kings was succeeded by a Ukrainian democratic and republican government. The old Polish structure was replaced by one with Ukrainian characteristics. Economically, the Cossacko-Hetmanic period was an era of independent national economy that developed under a more favorable political atmosphere, and in a more balanced way; but it was still a continuation of the frontier economy of the Ukraine, constantly expanding toward the South and East. It was responsible for the growth of agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing. However, before the Ukrainian society and the Ukrainian economy developed fully in the sovereign state, by 1781, Ukraine was incorporated into the Russian empire.<sup>24</sup> Of course, there had not been enough time since 1648 and 1649 to permit the maturity of the Ukrainian national economy, which was still predominantly an agricultural economy of the frontier. With its inclusion in the all-Russian imperial market, Ukrainian economy lost its relative independence, and was in the position of an exploited agricultural colony of the semi-mercantilist Russian Empire.

Once more the progress of the socio-economic evolution of the Ukrainian people was suddenly interrupted and directed to serve their conquerors. Mercantilism in the Russian Empire was succeeded by capitalism. Being politically a part of Russia at that time, Ukraine also experienced the transition, and became, especially after the abolition of serfdom in 1861, a semi-capitalistic colony of the semi-capitalistic Russian giant. The First World War and the National Revolution of 1918 produced a sovereign Ukrainian Democratic Republic. But the period of a free Ukrainian nation in the 20th century was too short to affect very deeply the evolution of social and economic institutions in Ukraine. Yet this brief national era was marked by a struggle between the old semi-capitalistic institutions and the socialist reform movement.

The Communist Revolution in the Russian Empire, 1917 to 1921, put Ukraine again under Russian rule. She became a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic within the Soviet Union, with all the characteristics of communist collectivism. The old class structure, capitalistic society, private property, and individual initiative were suddenly destroyed, repealed, and replaced by a new Communist society, new social classes, state ownership, and collective initiative. The process of building had to be started all over again from the social wreckage left behind by the Bolshevik Revolution. Indeed, the socio-economic evolution of the Ukrainian people, even now, was to be anything but a steady and smooth growth.

**Periods of Ukrainian Socio-economic History.** For convenience in discussing the social and economic growth of the Ukrainian people, the whole evolutionary process will be divided into periods. Two significant and epochal events, and two fundamental changes took place in the course of these eleven hundred years. These challenging events and changes are so distinct that they make the identification of individual periods a relatively easy task. The discussion of the unevenness and irregularity of the development of Ukraine has already established certain bases for a correct division of the social and economic evolution of the Ukrainian people into several periods of distinct characteristics. Seven different eras may thus be distinguished.

First period: the prehistoric, lasted from the remote times of the Slavic settlements of the Ukrainian territories, until 860 A.D. when Ukraine entered the historical-political scene of Europe. The event was marked by the large-scale military expedition of the two Kievan chieftians, Askold and Dir, against Constantinople. In this period, Ukrainian nationality was formed, and its distinctive social and economic evolution began.

**Second period: the Kievo-Galician era lasted from 860 until 1349, when the Galician-Volhinian realm was liquidated by Polish and Lithuanian intervention. It was an era of organic growth of medieval Ukrainian society and national economy. Within this period, three distinct phases of development can be distinguished, namely, the Kievan era, the Galician-Volhinian era, and the period of the Mongol rule in the Eastern Ukraine after 1240, the year of the Batu's conquest of Kiev.**

**Third period: the Lithuanian-Polish era continued from 1349 until the National Revolution of 1648-1649. The first phase of the period is the dark age of complete national ruin under the rule of the Mongols. The second phase is marked by a national revival within the framework of the so-called Lithuanian-Rus' state, which lasted until the Lithuanian-Polish Union of Lublin in 1569. In the Lithuanian-Ukrainian state, the Ukrainian social and economic institutions developed rather freely in spite of continuously growing Polish pressure. The Lublin Union which was preceded by the Polish annexation of all Ukrainian ethnical territories, formerly under Lithuania, initiated ruthless Polish rule in Ukraine. By this time the national character of the social and economic institutions in Ukraine had been almost entirely lost.**

**Fourth period: the Cossacko-Hetmanic era lasted from 1648 until 1781, when Russian regulations were introduced into Ukraine. At that time the political sovereignty of the Ukrainian people had been reestablished, and a new revival in the evolution of the Ukrainian society initiated. The Ukrainian national economy developed rather well. Two phases can be differentiated in this period. The first was characterized by national sovereignty in the complete sense of the term, a sovereignty that continued until the battle of Poltava in 1709. The second phase began with the period of growing Russian pressure initiated by Peter the Great.**

**Fifth period: the Russian Czarist rule lasted from 1781 until 1917. The interests of the all-Russian markets and the political pressure of the Czardom completely destroyed any essentially Ukrainian social and economic institutions, and turned Ukraine into an agricultural colony of the Empire in the course of the 19th century. Russian institutions and establishments were introduced throughout Ukraine.**

**Sixth Period: the National Revolution and the era of the Ukrainian Deomcraite Republic extended from 1918 to 1921. This era, too short to have had any considerable effect on the social and economic evolution of the people, was brought to a violent end by the Communist domination of the Ukraine.**



**Seventh Period:** the Russian Soviet rule lasted from the Bolsheviks' conquest and domination of Ukraine in 1921 and 1922, and established a Communist social and economic order there. From this time, Ukraine has been a colony of the Russians. Two separate phases of the Soviet rule in Ukraine can easily be identified. Until 1928, the era of the so-called New Economic Policy prevailed, in the course of which the Red regime was relatively tolerable. Ukrainization of the political and cultural life, and liberalization of the economic system were the marks of the time. Since 1928, the era has been one of ruthless collectivization of the economy, and complete Russianization of all phases of Ukrainian culture and national developments. The Five Year Plans had become the bases of the country's business management.

As anyone might expect who is conversant with the ways of history, the transitions from one of the above periods to another are neither immediate nor sharply defined. Such changes are often prolonged, as, for example, the Mongolian invasion, which links dramatically the second and third periods - the Kievo-Galician and the Lithuanian-Polish eras. Another example of such dynamically extended transition is the increasing pressure of Russian influence which culminated in the event already noted in the preface as forming the terminus of this present economic history of Ukraine - the introduction of Russian rule in 1781.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC HERITAGE OF THE PREHISTORIC PERIOD

#### **Origin of early political organizations - Social structure - Early economic development - Agriculture - Commerce**

**Origin of Early Political Organization.** Since man is naturally social, the individual knows and feels that he can best develop both spiritually and materially when living together with other human beings as a member of a community. This fact was already recognized and analyzed more than two thousand years ago by Aristotle.<sup>1</sup> However, the forms of social organization have been subject to a continuous evolution which has gone on through the remote centuries of prehistoric and ancient times, eventually culminating in the highest stage of socio-political organization, the state or nation. In primitive times, only instinct and psychic spontaneity were at work producing such communities as the family, the clan, the tribe, or simple tribal, semi-state organizations. Perhaps the ancient states grew out of blood relations and the patriarchal principle. Later, when civilized men began to analyze the significance of socio-political associations, states were thought to originate by social contract.<sup>2</sup> The conscious building of political organizations by social agreements does not rule out the spontaneous establishment of social groups. The state is rather a culmination of rational as well as intuitive comprehension by the mind of man of the need of individuals to live and grow within the framework of an orderly arranged society. It must be stressed, however, that neither the state nor any other form of social organization is an end in itself, but rather the means toward realizing its prime objective, the most effective development and growth of the individual personality. If one applied the obverse philosophy and regarded the State as an end in itself, the road to totalitarianism would be already paved.

The Ukrainian Slavs, like other races and peoples at their primitive and prehistorical stages of national development, instinctively and spontaneously aimed to form social organizations and quasi-

state organisms. The idea of a social contract to create a state appeared very early among the Eastern Slavs. The chronicles of the time tell of an invitation extended to the Norsemen by the Slovenians, asking them to rule over the Slovenian lands. The arrival of Askold and Dir at Kiev may also suggest the possibility of a social contract in the growth of the old Kievan empire.<sup>3</sup> Later on, at the time of a higher level of the social and cultural evolution of the Ukrainian people, there were no traces of any totalitarian trends, such as despotism, absolutism, or dictatorship. Thus, the ancient political organizations of the Ukrainians in the eighth and ninth centuries emerged, originating as they did from the family and blood relationships. Nevertheless, reminiscences of the distant past existence of the strong state formations of the Scythians, Roxolians, Iazygians, Sarmatians, and Goths in Ukrainian territories in the remote prehistoric age, indirectly contributed to the desire of the Ukrainian Slavs to have a state organization of their own. Moreover, the experiences of hardships they suffered under the Magyaro-Khazar rule extremely intensified that desire.

Originally, the entire organized life of the ancient Ukrainians developed merely in the form of a self-sufficient household economy, and from that original cell of human organization, the growth of the Ukrainian nation began. The very ancient Ukrainian family was probably founded on the matriarchal principle, where the mother was the center of the family and enjoyed their respect and authority. This resulted in the monogamous marriage and the relatively high morality of the sexual life of the Ukrainian Slavs. Polygamy prevailed among the Polianians. Later the matriarchal principle was replaced by the patriarchal family constitution, so that in the earliest Ukrainian legal codification, "Rus'ka Pravda," the latter alone prevailed. The reminiscence of the old matriarchal system survived in the elevated position of Ukrainian women in family and society under the Kievan empire, and afterwards, throughout the centuries up to the present day. This high social position of women in Ukraine directly contrasted to their status in Muscovy-Russia and Poland.<sup>4</sup> On the eve of the historical period, the Ukrainian family was already patriarchal, for the father had extensive authority, especially with respect to managing the communal efforts to provide for the subsistence. The family was a most natural form of cooperation toward common survival, as based on blood relation. The prevailing severity of the environment necessitated, on the other hand, a strong patriarchal rule. The eldest of the family regulated social life within the household, organized economic activities, and also acted as

judge in family quarrels. His position in the family, however, was never as absolute and despotic as among the other peoples. The elevated position of mother and wife in the family, the rather democratic constitution of clan and "verv", and the inborn Ukrainian individualism prevented the "paterfamilias" from becoming a despot.

Out of the ancient family there developed the clan system, which having been still to some extent agnatic can doubtlessly be regarded as a surrogate of the later state organization and as a further step in that direction. The clan, especially in the final development of its constitution, profoundly influenced the permanent settlement of the Ukrainian Slavs. The clan settled down regularly in a compact way, and gave rise to the old Ukrainian village. Clan villages were communities of collectively organized labor, production, dwelling, and consumption. Clan communities owned pasture lands, woods, beehives, and fisheries, and collectively raised cattle, cultivated soil, and participated in trading, which was a very important occupation especially among Polianians, who became the most civilized and most powerful among the Ukrainian tribes and actually initiated the building of the Kievan Empire. The clan was governed and regulated by a chieftain, called "starosta" (the eldest). His authority, however, was neither despotic nor unlimited. There existed a clan council, composed of all family heads, which retained a supervisory power and restricted the authority of the chieftain in many respects. Although the power of the council was often more comprehensive than that of the chieftain, practically speaking, the personality of the latter was usually the deciding factor, since it largely determined the extent of his real authority. The economic constitution of the clan was communal, as pointed out, but not communistic, in the modern sense of that term. The clan owned properties, but its members could not own property, so that there was no institution of inheritance. But at the same time, pauperization of individuals was impossible, since a clan as whole took a moral and material care of all its members, protecting them against any misfortunes. The clan constitution was predetermined by environment. It was hard for the individual to survive in the virgin woods or vast steppes. Even a small family was not able to survive. Therefore, the ancient Ukrainians lived in their clans numbering as many as fifty or sixty persons. Dwellings and farms of the clan were often fortified for protection against all kinds of human and animal enemies, and were called "Dvorishche" in the old Slavonic language. Of course, not all clans enjoyed the same social and economic status; there were poor and insignificant clans, as well as wealthy

and powerful ones. This difference was determined by the size of the clan, its collective initiative and effort, and the leadership of its chieftain and council. By and large, the clan performed in miniature all the functions of the state: protection, defense, social care, and regulation of the communal economy. And above all, the clan was a community of production and consumption. But by the eleventh century, the clan organization almost disintegrated under impact of growing individualism.

Several reasons contributed to the disintegration of the clan. First, the inborn Ukrainian individualism asserted itself persistently with only slight changes to conform to new environmental factors. Thus new forms of cooperation were found to replace compulsory collective institutions based upon blood relationships. Secondly, flourishing trading activities and growing wealth made each participant think more independently as he came into contact with foreign cultures. Moreover, commerce and trade, requiring a great deal of individual initiative, do not fit into collectivism. Furthermore, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, the powerful Kievan state organization already existed to solve the problem of collective security formerly left to the clans. Once they no longer required clan protection the individualistic Ukrainians took full advantage of the newly formed state to repudiate restrictions. Finally, when clan outside pressures diminished somewhat, there was no great need for clan life in the fortified "Dvorishcha."

In the prehistoric period of the socio-political evolution of the Ukrainian peoples, the clans had formed a number of tribes by the process of confederation; and in the political framework of the Kievan Empire, the tribes melted down into the Ukrainian nation, while the clans disintegrated and disappeared. The chronicles named seven Ukrainian Slavic tribes: the Polianians, Derevlians, Dulibians, Khorvatians, Siverians, Ulichians, and Tiverians. The individual tribes had soon developed their own political organizations - the tribal states. On the eve of the historical period, tribal communities were no longer based on any blood relation, although in a few cases there were among them the memory of a famous ancestor and common origin. Tribes were rather territorial and ethnic groupings. They differed among themselves in customs, way of life, and religious beliefs.<sup>6</sup> Ethnically the seven tribes were rather similar. Geographical conditions and natural environment formed separate tribes as specific communities of interest. The individual tribal interests originated, of course, specific tribal economies. Accordingly, the Polianians developed agriculture and trading; the Derevlians and Dulibians, forest economy; and the Ulichians and Tiverians, cattle and horse raising, because of the closeness of

the steppes. The topography of the tribal lands was a very important element in determining the individual tribal traits and characteristics, their customs, and their principal occupations, and largely contributed to the origination of the first tribal political organizations. Later on, however, under the impact of the unifying power of the central government of Kiev, those differences were reduced; but in some distant geographical areas of Ukraine, like the Carpathian Mountain provinces, the individualities of the old tribal traditions were retained until the second half of the twentieth century.

The first state-like political organizations were created by the separate tribes along tribal principles. Neither strong nor durable, only a few of these tribal states gained any degree of power. The chief, elected to his office, was at first called "thousander", then prince. His political position became stronger and more lasting through the gradual adoption of the principle of heredity. But some references in the old chronicles imply that sovereign rights were still vested in the people, who could confirm or expel their princes. There was no tradition of absolutist forms of government among the ancient Ukrainians.

The prince ruled with the advice and consent of the peoples' meeting, a body composed of all free and adult males of the tribe, summoned to consultation at regular intervals, or whenever it was necessary or expedient. This body limited considerably the power and authority of the princes, but here again the personality of the prince usually was the deciding factor in the division of authority between the two sources of political power. In only a few cases did the prince succeed in reducing the authority of the peoples' meeting to any considerable degree.

These people's meetings were, according to Beztuzhev-Riumin, the core of the democratic rule of the old Slavic tribes. The meeting was composed of the eldest of the tribe. Usually the tribal princes called the meeting to decide some important question, but there is ample evidence of meetings without dukes, called to order in special cases, mostly to oppose the duke or even to organize action against him, to expel or even to kill him, and then to introduce a new one. The sovereignty of the people and the spirit of democracy are here distinctly evident.

The origin of the institution of the above tribal dukes is historically not clear. The chronicles mention various tribal rulers, like Kyi, Shchek, and Khoriv among the Polianians, and state that the Derevljanians had their own dukes as also the Dregovichians and Slovinians (Hipatian Chronicle). The ancient documents, however,

do not indicate anything about the origins and character of these tribal rulers, whether they were hereditary or electoral.<sup>7</sup>

A fortified town served as the political and economic center of the tribal state structure, and the capital of its territorial administration. The territorial administrative units were called "vervs." Historical documents name numerous "towns" in Ukraine in the ninth and tenth centuries, such as Cherven, Peremyshl, Volin, Lubetch, Terebovla, Peresechen, Turiv, Kiev, Peryaslav, and many others, the majority of which must have been capitals of some kind of political organisms in the remote prehistoric era. Archeological studies implied the existence of about a thousand such fortified "towns" at various periods prior to the organization of the Kievan realm in the ninth century. These towns indicate, of course, the relatively advanced development of architecture and construction among the ancient Ukrainian Slavs. The new administrative unit of the *verv* probably developed in the interest of efficiency when the tribal-state organization was still composed of clans. A *verv* was formed strictly according to territorial and geographical principles and without any reference to blood relation or common ancestry. After the disintegration of the clan system, its importance increased considerably. Expediency produced the *verv* organization. The council of the elders of the particular *verv* territory seemed to carry the most weight. The *verv* community had actually two main responsibilities: to provide the people with protection, and to collect tribute payments and service owed to the tribal prince or other rulers.<sup>9</sup>

Already in the eraly period, the political evolution of the Ukrainians progressed to the point of large-scale if temporary political formations. These state formations grew beyond the limit of the tribe, and were developed strictly according to geographical factors and political experience. Masudi reported that in the ninth century there existed a strong, semi-political and semi-military federation in the area of present day Volhinia (West Ukraine), which he called "Valinana." The name may resemble the modern terminology and may be simply an Arabic distortion of the original Slavic name. The Valinian federation was ruled by the Dulebian dukes and it was formed, probably, for the purpose of overthrowing the foreign rule and providing a more adequate defense against the hostile tribes. The historical documents of the sixth century reported a most intolerably harsh Avar rule over the Dulebian tribe. The suffering of the Dulebians might have taught them how to build a strong political organization of their own, in order to defend and to preserve their

freedom. They might have been exposed also to attacks of the Moravians, who succeeded in the 8th century in establishing a powerful empire, and who certainly dominated some western borderlands of Ukraine. In this way they became the political neighbors of the Dulebians. Their relationship must not have been very pleasant and peaceful for the Dulebians, who then created a federation for mutual defense. Territorially, Valinana, or Volhinia, extended far beyond the tribal limits of the Dulebians and covered, at least, a major part of East Galicia. The western Galician areas were under Moravian rule.<sup>10</sup> Ibn Rusta, another Arabian traveler-merchant, relates of a Slavic city V-a-i-, situated about a ten days' journey from the Hungarian borders. This reference might have pertained to the city of Volin, the probable capital of the Dulebian federation.

Another large political federation, also in Western Ukraine, was known under the name of the "Red-Towns" (Chervenski-Horody). The Red-Towns area was for a long time the major political issue, and a continuous source of quarrels between the Ukrainians and the Poles. Also, the Derevljanians succeeded in creating a strong political organization, which later caused much trouble for the Kievan duke Ihor (Igor) and his wife, duchess Olha (Olga, Helga,) when they tried to establish Kievan supremacy to lay the foundations for the Kievan Empire. The Derevljanians' duke, Mal, was singled out by the chronicles for his stubborn opposition to Kiev. No doubt, the Polianians also had a relatively strong state organization reinforced by their commercial wealth and higher civilization, before the Kievan Empire had been formed with the help of the Northmen. The beginnings of the political organization of the Polianians were associated by the chronicles with the name of Kyi, the mythical founder of Kiev, and his two brothers, Shchek and Khoriv, and his sister, Lebed. Archeological studies revealed, however, a very ancient origin of Kiev, long before the Slavic era in Ukraine, and perhaps at the time of the Gothic settlements in the third century A.D.<sup>11</sup> Kyi, Shchek, and Khroiv, were probably the most outstanding among the Polianian rulers. Or perhaps they gained their fame by rebuilding the city after its destruction, or after some historical cataclysm. Although the older historiography regarded those names and the entire story about the foundation of Kiev, given by the chronicles, as legendary, today they are considered reminiscent of true and factual developments.

Political life in the ancient tribal state organizations was neither peaceful nor quiet. First of all, hostile foreigners constantly harassed the ancestors of the modern Ukrainians. The chronicles and



other historical documents supply abundant information about the Khazars, Bulgars, and other neighboring peoples, who extended their rule over the Slavic territories. The Slavs had to pay a heavy tribute to the Khazars, a semitic people. They soon tried to rid themselves of foreign domination and its heavy economic burden. On the other hand, within the autonomous Slavic tribes a continuous struggle for power was going on. Especially strong was the struggle between monarchic principles, represented by the princes, and democratic and parliamentary democratic principles, represented by the people. The tribal chiefs, or the Northmen outsiders, because they sought frequently to seize an absolutist rule, frequently were expelled by the people. The echo of these developments was distinctly marked in the chronicles, when the "Story of the Old Times" related the previously mentioned event of the expulsion of the intruders by the Slovinians. Then the Slovinians began to rule themselves, but proved unable to maintain order. Consequently, they invited the northmen to return and resume their rule. Analogical developments of expulsion of dukes by noblemen and people occurred often in medieval Ukraine whenever these dukes exhibited any despotic tendencies. These historical events are indicative of the traditional hatred of arbitrary rule by the ancient and medieval Ukrainians, a trait which still characterizes their descendants.

**Social structure.** The ancient, prehistoric man felt his full and complete dependence upon nature and natural elements, and was acutely conscious of their power and his own weakness. Natural forces were actually the model and framework according to which the primitive man formed his way of life. Kept in constant contact with the natural phenomena which predetermined his physical and social existence, the ancient human being, when he only began to think and to perceive reality, saw over all in his environment differentiation and inequality. Accordingly, he also began to differentiate his social position. Anybody who succeeded in gaining more power or prestige in some way, either because of his physical strength, skill, or mind, or by accumulated wealth, at once attempted to dominate the weaker, or at least gain an elevated social and political status.

Social differentiation had its deep psychological motivation; therefore it was deeply rooted in the human social constitution. The typical man is self centered and egoistic, at least to a certain extent. He usually thinks better of himself, and he likes to be better than and different from others. Consequently, he tends to take

advantage of every available opportunity to place himself above others, or at least differently from others. These two powerful factors, man's own psychology and the physical environment, originated social differentiation and the evolution of social classes among the most primitive and also civilized societies. Moreover, the more primitive the civilization level of given societies seemed to be, the more drastic and sharp their social differentiation and stratification tended to develop, as the result of their lack of understanding of the dignity of man as an image of God, and of the original plans of God. Spiritual and mental degeneration and deterioration also produced sharp social stratifications.<sup>12</sup> Social studies have recognized two principal forms or types of social differentiation: caste stratification and class differentiation. A caste society is constituted by a very rigid stratification into a number of exclusive and tightly closed and separate segments (castes), where each and every caste has different legal status and position in the entire social structure, different rights and obligations. A transition from one caste to another, either upward or downward, is almost impossible. The caste system is frequently based on religious beliefs; it is strictly hereditary and deeply permeated by the principle of blood relationship and blood differentiation. The old Hindu caste system of the Brahmins and the ancient Egyptian society would be distinct examples of such a social constitution. A class society, on the other hand, is a more liberal social differentiation, without any religious notion forming its basis. Medieval Europe can serve here as an example, with its four distinct and separate classes of the nobility, the clergy, the townspeople, and the peasantry. The true origin of class stratification was rather the old professional and economic differentiation of ancient society rather than any principle of blood relation. Later developments, however, brought on the element of blood relation, and differentiated legal status of individual classes, as well. The transition from one class to another was not always easy, but at least possible. As a matter of fact, in the majority of cases, a West European class society was featured by dynamic changes in the composition of its individual classes, by which some members of the upper classes were reduced to a lower status, and at the same time, the newcomers from the lower strata were raised to the ranks of the nobility or gentry.

The social structure of medieval Ukrainian society was analogous to that of Western Europe, although it was still much more liberal and much less rigid. Mobility from one class to another was not at all difficult. Even the transition from the status of a slave

to that of a free man was relatively easy.<sup>13</sup> This might indicate a relatively high cultural level in the pre-Kievan and Kievan society of the Ukrainians. The oldest social stratification of the Ukrainian Slavs distinguished actually only two principal classes: the free people and the slaves. The free enjoyed the fullness of the legal and economic status of the clan or tribe citizenship, being endowed with all the civil and political rights. They owned properties, either individually, after disintegration of the clan system, or collectively, through their being fully privileged members of the clan community. According to Kluchevskii's historical interpretation, the differentiation into free and unfree came in Ukraine as a result of conquest and war. By and large, the free were the Slavic conquerors, the unfree were the original non-Slav inhabitants of Ukraine, made slaves by the law and custom of the conquering newcomers. Then, the wars among the individual Slavic tribes added the Slavic element to the slave class in the form of prisoners of war. Originally, the defeated and the prisoners were killed by the conqueror. Later on, however, when their value as labor force was recognized, their lives were spared, but socially all rights were denied to them as punishment for their resistance and opposition. Along with their possessions and wealth, the vanquished were deprived of their freedom.

It seems, however, that the Slavic conquerors were socially differentiated already before their arrival in Ukraine. There were among them wealthier and poorer elements. At that time, during which prevailed the economics of primitive man - hunting, fishing, and cattle raising - the surest way to acquire wealth and recognition was by trading and other mercantile activities. Thus, merchants among the ancient Ukrainian Slavs soon became the monied people, who also enjoyed a high social status because of their economic power. A class of wealthy merchants appeared very early among the Ukrainian Slavs, especially among the Polianians and Siverians. Those merchants of necessity had to become warriors, since they had to defend their goods and their wealth against all kinds of enemies at home, as well as on their travels to commercial centers.<sup>14</sup> After the migration and the final settlement of the Eastern Slavs in Ukraine, those powerful merchant-warriors probably took by armed force from the original population the majority of their territory, thereby considerably increasing their own wealth. There is, however, some historical evidence which leads us to assume that some of the more prominent persons among the conquered tribes soon managed to improve their position and join the upper class of

the wealthy. Hence, their wealth, including the acquired landed properties, and their warrior capacity made of those merchant-knights a guard or team-guard of the dukes. Already in pre-historic times, some kind of early aristocracy emerged from these, characterized by higher social status, greater economic power, and high political position. The old legend of the chronicles about the three brothers, Kyi, Shchek, and Khoriv, who built and operated a ferry on the river Dniepr, gained recognition, accumulated wealth, and then were elected to be the rulers of the Polianians, seems to indicate clearly the commercial background and economic motivation of the early class differentiation among the Ukrainian Slavs. Perhaps even the dukes were chosen from the ranks of the wealthy merchants.

Thus, there were basically three social classes among the Ukrainian Slavs, and there are convincing indications that the social cleavage among them was considerable, although not insurmountable. The wealthy upper classes of the land owners and merchants, because of their riches, acquired certain conceptions of superiority and did not like to intermingle with the common people. The criterion of freedom distinguished the common people from the slaves, and was sufficient to separate these two classes throughout. Racially and nationally, the old Slavic nobility was not homogeneous, and especially later, the ducal team-guard (*drushina*) was a real melting pot of the Slavic, Allan, Ante, and Scandinavian ethnic elements. Thus it was not the national, but rather the economic and social status that determined the issue of social stratification. Slavic elements, as has been pointed out, not only joined the upper class, but were also among the slaves, as a consequence of intertribal conflict or crimes. On the other hand, a common man could become a grandee by acquiring riches or by performing a heroic deed, while a slave could gain freedom. It seems that already in the prehistoric age some forms of slave liberation existed and that these forms were more developed only later on under the impact of Christianity, and therefore made more numerous and more dignified.<sup>15</sup>

**Early Economic Development.** The early economic development of the Ukrainian Slavs was a process of evolution from the most primitive to one of the most advanced forms of production and distribution. When the Slavs came to Ukraine they were nomadic barbarians engaged in a hunting and fishing economy.<sup>16</sup> The flora and fauna of the area afforded the newcomers excellent opportunity

for abundant hunting and fishing and for rapid progress toward the pastoral and agricultural economies. This does not mean that during the hunting and fishing periods the Ukrainian Slavs did not engage in other occupations. As archaeological excavations have disclosed, they traded extensively. However, hunting and fishing were their principal activities and the basis of their economy. Since such a food-gathering economy required about one square mile of land for each mouth to feed, it was capable of supporting only a relatively small population.

Originally the Ukrainian northern forest regions and southern steppes were ideally suited to this way of life. They contained numerous animals which provided meat and skins, rivers and lakes full of all kinds of fish, and useful plants of many varieties. The chronicles and other written reports of this early period support archaeological findings that prove the existence in Ukraine of that time large numbers of wild animals such as ureoxes, bears, leopards, wolves, foxes, deer, lynxes, elks, martens, beavers, otters, cattle, wild horses, and wild goats. Rivers and lakes contained a great variety of fish, including sturgeon, sheathfish, crucion pike and carp, all of which contributed in large measure to the diet and trade of the people. From hunting and fishing, the ancient Ukrainians derived their basic means of subsistence, as well as skins and furs for clothing against the severe winter.<sup>17</sup> Furs, obtained through hunting and trapping, were also an important article of trade and the means of paying taxes even in remote times.

How profoundly important furs were for the early people can be seen from the early use of fur as a kind of commodity-money for the limited exchange among the eastern Slavic tribes.<sup>18</sup> More specifically, marten skins were widely used as a medium of exchange and as a means of paying debts. Later on, at the time of the Kievan Empire, when metallic money had come into use, one of the basic monetary units was called "marten," as a reminiscence of the older tradition. This tradition was not exceptional since it was common for the members of a primitive society to select a certain basic commodity, produced by their economy, as a measure of value and wealth and as a generally acceptable medium of exchange, and to make it their substitute for money.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, furs were the major commodity used for paying tributes and other tax-like contributions either to invaders and conquerors or to the Slavic rulers themselves.

Hunting, trapping, and fishing were carried on within the framework of the self-sufficient household economy of the clan, and

initially, on a collective basis without any particular division of labor, although they remained the primary masculine occupations. Hunting was performed by pursuing animals either on foot or horseback, by extending huge nets among the trees, or, frequently, by placing traps to bar the animals' escape. Birds were caught by means of small nets and snares. The first form of division of labor was arranged according to sex. Women spun and wove the cloth, while men tailored the clothes and twisted ropes for nets that were extensively used in hunting, trapping, and of course, fishing.<sup>20</sup> Initially, there was little distinction in the type of work performed by freemen and slaves. Perhaps slaves did only more menial labor, such as taking care of the scanty livestock, twisting ropes, making nets, and performing repair work around the household, while the free men did actual hunting, trapping, and fishing, some major jobs in the household, as well as some trading. Probably a limited amount of farming was also done by the slaves. As long as the collectivism of the clan system prevailed, hunting was performed on communally owned areas, and fishing on comunally controlled rivers and lakes, or on unclaimed land as long as it was still available. However, even after the clan organization disintegrated, hunting and fishing rights still continued for a long time to be the communal property of every village or population.

In time, with the increase in the density of population, and the parallel decline in reserves of animals, birds, and fishes as free gifts of nature, a cattle raising economy came into being among the Ukrainian Slavs. Wild animals, such as cows, oxen, horses, hogs, and goats were caught, tamed, and domesticated. The animals were at first raised to supply food, meat, milk and milk products, and some raw materials like horns and skins. Even horses were originally raised for food until their value as draft animals and for military purposes was recognized and exploited. With the growing significance of cattle-raising the Ukrainian economy moved toward the pastoral stage, which, however, never gained so great a degree of economic predominance in the Ukraine as among the Oriental peoples.

At any rate, animal husbandry became a distinct and important profession, divided into several classes, probably differentiated even in their social status, according to the types of animals produced. Horse-breeding developed partially as a result of domesticating wild horses called tarpans, but more generally from horse trading and the importation of horses from Asia.

This importation came about through the exchange with Khazars, Cumans, and other steppe nomads, who maintained extensive commercial relations with the Central Asiatic markets, and were also excellent horse breeders. Horse-breeding and cattle-raising, according to Kulisher, were practised in Ukraine since the earliest prehistoric era.<sup>21</sup> The vital importance of these industries is well illustrated by a passage in the writings of Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, when he says: "Rus endeavors to keep peace with the Cumans, because it receives livestock, horses, and sheep from them, and this enables Rus to live better and more conveniently."<sup>22</sup> The economic significance of the early Slavic trading is here also clearly indicated.

Another important branch of early Slavic business was bee-keeping for honey and wax, especially in the forest areas of Ukraine. Honey served as an almost daily meal, and wax was used to make candles. Both articles became important export items, directed especially by Byzantium. Because of the importance of honey and wax production, early customs became established laws that afforded strict protection to the property rights to the beehives of the clans, and, later, of the individuals. Since immemorial times, furs, honey, wax and slaves were the most important parts of the Ukrainian economy, and were synonymous with wealth and opulence.<sup>23</sup>

Separate crafts were developing out of the somewhat specialized production of homes, home appliances, and tools for hunting, trapping, and fishing within the framework of the family household. Among the most important crafts, which eventually experience their first full growth in the Kievan Empire, were weaving, spinning, the production of line from flax and hemp, procurement of garments as early tailoring, making hunting and fishing nets, carpentry, tanning, and pottery ceramics. The tanning craft was well developed even prior to the Kievan period, as it clearly indicated in the story of a tanner, Kuzhumiaka, who saved his city from a dragon and from the Cumans. Tanners probably enjoyed much social esteem. In the forest areas, still another trade developed, namely the lumber industry, and in connection with it, the production of tar and potash. From wood also, all home appliances and tools were produced by various groups of early craftsmen. The crafts were still clumsy and inefficient during the prehistoric time, but progress had been achieved by the ninth and tenth centuries. The craftsmen were gradually concentrating in the early villages and towns, creating a new class of townspeople, which somewhat later developed into a new type of merchant, and which differed from the

peasants in the matter of specialization. It seems to be quite certain that the skilled trades were first brought into Ukraine by the Iranian and Arabic craftsmen. Then, in the later centuries, the Iranian and Arabic masters and the Oriental patterns were replaced by the Greeks and Germans and their trade skills.<sup>24</sup>

Finally also, some metallurgy, primarily the iron industry, was developed although to a very limited degree. Iron ore was extracted in the northern areas of Ukraine as early as the era of the Antes and the Polianians and Derevlians continued the traditions of mining and processing of the ore, chiefly for military purposes. Primitive foundries existed in the tribal territories of the Polianians, Derevlians, and also the Siverians, already in the eighth and ninth centuries. Along with the extraction and processing of iron ore, the craft of blacksmithing and weapon production very early emerged in Ukraine. In the western areas of Ukraine, the later Galicia, salt mining was an important industry, but the eastern Ukrainian provinces had to rely largely on the importation of salt from the Crimean Peninsula and the Don-Volga area.<sup>25</sup>

**Agriculture.** During the pastoral age agriculture was already developing on a limited scale, but because of its secondary character it was left largely to women and slaves. Nevertheless, as a result of a gradual economic evolution, agriculture finally superceded cattle raising by the time of Ukraine's appearance upon the European historical scene. Some authors consider a developed agricultural economy to have been the primary occupation and the basis of the national wealth in some later period of the Kievan supremacy, possibly in the 12th or even the 13th century, but linguistic studies of the old Slavic language in Ukraine, as well as archaeological excavations afford irrefutable proof of an ancient tradition of farming among the Ukrainians.<sup>26</sup> Since remote times rye, wheat, oats, barley, millet, and spelt were cultivated as food for people and domestic animals. Buckwheat came into use some time later.

Even the primitive agricultural period represented great progress in the production, consumption, and standard of living of the old Ukrainians, compared to the previous economy of hunting, fishing, and cattle-raising. The cultivation of orchards was widely prevalent as early as the Iranian era. The production of apples and cherries was especially widespread. Foreign travelers reported the existence of numerous orchards and great quantities of fruit in this area.<sup>27</sup> There was, however, little gardening and vegetable production; it was not until the time of the Kievan Empire that an



extensive vegetable cultivation came into being and became an important branch of farming.

Farming was practiced by way of large and small landed estates operated on the basis of private ownership and control. There is no valid reason to attribute any collective agricultural system to the ancient Ukrainian Slavs, since agriculture developed as one of their leading industries only after the disintegration of the communal clan constitution. This development, however, produced a labor problem, first, because collective cultivation was out of the question, and secondly, because farming was a much more intensive way of production than cattle-raising, requiring much more labor. The individual household could not supply the needed manpower, especially when the latifundia system began to emerge. Hence, the growing use and increasing importance of slavery in the agricultural economy came about as a direct result of these developments.<sup>28</sup>

Farming methods were primitive. At first, only freely available soil was used, for the elimination of the forests was not yet necessary. At that time fertilizer was unknown. Later, when the decreasing availability of free land for cultivation paralleled a rapid increase in population, deforestation was made necessary. Woods were burnt to make way for farmland. Experience proved that the resultant ashes when plowed into the soil, made an excellent fertilizer. Animal manure came into use much later.

There was initially no rationality in the utilization of the fields; neither field rotation nor crop rotation was practiced. After two or three years' cultivation, the given area was left to lie fallow for an indefinite time, or a quest for new land was made. This system, called "pereloh" in Ukrainian, was both extensive and inefficient. But as long as land was abundant it sufficed. Under the pressure of a growing demand for food caused by population increases, it became necessary to adopt the systematic two and three field rotation of crops.

In the wooded areas, when the lands were left without cultivation for several years, certain patches were again covered, as Vernadsky said, with a new growth of bushes and young trees which were burned anew to fertilize again the soil for growing crops for the next year or two.<sup>29</sup> In the steppes a similar method was used; that is, leaving once plowed and cultivated plots to lie fallow and to become covered with grass and other steppe growth while other areas were farmed.

In cultivating the soil, the Slavs used the simple method of

breaking up the land with a hoe or other primitive tool made from wood or stone. The work was done by the men, principally by the slaves. Very early, however, a wooden plow was introduced, at first pulled by men, later by horses or oxen. The wooden plow was a traditional agricultural tool of the ancient Scythians. Among the primitive implements used in farming were, first of all, wooden tools, like a wooden harrow, rake, shovel, fail, and fork; thereafter, a shovel with an iron blade, a scythe, a sickle, and an iron fork came into use, but probably before the historical era. The productivity of this simple type of agricultural economy was obviously low, since the wooden implements did a poor job in plowing and cultivating.<sup>30</sup>

With the transition of the Slavic economy from the pastoral stage to the agricultural, the Ukrainian village emerged. Originally the clans lived on their farms isolated from each other. With the growth of the population, the married children could no longer remain with the clan, and were compelled to build their own homesteads, consisting of dwellings, shelters for domestic animals, and primitive barns for storage. These homesteads of the blood-related clans were arranged close to each other, yet outside the old clan bounds. Thus the primitive Ukrainian village emerged as a number of individual households. Later on, "strangers" also came to the village, and after a period of adjustment, were accepted into the community with full rights and privileges. With the passing of time and the amalgamation of more strangers, the ancient village became exclusively an administrative and organizational unit within the framework of the *verv*, losing its tradition of a blood-related community.

The development of the Ukrainian village was preconditioned by the severity and uncertainty of the environment. People preferred to live close together in order to increase their security, to defend themselves more effectively against such dangers as thieves, robbers, and enemies, and to protect themselves and their cattle from wolves, bears, and leopards. Originally the villages were built without any plan. Soon three leading forms of villages developed: the group village, the one-street-village, and the chain village. The group village was very populous and was somewhat irregularly built, with many streets running in all directions and with houses arranged centrally and close to each other. This was the oldest and most popular type. The one-street village was the most regular form of settlement; it was found primarily in the northern areas. Homes were built on both sides of a solitary

street and immediately behind them extended fields and meadows. The chain-village was the latest type of Ukrainian settlement from the 13th and 14th centuries and was the outgrowth of the traditions of the Magdeburg law and German colonization. It developed along a main street, but less regularly than the one-street-village, with some side roads, and with the homesteads located at various distances from the main street.<sup>31</sup> The village became the center of the agricultural economy of the Ukrainian people.

**Commerce.** Those villages which, because of their proximity to ancient pagan places of worship or to the fortified residences of tribal dukes, afforded opportunities for mass meetings and business transactions, soon developed into the early trading centers in the form of towns. The areas surrounding the ducal residences were especially conducive to the growth of towns, since the dukes could guarantee protection and safety. Their castles were usually constructed in almost inaccessible places, or on the trading routes, to secure for the dukes themselves either easy defense or profitable business, or both.<sup>32</sup> Among the most ancient towns in Ukraine, as it was pointed out previously, were Kiev, Iskorosten, Turiv, Pereschen, Volin, Pereyaslav, Cherven, and many others, which from their beginnings as fortified places, soon developed into substantial commercial centers. Not infrequently the dukes themselves established new towns either at the crossroads of commercial routes or elsewhere for defense as was indicated by the Lavrentievskaja Letopis, for example.

At first there was literally no difference between the mode of life of the village and of the town. The countryside peasants engaged in some trading, aside from their farming and cattle raising, and the townspeople cultivated the soil and bred cattle, aside from their trading. But the growing specialization required by the expanding market and growing density of population, finally brought on a clear-cut difference between the village and the town. This growth of the town was initiated and accomplished among the Polonians and Siverianians sooner than among any other Ukrainian tribe.

Politically, the growth of towns resulted in the increasing importance of people's meetings, which in many cases became much more powerful than the tribal dukes, and decided the leading problems of their tribes and territories, sometimes completely ignoring the dukes. It seems, therefore, that the development of towns and commercial activities contributed to the growth of the democratic

constitution of the ancient Ukrainian tribes, which was, however, a little weakened in the Kievan era. As a matter of fact, when commerce evolved among the Ukrainian Slavs in the most distant prehistorical period, it was conditioned primarily by the geography and topography. First of all, the geographic differences of the northern forest and the southern steppe areas necessitated exchange and commercial trading between the two parts of the country. Secondly, the growing production specialization of the village and of the town demanded reciprocal exchange. And finally, the location of Ukraine at the crossroads of the major commercial routes of medieval East Europe decisively contributed to the increase of commercial activities on the part of Ukrainian Slavs.

The considerable development of early Ukrainian trade has been fully recognized by historiography. Some historians even went so far in their speculations as to accept the predominantly commercial character of the ancient Ukrainian economy, without giving credit to agriculture as the real foundation of the country's economy.<sup>33</sup> There is no doubt, however, that the economic evolution of Ukraine already reached the agricultural-commercial stage at the time of the Kievan Empire, considerably ahead in time of the West European countries. Archaeological excavations have revealed the very ancient character of Ukrainian trading activities. Numerous Roman, Greek, Arabic, and Persian coins from the first and third centuries after Christ were found all over Ukraine from the river Dniestr to the Don, and from the Crimean Peninsula to Novgorod the Great, proving the vital commercial activity between Ukraine and distant lands. These vital quantities of foreign coins also furnished proof of the accumulation of relatively great wealth as a result of commerce.

Domestic commerce was not equally developed in the various regions of Ukraine, and similarly the participation of the individual tribal areas in foreign trading was not of the same extent and volume. This difference was largely determined by the economic convenience of the geography of the given territory. It was stressed before that the Polianians and Siverianians excelled others in this respect, while the Derevljanians, living in their forests and marshes, were far behind the former in their economic evolution. Domestic exchange was largely carried on in the form of direct trading between the producer and consumer, at first predominantly by way of barter. Very early, however, foreign coins came into use even in domestic trading, which was mainly transacted in the public market places. Regular weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, or, later, yearly,

trading fairs were held to bring the sellers and buyers together. The tradition of the fairs had grown considerably in importance by the time of the Kievan Empire, and these fairs, especially the semi-annual and annual ones, became a major mercantile event. Retail stores, which appeared relatively early in Ukraine, for a long time played only a secondary and supplementary role, and their owners also traded their merchandise at the fairs. Foreign goods were sold mainly in the market places.

In their foreign trading the Ukrainian merchants traveled as far as Greece, Bohemia, Hungary, Caucasia, Persia, the Balkan Peninsula, and the lower-Volga area, and as early as the seventh and eighth centuries. The three major commercial routes in East Europe made Ukraine an important intermediary for transit and trade between East and West on the one hand, and North and South on the other. Furthermore, as a consequence of being the commercial middleman, Ukraine soon became a very important trading partner in the medieval international exchange of Europe, and an important consumer of foreign products.

The first of these routes, and the most important in its political aspects and consequences, was the so-called "Varengo-Greek Route," connecting Scandinavia and Byzantium through the Baltic Sea, the Ladoga Lake, the river Volkhov, and the tributaries of the river Dniepr, down the Dniepr, and through the Black Sea. The Varango-Greek Route channeled from Greece and the East to Ukraine, gold, silver, copper, wampum, silk, spices, wines, fruits, carpets and perfumes, and it was the outlet for Ukrainian furs, wax, honey, and slaves to the Greek, Persian, and Arabic markets. Commerce showed the way, and by that route the Northmen came to Ukraine, and advanced her political consolidation. The second trading channel was the so-called "Iron Route," along the river Dniepr, the Black Sea, the river Danube, and into the heart of the Balkan Peninsula. The Iron Route connected Ukraine with the important commercial centers of Southeast Europe. The commercial potentials of the Balkan lands later on induced Prince Sviatoslav to wage wars against the Bulgarians and the Greeks. The third, the so-called "Salt Route," extended to the mouth of the river Don, through the Azov Sea, to the Crimean Peninsula, and the ancient Greek Black Sea colonies. By the Salt Route the early Ukrainian Slavs imported salt and Oriental goods, and came into early direct contact with the Greek and Iranian civilizations, which profoundly influenced Ukrainian culture. Still another route led toward the Khazar commercial centers, especially to their capital,

Itel, from which horses, cattle, and Oriental merchandise were brought. By means of the Ukrainian-Khazar trade, the Ukrainian Slavs were in touch with central Asia. The tenth century seems to mark the peak of the commercial development of the ancient Ukrainian Slavs, which declined after Sviatoslav of Kiev destroyed Itel and Bolger, two important commercial centers of East Europe. The Khazars also tutored the Ukrainian Slavs in commerce, being themselves very successful merchants.<sup>34</sup>

The rather primitive economy of Ukraine of that time exported only a little variety of the produce of her forests and steppes. Wood, wooden articles, especially wooden boats, honey, wax, furs, and numerous slaves were the main export items. Ukrainian merchants of the tenth century travelled as far as Bagdad and Syria, and later as far as Daghestan in the East, and Prague and the islands of Rudia in the West.<sup>35</sup> They brought home a great variety of merchandise, as mentioned above, like wines, tropical fruits, spices, salt, carpets, velvets, silks, china, silver, gold, copper, other metals, metal goods, arms, fine linen, woolen materials, sheep, horses, and cattle. The slave trade was a very important branch of commerce, and it continued throughout the prehistoric era on a large scale in the entire Orient. In the eighth and tenth centuries female slaves of Slavic extraction were widely known. Slaves were, according to Hrushevsky, the chief article which attracted the Arab merchants and induced them to visit and to travel in Ukraine.<sup>36</sup> The origin of the slave trade in Ukraine seems to be oriental, probably the remnant of the extensive Iranian influence in the early centuries, even from the pre-Slavic era of Ukraine.

The standards of consumption of the early Ukrainians followed the natural character of Slavic economy, which featured hunting, fishing, farming, and trading. The Ukrainian diet included various kinds of meat, such as beef, lamb, veal, and poultry; milk and milk products, such as cheese and butter; a variety of porridges prepared from millet, barley, and wheat; a few vegetables; honey, both as food and as drink; and, of course, a variety of fish. The wealthy classes of merchant-warriors and the ducal families no doubt consumed important luxuries not available to the average citizen. Clothing, both garments and shoes, was mainly produced from skins and furs. Linen from flax and hemp was used considerably later, perhaps on the eve of the historical era. Woolen materials were little known in the early times. Home appliances were largely made from wood and clay. Glass was rarely used, and

certainly not among the common people, since there were no glass works in ancient Ukraine.<sup>37</sup> But commercial activities were the source of much wealth, and of a relatively high standard of living among the upper classes of the Rus society. Arabic travelers recounted the riches of the Ukrainian Slavs. Ibn-Dasta, Ibn-Hawqal, and others said that the Rus were constantly trading, had numerous rich and large cities, and lived in plenty, and that even the men wore golden bracelets while the women wore heavy golden chains and costly necklaces, and that their households were abounding in luxurious furnishings, carpets, and rugs. Their garments were of Byzantine fabrics and Oriental silks, and their furs were costly sables and beavers.<sup>38</sup> These reports indicate a great difference and cleavage between the rich and the common people among the old Ukrainian Slavs.

**PART II**

**THE KIEVAN-GALICIAN PERIOD (860-1349)**



## CHAPTER FOUR

### POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

**Political growth - Political structure - Social classes of "Ruska Pravda" - Nobility - Peasantry - Townspeople - Slaves - Churchpeople - Foreigners - The issue of feudalism in the old Ukraine.**

**Political Growth.** In the course of approximately a century and a half (from the middle of the ninth to the end of the tenth century), the powerful Kievan Empire was built in Eastern Europe. Its growth was initiated in the Ukrainian ethnographical territories by the Polianians, a politically and culturally advanced Ukrainian tribe. The city of Kiev was always its capital. Its amazing growth actually took place during the reign of four rulers, Oleh, Ihor, Sviatoslav, and Volodimir. The three latter were members of the Rurik dynasty, a family of Scandinavian origin which ruled in Ukraine for about 350 years during the Kievan-Galician historical period. Territorially, the Kievan Empire extended over vast East European areas, and included in its body politic various races, numerous religions, and different nationalities, such as the Ukrainians, Byeloruthenians, Russians, Ugro-Finns, Bulgars, Khazars, Mordovians, and many others. However, the Ukrainian origin of the Empire is unquestionable.

It was previously pointed out that some Russian historians, such as Pogodin, Sobolevskii, and Kluchevskii, affirmed that the Kievan state was of Russian origin. This theory was enthusiastically accepted by many other Russian scholars; it was also pronounced official by the Russian government. Eventually, the Pogodin-Sobolevskii interpretation was uncritically accepted by Western historiography as well.<sup>1</sup>

One of the major arguments in favor of the Ukrainian origin of the Kievan realm was the fact that from the tenth to the 14th centuries the political and social institutions of the Ukrainian South were diametrically different from those of the Russian North (Suzdal and Rostov), as well as from those of the later Muscovite state of the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries. These striking inconsistencies were indicated by Kluchevskii, Vernadskii, Hrushevsky, Doroshenko, Manning, and Chubaty. Thus, if one and the same national stock had initiated the political organizations of both

Kiev and Moscow, there would be evidence of similarities in their political, social, and economic institutions.

But historiography does not find any such similarities. Apropos of this matter, Vernadsky said: "As a contrast to both, Muscovite and Lithuanian states, Kievan Rus was a country of free political institutions and free interplay of social and economic forces.... There must have been something in Kievan Russia which made people forget its negative side and remember only its achievements. That 'something' was the spirit of freedom—individual, political, and economic—which prevailed in the Russia of that day and to which the Muscovite principle of the individual's complete obedience to the state was to present such a contrast." It must be pointed out here, that Vernadsky, following the Russian interpretation of the East European past, erroneously identifies Ukraine with Russia throughout. <sup>2</sup>

In the Russian North, the princes began from the very beginning to exhibit absolutist tendencies and despotic attitudes. The political role of the people's meetings was nullified, the aristocracy was completely subordinated to the state, the absolutist system overruled any social and economic freedoms, and the particularism of the Northern territorial interests was opposed to and disruptive of the Kievan principle of an imperial unity.<sup>3</sup>

These despotic trends in the Russian nation became much stronger in the Muscovite Grand Duchy and the Russian Empire of later centuries. Some Russian historians attempted to explain those political currents of the North as a result of the enormous impact of the prolonged Mongol rule over the Russian territories. Presumably, they said, the despotic elements of the Mongol state and political organization influenced the Russian political constitution toward absolutism. But why those absolutist and semi-totalitarian tendencies existed already in the Russian communities prior to the invasion, has so far remained unexplained by them. The individualist and democratic traditions of the Ukrainian people, largely prevailing in the Kievan Ukraine, continued as the primary forces forming the democratic constitution of the Ukrainian Hetmanic state of the 17th and 18th centuries as well.<sup>4</sup>

The continuity of the socio-political evolution of the Ukrainian people was there clearly at work. Any historio-philosophical theories and speculations cannot help much here, unless the national identity of the Ukrainians would be blankly denied and they would simply be declared as a branch of the Russian nation, which has been the unrealistic narrow escape of Russian histori-

ography for many years. There can be no doubt, of course, that the political beginnings of the Russian people go back as far as their participation in the community of peoples in the framework of the Kievan realm. Individual Russian principalities were built into the Empire as individual, perhaps, federative components, which recognized the supremacy of the Ukrainian Kiev. But the Russian people, not yet nationally crystallized at that time, were not the creator of, but the co-partner in, this political organization of the Ukrainian Slavs.<sup>5</sup>

The ninth century witnessed in Ukraine a number of small tribal, state-like formations of rather primitive organizational characteristics; yet by the tenth century a vast empire of advanced political structure existed there. As a matter of fact, four men were in charge of the gigantic political project which resulted in the creation of the Kievan realm out of the small state of the Polianians. The time involved was too short to explain this historical phenomenon by normal criteria; hence many hypotheses and theories have been developed by Russian, German, Ukrainian, and Polish historians to explain the birth and growth of the Kievan Empire. Two of these are important: (1) the Normanistic theory and (2) the anti-Normanistic, prevailing Slavonic theory.

Tomashivsky, one of the outstanding Ukrainian historians, evaluating both schools of thought, said that the Normanistic theory is the older and better substantiated, while the anti-Normanistic is newer, a rather naive and sentimental theory more patriotic than scholarly.<sup>6</sup> The Nestor Chronicle related clearly the arrival of the Northmen (Varengians) in Novgorod the Great, and later, in Kiev, where they contributed greatly to organizing the political life of the Slavs.<sup>7</sup> Other historical documents, such as foreign chronicles, memoirs, and international agreements, also proved to some extent the influx of a relatively large number of Northmen in Ukraine from the middle of the ninth century until the end of the tenth. These migrated to Ukraine in a continuous flow of small parties of warriors and merchants, settling down and entering the services of the Kievan princes, who were originally also Northmen or of Normanic descent. Thus Rurik, Askold and Dir, and Oleh were Normanic warriors who acquired their princely authority among the Slavs either by conquest or by election. Since the Northmen arrived in rather small parties, they were quickly assimilated by the more numerous Slavic ethnic element. Sviatoslav, Volodimir, and Yaroslav, the later Kievan rulers of the Scandinavian Rurik dynasty, were already thoroughly Ukrainian.

The Northmen, the famous builders of empires throughout the European continent (British Isles, Normandy, Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Norway, Denmark, for example), contributed greatly to the construction of the Kievan realm by their organizational skills and military discipline. Only the Normanistic interpretation of Ukrainian history can explain the rapid growth of the Kievan state from primitive tribes to a vast empire in a mere century and a half. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to deny specifically Ukrainian-Slavonic elements in the organization and development of the Empire. Legal individualism, economic, almost "capitalistic" freedom of action, strongly democratic government, and social liberalism were certainly not of Normanic origin. These elements were as important as the organizational skills and social discipline of the Varengians in the rapid growth of the Kievan state. This atmosphere of freedom attracted other ethnical groups to join the Empire, and induced them voluntarily to contribute to its social and economic evolution. Bruckner, a German historian of Eastern Europe, compared the Normanic immigrant to the hammer and the Ukrainian natives to the anvil in the creation of the Ukrainian Kievan Empire.

The Ukrainian character of the Kievan state is not refuted by the admission of the significance of the Normans, who, having performed their historical mission, amalgamated with the Slavonic ethnical masses. Koneczny stressed the fact that the Northmen after having arrived in Ukraine, participated in neither the local administration nor the judicial matters of the native Ukrainians. Traditional institutions were permitted to develop freely according to the different tribal customs, while some new Normanic institutions were created and gradually developed within the framework of the Kievan State.

The federal government was at first staffed by Northmen. But soon the Germanic names disappeared from official documents, replaced by Slavic. This change indicates a rapid assimilation and Ukrainization of the Normanic ethnic element.

The Ukrainians had begun their political evolution with the family and the clan, and evolved through tribal and super-tribal organizations. Their extreme individualism emphasized private interests and economic motives, hindering to some extent their political evolution. The Norman discipline, strong military organization, and even the Germanic herd instinct, were a welcome change, which accelerated the political maturity of Ukraine. Indeed the function of the Northmen was essentially that of expediting the political development of the Slavs.

The Normanistic interpretation of the early Ukrainian and Russian histories was initiated by two 18th century German scholars, Bayer and Schlozer. It soon brought a reaction from Russian and Ukrainian historians, since it was regarded by some as a direct insult to the national and patriotic sentiments of their peoples. Lomanovskii, Gedeonov, Illovaiskii, Hrushevsky, and others attempted at first to correct the wording of the old chronicles, to cast doubt upon the old version of the "calling of the Varengians," and by so doing, to prove that the Kievan realm was a purely Slavic political organization, and that the Varengians either were Slavic or were hirelings in the service of the Kievan dukes without really influencing the historical evolution of Ukraine or Russia.

After these anti-Normanistic theories were soon recognized as artificially contrived, numerous other hypotheses were formulated in an attempt to attribute the beginnings of Kiev to the Khazars, the West-Slavs, the Goths, or even the Balts. But these attempts only aggravated the confusion.<sup>8</sup>

**Political Structure.** Nestor, the chronicler, related that in 980 Volodimir the Great put the Northmen in charge of the administration of various cities in the capacity of deputies. Probably this practice originated prior to 980. When, in 981, Volodimir occupied the "Red-Towns," later Galicia, he garrisoned there small parties of Normanic warriors to establish his rule in these newly acquired areas.<sup>9</sup>

Later the younger members of the royal family of Rurik, sons or relatives of the Kievan princes, were sent as deputies to various provinces. Initially, their main duties were collecting taxes and protecting the public. Older administrative and social institutions were unaffected. Since the distant provinces enjoyed rather tenuous relations with Kiev, and assimilated rapidly the deputies of the house of Rurik into their own social texture, they developed autonomous political positions and separate economic interests, and the Kievan Empire became a federation.

Ukrainian individualism and traditional regional particularism proved to be stronger than the centralism of the Northmen, who were too few, and therefore too weak, to construct a state exclusively according to their ideas. Moreover, there existed among the provinces a strong feeling of unity based upon a single ruling Orthodox religion still strongly influenced by the old Slavonic pagan beliefs, a single legal system initiated by the legislation of Volodimir the Great and Yaroslav the Wise, a single language and

tradition and an interest common to the entire Ukrainian south, in defense against the continuous attacks of the nomadic Cumans.<sup>10</sup> The ethnically different borderlands of the Kievan Empire, especially the northern Russian provinces, developed extremely separatist tendencies. They were never interested in the problems of the Ukrainian south, and in its constant struggle against the Cumans and other steppe peoples. The Suzdal-Rostov-Vladimir dukes appreciated the troubles of Kiev, which contributed to its fall, and eventually to their own political growth.<sup>11</sup>

The constitutional structure of the Kievan realm was subject to far-reaching changes in the course of time, and this fact confused some historians to a considerable degree. For example, Soloviev believed that the Kievan realm was a clan community of the Rurik dynasty with a hereditary character in the sense of the civil law, rather than a political organization. The seniority principle in succession to the throne might prove to some extent the civil legal origin of the Kievan community of the Ruriks. Kostomarov, on the other hand, stressed the public-constitutional character of the structure of the Kievan state. According to Kostomarov, the Kievan state was a federation of a number of political entities. There appears to be no doubt about the federate nature of individual territories such as Central Ukraine, Galicia and Volhinia, Pskov, Novgorod, Sievier, Byeloruthenia, and the Suzdal-Rostov northeastern area, within the Kievan Empire, at least in the later period. That these lands became fairly autonomous favored also the evolution of three distinct ethnographical and political processes. These continued in their specific and separate ways and eventually resulted in the final crystallization of three separate nationalities in East Europe: the Ukrainians, the Russians, and the Byeloruthenians. But it cannot be denied that the whole Empire was considered by the ruling dynasty as the exclusive patrimonial property of the family, in the sense of the private law.<sup>12</sup>

Pogodin reemphasized the private law characteristics of the realm. Presniakov held that the Kievan state was a highly specific constitutional hybrid peculiar to the Rus commonwealth, having been neither a monarchy nor a federation, but a patrimonium of the Rurik House, where the individual lands were organically built into the constitution of the Kievan realm. Kluchevskii presented a completely opposite view. He believed that the individual lands were only administrative units of the Kievan state, and that the individual princes were only the deputies to protect order and

safety.<sup>13</sup> No one of the above historians was fully correct, since no one properly evaluated the constitutional changes of the Kievan Empire.

At the time of Volodomir the Great and Yaroslav the Wise, the authority of the Kievan Kagans (Grand Dukes) prevailed, and the provincial princes were only deputies of Kiev. It was the era of the greatest political and economic power of the realm, so that for that period Kluchevskii's hypothesis might be close to the facts. But later, no doubt, the Empire developed more and more into a federation. After individual territories acquired a high degree of autonomy, Kiev lost any real supremacy, retaining only prestige for the time being, for each prince desired to become the ruler of Kiev eventually in order to increase his own fame.

The authority of Kiev declined as did the power of the Empire as a whole. As long as the Kievan principle of seniority prevailed whereby the oldest Prince of the House of Rurik succeeded to the rule, the realm was a federate state with some supremacy accorded to the capital at Kiev. But the progressively developing weakness of the Empire resulted in growing separatist interests on the part of the individual principalities, and transformed its constitution into a confederation of almost sovereign lands. Kostomarov's and Hrushevsky's hypotheses may best illustrate the constitutional structure of the Kievan Empire of the late 12th and the 13th centuries. The confederate form of government was practically initiated by replacing the principle of seniority with that of patrimonial primogeniture within the individual branches of the Rurik dynasty, which were attached by heredity to separate territories. This change was accomplished by the congress of the princes at Lubech, in 1097. Consequently, Kiev lost even its prestige, and the territorial principle began to prevail entirely. The princes agreed at Lubech to introduce primogeniture, in order to prevent frequent abuses of the principle of seniority and to prevent continuous wars and quarrels among the individual pretenders for the splendor of the Kievan throne.<sup>14</sup> The princely congress at Vetychi, 1100, and at Horodok, 1148, might also have indicated the confederate character of the state. Although these meetings of the members of the members of the house of Rurik were not attended by the majority of princes, they tried to solve most urgent political and constitutional issues. This development may also be considered as a symptom of the changes taking place in the structure of the State.

The Kievan Empire reached its peak of political power in the first half of the 11th century. This political splendor greatly

facilitated the economic growth of the entire country. As long as the supremacy of Kiev prevailed, large-scale economic activities flourished, unhampered by local and territorial antagonisms of the individual principalities and subjected only to minor restrictions of domestic trading and exchange.

The gradual decline of the realm's power through the stages of the federative and confederate constitutional changes, the continuous warfare among the princes of the Rurik dynasty, and the growing particularism and territorial economic jealousy, all greatly hampered and retarded the economic development of Ukraine. The prohibition of the Galician dukes from exporting salt to other Ukrainian principalities, in 1097, may serve as an illustration of such developments. In the middle of the 13th century the Kievan Empire collapsed under the impact of the Mongol invasion of Eastern Europe. The Galician-Volhinian Duchy succeeded Kiev, and soon accomplished a new unification of all ethnographically Ukrainian territories, including Kiev itself, under a strong national government. The center of the Ukrainian political, national, and economic life was this time shifted to the West. The Galician-Volhinian state was, in contrast to the Kievan realm, exclusively Ukrainian in the national and ethnical aspects, without those enormous borderlands so greatly differentiated, racially, nationally, religiously and culturally. Constitutionally, the Galician-Volhinian Duchy was, like the Kievan state, a federation of individual and autonomous principalities. There also was retained the principle of the exclusive patrimonial rights of the House of Rurik to all separate lands as well as to the entire Duchy and to the princely office, as in Kiev. These rights were a reminiscence of the ancient evolution of royal power from the "paterfamilias," which tradition had continued in Ukraine throughout the entire Kievan-Galician period. As Soloviev so emphatically pointed out, the notion of private family law prevailed in the constitution of both states.

The Ukrainian people revived politically in the new state of Galicia, and once more attained heights of splendor and opulence, but only in what was later called the right-bank and West Ukraine. At the same time, Eastern Ukraine experienced her "dark age" under the Mongol rule following the Batu conquest of Kiev in 1240. Of course, the Galician-Volhinian state did not escape political suffering under the Mongol invasion. It had even to recognize and accept the supremacy of Sarai, as well as Kiev did. But the



Mongols never established themselves in Galicia and Volhinia to the extent that they had in Eastern Ukraine, which was much closer to their central territories and their capital of Sarai. No doubt, the Mongol invasion substantially paralyzed the economic life of Galicia by erasing many traditional commercial routes from the North to the South, routes which for many centuries had contributed considerably to the wealth of the Ukrainian people.

**Social Classes of "Ruska Pravda."** Concurrently with the political and cultural progress of medieval Ukraine, its social differentiation and social structure grew more complex and more elaborate. The oldest Ukrainian code of laws, Ruska Pravda, which was a product of at least two centuries of evolution of the legal and social concepts of the Ukrainian people, gives us an approximate insight into the social constitution of the Kievan-Galician period. Of course, it does not matter here whether Ruska Pravda was an official or unofficial legal compilation. The social differentiation of that period, according to the code, advanced so far as to become a class differentiation in the sense of public, as well as civil, law. Prior to the Kievan era, the social stratification of the Ukrainian Slavs was primarily a creation of the private law. The code provided the legal framework for those social classes. But according to Vladimirkii-Budanov, a reliable student of the history of Ukrainian and Russian Law, the social concepts of Ruska Pravda did not represent any advanced product of the evolution of medieval Ukrainian society, but only a certain evolutionary stage of its social and legal growth.<sup>15</sup>

Of course, the individual lands of the empire exhibited certain social peculiarities of their own, which were not adequately evaluated by the code. It seems, however, that the legal concepts of Ruska Pravda were intended to have a universal character, that is, to contribute towards imperial unity by overcoming regional individualism. At the same time, parallel efforts were made towards consolidation by the newly introduced Christianity. The code of Ruska Pravda continued basically to differentiate among three classes, the princely people, the common people, and the slaves. All three classes, including the princes, were placed in a differentiated relation to the sovereign. The princely people, the aristocracy or as they were later called, the Boyars, were directly and individually subordinated to the duke. Consequently, each and every princely man had certain individual rights and obligations toward the state and the prince. The relationship between the common people and the duke was also direct, but on a collective

basis, so that villages and towns had certain rights and bore certain obligations toward the state and the duke. The common free man had his individuality and personality in the sense of the civil law; his local or professional community, however, was the subject of public affairs. The slaves were in no direct relation to the prince—they were the property of the free citizens, and were regarded as such by law. According to the code, war prisoners, criminals, and debtors in default were to become slaves, and of course, there were also the slaves by birth. *Ruska Pravda* also recognized slavery that arose in consequence of an individual agreement between the master-to-be and the slave-to-be. This peculiarity will be discussed later. The slave was a thing and had no public rights, although he enjoyed some civil rights (limited property). Killing a slave was punished only by a monetary compensation paid to his owner.<sup>16</sup>

Later developments brought new forms of social differentiation, already initiated by the principles of *Ruska Pravda*, namely: the aristocratic upper class, peasantry, townspeople, slaves, church-people, and the separate group of the foreigners. Since each and every class then became considerably stratified in itself, there resulted a very complex Kievo-Galician society. These classes not only were socio-political phenomena, but they also originated as separate occupational and economic groups, and continued as such throughout the entire Medieval period. Each class had a distinct economic function to perform, as well. Social stratification continued to prevail in the projections of the public and private law. Individuals acquired their social positions primarily as members of their classes, and their rights and obligations toward society as a whole and toward the state could change only by a change in their class membership.

The transition from one class to another was relatively easy in the Kievan-Galician era, as Yaniv pointed out in his analysis of the history of the Ukrainian social constitution. He found certain internal and external forces which rendered that flexibility in the social structure so different from the West European patterns. Even the closest neighbors of Ukraine, Poland, and Russia developed more drastic and more rigid class distinctions. Poland effected these distinctions by following more closely the West European developments, while Russia's social stratification was of Oriental origin. The internal force which eased social differences in Ukraine was the tradition of individualism. The Ukrainian Slavs followed an instinct to let human beings grow individually

rather than to subordinate them to the interest of the class or the state. A natural result was the reduction of class antagonism. The external contributions to the structural flexibility of Ukrainian society of that era were even more powerful. Yaniv explained them as follows: "The borderland character of Ukraine always exposed her to the constant attacks and raids of the steppe nomads, and this required a defense preparedness of the entire population, and not only a particular class or caste. Military duty was imposed on all social strata, although to a different extent, and the continuous threat produced a feeling of social solidarity of the whole nation, and minimized social contradictions and opposing class interests."<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, this continuous threat and permanent warfare required a great deal of individual initiative and individual responsibility to face and to resist the dangers. In this way also, the individualistic features of the Ukrainian national character were intensified and magnified by the external developments, while the rigidity of the social stratification was considerably softened.

**Nobility.** The ethnical, racial, and national composition of the Ukrainian upper class of the Kievan-Galician era was heterogeneous, since it originated in three distinct social and ethnical processes. First of all, the Northmen introduced into the Ukrainian national constitution, the institution of the princely team-guards (*druzhina*), which originally was the basic military unit, assisting the prince permanently in both war and peace. By the time of the arrival of the Varengians in Ukraine, the team-guard was exclusively Germanic, and it represented the core of the military power of the adventurous dukes. Later on, after having completely lost its Normanic ethnic character, the institution remained in medieval Ukraine as the foundation of the military power of individual princes and individual federative lands. The relationship of service between the duke and the warriors was based on individual agreements which established far-reaching social ties, rights, and obligations, and necessitated a close dependence of the team-guardsmen upon the prince. But the military nature of the team-guard was soon widened. Having tested the fidelity of their warriors, the dukes began to use them as their deputies and officials in administration and government, both on the central and on the local levels. Yet the appointment of the knights to governmental and administrative positions was associated, according to the medieval custom as in Western Europe, with the *latifundia* grants of landed estates, soil meadows, and woods, and undersurface mineral resources, as compensation and reward for the services rendered or to be rendered

After the knights acquired wealth and prestige and became interested in local affairs, the personal ties between them and the dukes were subject to a gradual weakening so that these guardsmen slowly developed into the fairly independent stratum of landed aristocracy. Their obligation to public service, including military and administrative functions, remained, but at the same time they assumed new economic functions, especially after having amalgamated with the old Slavic upper class. This Slavic plutocracy, originating from the ancient merchant-warriors, had already become the land-owning class prior to the Kievan period. In the course of an over-all assimilation, these native members of the upper class were soon absorbed into the governmental and administrative machine by the Kievan dukes. In this way these nobles acquired additional wealth and prestige. Land ownership, wealth, government service, and public prestige became the common denominators for the Normanic adventurer-knights and the Slavic nobility, resulting in the growth of a new special class, commonly called Boyars. Within the class a rapid naturalization tended to produce a prevailing Slavic ethnic alloy, solidly cemented to the Kievan society. It should be pointed out that the Slavic plutocracy, being the second component of the Kievan-Galician boyar class, was originally an ethnical mixture of Slavs, Avars, Khazars, and other peoples, who willingly subordinated themselves to Slavic rule. The third human element constituting the Kievan noble class, was the continuous influx into the boyar or grandee class of the "new men," descendants of the common people, such as children of the orthodox churchmen, the aristocracy of the towns, and the various foreigners in the service of the dukes, including Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians.<sup>18</sup> This vertical mobility was a very important element in preventing the development of a rigid class system in medieval Ukrainian society, and retaining a fluctuating and flexible system of social stratification.

The evolutionary process which resulted in the formation of the boyar class was an interesting phenomenon. For example, the Normanic warriors acquired wealth, prestige, and status from their outstanding services. The Slavic upper class was admitted to the public service because of their wealth and prestige, and, eventually, became the boyars. Commoners could improve their status only through their faithful service to the prince. This advance was possible even without such racial and traditional ties as existed between the Rurik House and its Scandinavian warriors.

All three branches of the class of *grandees* soon developed mutual interests, opposed to the lower classes and antagonistic to the dukes. While the boyar council, the *duma*, gradually acquired more and more power in determining the domestic and foreign affairs of their lands, the authority of the dukes declined because of the continuous wars among themselves, during which each and every prince solicited by bribery the aid of the nobles. The boyars exploited the situation to their advantage. In certain lands, and especially in Galicia, the *grandees* engaged in open conflict with the dukes. They instigated and organized palace revolutions, expelled dukes from the country, called others to rule, even murdered them, and in all cases considerably limited the princely authority. Once, in 1213, the boyars seized power, and one of them, *Kormilchich*, proclaimed himself the duke. This act was, of course, regarded by the Rurik dynasty as high treason, and the traitor was eventually punished by death. But it distinctly indicates the social influence and the political strength that the Galician *grandees* managed to obtain for themselves.

The boyar class was greatly differentiated internally. Of the highest rank were the so-called *hearth friends* (the *ohnishchani*), the nobles who held the most elevated offices and were so very close to the duke that they almost became members of his household. Oddly enough, however, the princely slaves (*tivunes*), who also performed important governmental and administrative functions, were included among the *hearth friends*. This circumstance directly helped to confuse the social barriers even between the nobles and the socially elevated slaves. Then came the social stratum of the grand boyars, rather few in number but very wealthy and powerful provincial aristocrats, especially in Galicia. They were the main opponents of the extensive authority of the dukes. Some Galician rulers, like Prince Volodimir and Prince Roman, did not hesitate to use violence and bloodshed in order to confirm their own power by reducing that of the rebellious boyars. The third boyar stratum was the country gentry—the knight in the West European sense—larger in number, less powerful than the grand boyars, but holding closely together. All members of the entire boyar class were endowed with full personal freedom, complete rights to hold private property, unlimited inheritance, equality in consideration among male and female beneficiaries, freedom of business and initiative, and exemption from certain taxes such as inheritance taxes. They were protected by law against

violence. Killing or injuring a nobleman was punished by fines twice as high as the ordinary. The status of nobility was acquired either by birth or as a reward for faithful service to the prince, and it was lost by conviction for major crimes, such as murder, robbery, military desertion, and treason.

The *grandees* were economically very important since they owned a great deal of the country's land, productive resources, forests and minerals, the majority of the slaves, and a substantial proportion of the labor force, at least in the early Kievan era. They enjoyed freedom of initiative and private property rights to an extent that no other social group had, and they were, along with the dukes and a few wealthy merchants, the main capitalists who had the opportunity and facilities to contribute to the country's production and economic growth. Agriculture was the most important sector of the Kievan-Galician economy, and the boyars, owning *latifundia*, produced a major share of the income of that sector. Being wealthy "capitalists," the boyars supplied capital also for certain other ventures, and participated sometimes directly and openly, and sometimes indirectly and secretly, on a partnership basis, in various mercantile propositions. They owned mines, produced potash and tar, exploited iron ore and manufactured iron, and were extensively engaged in foreign trading and many other business activities. Ukrainian aristocracy was very business-like, without those prejudices against trades which existed in West Europe. Some boyars were in direct service relations to the city communities. This business-like attitude of the Ukrainian gentry was another factor tending toward smoothening the social stratification of the Kievan-Galician period.

**Peasantry.** The peasants formed the second most important social class in the Kievan Empire and the Galician-Volhinian state. They made up the majority of the population the stock of the nation. Socially, they were also considerably differentiated into a number of strata, ranging from the common free peasants, through the group of the half-free agricultural workers, down to the serfs, whose social standing differed little from that of the slaves. The peasantry was not, of course, racially and ethnically homogeneous, since it consisted of the prevailing Slavic element with a substantial addition of the conquered ancient natives of Ukraine who populated the country at various historical epochs, such as the Cimmerians, Scythians, Goths, Avars, Antes, and others, plus the numerous immigrating ethnical groups, such as the Khazars

and steppe nomads. Also, by the way of liberation of the slaves to the status of the free peasants, the ethnic heterogeneity of the Ukrainian peasantry was intensified, since a substantial portion of the slave population was composed of prisoners of war, coming from various lands and peoples. In the earlier era, the free peasants were split into two strata: those who had full property rights on soil, and those who had only the rights of possession of soil owned by princes, gentry, or the village communities. Cultivation of the soil was their business, and legally they were bound to the soil (*glebae adscripti*). Yet Hrushevsky denied the existence of any soil-bound peasantry in Kiev and Galicia, and was inclined to accept the presence there of only the free peasants who enjoyed full property rights.<sup>20</sup> Kluchevskii, on the other hand, believed that there were no fully free peasants in Ukraine, but only the soil-bound tenants of the ducal and boyar estates.<sup>21</sup> It seems, however, that both classes existed for some time, while soil-bound peasants represented a transitional social phenomenon, the result of the gradual development of peasant individual property out of the village communal ownership of land. In the Galician-Volhinian state, the soil-bound peasantry no longer existed, but probably the entire peasant class was included in a somewhat feudal system of the West European type. Later, still another group of relatively free peasants emerged, having originated from the stratum of the very poor who voluntarily accepted material dependence upon the royalty or boyardom. They were restricted to some extent in their personal freedom, including features of some contractual soil-bondage.

But all segments of the free peasantry enjoyed relative fullness of personal property rights. The inheritance rights of the peasants were somewhat restricted, however, since female descendants were excluded from inheriting real estate. Chubaty explained the situation as follows: ownership and inheritance of real estate were insolubly interrelated with the obligation of military service for the country. Thus, the sons of the free peasants, by performing their military obligation, established their full inheritance rights, while the daughters, being unqualified for service, forfeited their unlimited right to inherit soil and personal property, unless they married able young men who could guarantee to perform military service.<sup>22</sup>

Politically, peasants were full citizens, with the right and obligation to participate in the peoples' councils and their own

self-governing institutions in the village and very organizations, in the local police and judicial powers, and in collective tax responsibilities. The status of peasant was acquired by birth, by social and material elevation of the half-free and by legal emancipation of an agricultural slave. The peasant could forfeit his social standing and become a slave, as a consequence of a crime, bankruptcy, indebtedness, or marriage with a slave, or by way of a voluntary slavery contract.

The second distinct sub-class of the Kievan-Galician peasantry was the half-free (zakupi). The half-free were the poor peasants who worked for others, free peasants or gentry, and for others' account, on their soil and with their tools. Zakupi did not own or possess any soil or any working implements, but were rather a kind of farm labor. The half-free relationship was established on a contractual basis, with the distinct contractual agreement of remaining personally free despite becoming a hired and materially dependent laborer. But the lord accepted also some contractual obligations toward the half-free, such as furnishing them with working tools, food, some money, and some personal property. Personal freedom of the zakupi was, of course, restricted in many respects. They did not participate in the village and very self-government. They were subject to the judicial authority of their lords, and could not be witnesses in important cases. They could be whipped for punishment, a penalty never imposed upon free peasants. The half-free could be easily turned into slaves, especially for default in payment of debts. Nevertheless, they were extensively protected by the princely authority against the abuses committed by their lords and employers, a fact which considerably strengthened their social position. Full freedom of the zakupi could be restored by their improved material status and the termination of the contractual agreements. The peasant class was, economically speaking, a result of the progressive specialization in production of medieval societies in general. In Ukraine the peasants contributed substantially to the national income, primarily by farming but also by partially processing food and raw material. They also engaged in fishing, hunting, and cattle raising. The productive efficiency of the peasant class was motivated by private property rights and personal freedom for the majority of that class—facts which contributed to individual initiative.

The enormous wealth of the Kievan Empire astonished contemporary foreigners and modern historians. Kluchevskii and his



followers erroneously attributed it to trade.<sup>23</sup> But the real source of this wealth was agriculture, both boyar and peasant, founded on private ownership and individual initiative, and consequently a much more efficient system than that of Russia and Poland, where freedom did not exist to any great extent. At the same time, the peasants, including the half-free, were the most important labor power and productive agent of the medieval economy. However, since peasant capital ownership was rather negligible, peasant farming remained confined to small-scale enterprise.

Townspeople were the free bearers of the commercial and trading activities in the economic life of medieval Ukraine, just as in the West European socio-economic patterns of that time. Along with acquiring considerable wealth as a result of their commercial business, they also gained considerable political importance in the Kievan Empire. Their situation, however, changed in the Galician-Volhynian state, where the class of townspeople was politically suppressed by the nobility, and eventually prevented from any active role in current state matters. Actually, the merchant-townspeople lived only in big cities like Kiev, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, Halich, and Terebovla, while the inhabitants of the small towns and villages were occupied primarily with agricultural activities.

As far as the national character of the medieval city people of Ukraine was concerned, Pogodin tried to prove that this class, at least in the Kievan era, was Normanic. However, historical evidence seems to contradict Pogodin's hypothesis, and proves the prevailingly Slavic nature of the Ukrainian town. The influx of the Varengians in Kievan society was never large enough to make even the Kievan noble class primarily Normanic. And to claim any Normanic origin of the town population seems to be a very artificial historiographical speculation. Much more untenable is Pogodin's idea of Galician conditions.<sup>24</sup> The Northmen were first of all warriors and administrators, secondarily merchants, and never craftsmen. Moreover, the Ukrainian townspeople in the course of the medieval centuries experienced a continuous influx of foreign ethnic elements as a result of a permanent assimilation process. Many foreign immigrants, Poles, Germans, Jews, Armenians, and Wallachians, came in considerable numbers to the medieval Ukrainian towns, settled there, and in the third or fourth generation, became Ukrainian. The Galician dukes often invited the foreigners to come, and attracted them by granting exceptional

privileges for settling in Ukrainian towns. Their civilization, commercial abilities, and foreign connections seemed to be very advantageous for the growth of domestic economy.

The townspeople were composed of merchants and craftsmen, and their professions gave to the medieval town its specific character. These classes were internally differentiated, as were the nobility and the peasantry. Leadership was in the hands of an upper group of city patricians, especially rich and influential individuals and families. The second group was much more numerous, the social segment of the city plebs. Among them, material well-being, wealth, and capital ownership were the criteria of social stratification, rather than blood relationship or family traditions. The wealthy merchants were large capital owners, and as such, they financed many large-scale trading activities, both domestic and foreign, and not infrequently in an open or silent partnership with the business-minded boyars and dukes. Upward social mobility for them was not difficult because, from a legal point of view, they were held to be equal to the boyars. They also could be called to perform services in the ducal courts in the capacity of hearth-friends, a position which was held in high esteem.

The acquisition of wealth, therefore, permitted a city man to become a noble. In the Galician-Volhinian state, however, the social development was rather detrimental to the townspeople since the boyars acquired a more dominant political position, and successfully resisted the upward mobility of the townspeople despite the frequent intervention of the dukes on their behalf.<sup>25</sup>

From a very early era, the town enjoyed the privilege of extensive self-government. Since it was immune from the regular ducal administration pattern, this administrative freedom and autonomy aided greatly in the economic growth of the city. Indeed, the wider and more comprehensive the autonomy of the individual town, the more prosperous it usually was, while any infringement upon that freedom brought in its wake an economic decline. The later Galician-Volhinian princes introduced into some of their cities the Magdeburg system of municipal self-government, having hoped in this way to increase the prosperity of the towns. Among the first towns to receive the Magdeburg law were Volodimir, 1324, and Sanok, 1339, but the full development of that new German system of government of the townspeople took place later following the collapse of Ukrainian statehood.

The urban patricians were the cornerstone of municipal self-government which, at the time of the old verve system, included police authority, judicial power, and cooperation with the ducal tax collectors within the city limits. Although Vernadsky refers to the townspeople as a middle class, they actually formed a social stratum somewhat more privileged than the free peasants. In general, summarizing the over-all significance of the medieval town for the socio-economic evolution of the Ukrainian people, the townspeople as a class performed a secondary role in the growth of the nation, a role subordinate to that of the nobility and the peasantry.

**Slavery.** An ancient institution in Ukraine, slavery developed partially under the influence of trade relations with the Orient, as has been indicated in the previous sections of this treatise. Slavery was very important in the medieval economy for two major reasons. Above all, slaves were a significant source of labor power, almost indispensable in the period of a primitive economy and a relative shortage of labor in relation to the rather vast supply of land, especially in the large-scale, latifundia-based economies of the royalty and boyardom. Secondly, at least in the earlier Kievan era, the slave trade was highly profitable.

As a social phenomenon slavery was equally important. The racial composition of the slave class was heterogeneous. Therefore, in later years as the institution of slavery gradually withered away, manumission of slaves resulted in another infusion of non-Slavic blood into Ukrainian society which, however, still remained predominantly Slavonic in contrast to the Great Russian people, whose Slavic character was lost to a greater extent as a result of the process of assimilation.

The slaves were also socially stratified. At least two subclasses of the unfree could be differentiated. The higher of these classes, the "tivunes," served as administrators, tax collectors, real estate managers, ducal officials, and in other similar offices. Their social position was rather close to that of the half-free. In fact (although not in the theoretical terms of the law), it was even higher than the position of the common free ducal subjects. In their capacity as ducal officials, the tivunes enjoyed legal privileges as far as being protected by a double death-money indemnity when killed or murdered. Some of them were even considered to be the hearth-friends of the dukes, and in this capacity they could associate with the grand boyars.

Another, a lower group of the unfree, were the common slaves performing menial labor in the service of the gentry and common people. In the legal sense, the common slaves (kholopi) lacked legal personality; they were considered the property and possessions of their lords and masters. As such they were left fully in the power of their masters, who originally had complete authority of the *domini vitae necisque*. The common law took no interest in the slave. Later, however, under the influence of the Christian religion, first by reason of custom, and eventually by the evolution of legal concepts, the slave was treated more humanely. His master could be forced by court sentence to give him up, merely on sufficient proof of the master's cruelty. Although the lord was principally liable for the illegal deeds of his slave and had to compensate any material losses caused by the slave, the latter himself was held responsible in the case of murder, and was immediately punished by the death sentence. The unfree, of course, could not own any real property; they were unable to inherit; and they could not be witnesses in court proceedings. Yet those limitations were seldom applied to the *tivunes*.

Accepted by the Ukrainian people in 988, Christianity had a favorable influence on the social position of the unfree. Most conspicuous was the development of a number of new forms of manumission. The status of slave was acquired by birth, capture in battle, conviction for a crime, marriage with a slave, purchase, contractual agreement, bankruptcy, and indebtedness. All of these methods were reminiscent of ancient pagan customs. But the pagan era knew only a few grounds for the liberation of a slave. The Christian religion introduced, first of all, compulsory liberation of a slave, in due course of law, in the event of cruel and inhuman treatment. In addition, a prisoner of war could easily secure his freedom through ransom. Furthermore, the unfree concubine and her children by her lord obtained freedom automatically upon the latter's death. A sexually abused female slave received freedom at once according to new Christian principles. No doubt, under the impact of the Church and Western civilization, the lot of the slave was eased, his status improved, and his manumission facilitated. The abolition of the institution of slavery began, but it was not completed until much later. The gradual elimination of slavery continued after the collapse of the Galician-Volhinian state, within the political frameworks of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian realm and the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth, through the 15th and 16th centuries. The process was finished earlier in the West than in East Ukraine.<sup>26</sup>

**Church-people.** Another segment of the population, the church-people, developed in an essentially Ukrainian manner at the time of the Kievan-Galician period; only to a certain extent was this group analogous to the West European clergy. The main difference in the social status of these two groups was in their different relationship to the state authority. The West European clergy was just another privileged class with its specific rights and obligations. The Ukrainian church-people were not a homogeneous class of people, but rather a highly heterogeneous alloy of differentiated social elements, which, for one reason or another, were exempt from the legal authority of the state, and were fully subordinated to the ecclesiastic administrative and judicial processes.

There were three subdivisions of churchpeople: the clergy, both secular (white clergy) and religious orders (black clergy), the people in the service of the Church, and the needy (*personae miserabiles*). The church-people, constituting these social elements, retained at the same time their respective class characteristics as boyars, townspeople, peasants, or slaves, regardless of whether they were in the service of the Church or in its care, like the widows, the aged, the crippled, the orphans, or the so-called "izgoyis." The church-people were inhabitants of the towns and villages owned by the Church, the peasants cultivating the ecclesiastical landed estates as tenants, along with those boyars who were in a vassalage relationship to the Church. In the Galician-Volhinian realm there were, however, no more church-owned towns, but there still were the Church boyars, peasants, and slaves.

The institutions of the church-people indicated the enormous authority and wide autonomy of the Church, which was at that time "a state within a state." As a matter of fact, a very large number of people were directly exempt from the regular ducal administration and court power, and constituted another comprehensive group of indirect citizens, or ducal subjects. Certainly, the church-people were supposed to perform military duty for the country's defense, but they did it under the command of separate officers, appointed by ecclesiastical authorities, probably jointly with the ducal military commanders. Only the ecclesiastical courts of the bishop and metropolitan were competent to judge the church wards. Kluchevskii believed, for example, that in the Kievan Empire there were actually two different species of social stratification: the species of the civic (secular) social classes, as discussed in the preceding sections, and the parallel species of the Church classes.<sup>27</sup>

This parallelism, if existing, was not recognized by the public law, however, which always considered the Church wards only under their common name of the church-people. A very peculiar social phenomenon were the above mentioned "izgoiyis," under the protection of the Church. They were the people who, because of unfavorable circumstances or extraordinary developments, lost their previous social status. Thus, a prince who lost his land, or forfeited his princely rights of inheritance; a priest's son who, having failed to master the arts of reading and writing, could not succeed to his father's vocation; a merchant who lost his business, but left no debts—all these became izgoiyis. There were also many other forms of izgoiyism as a consequence of various other developments. The temporary izgoiyism of the dukes or ducal descendants was a cause of permanent political turmoil in medieval Ukraine, because the princely izgoiyis in due process of law usually declined to submit, and, taking their fortunes into their own hands, attempted to reestablish their previous political positions by force.<sup>28</sup>

From the point of view of the economic development of the Ukrainian people, the social phenomenon of the church-people was rather insignificant since they did not perform any specific economic or productive function of their own. Individual classes of Church wards participated in the national economy according to the medieval pattern of class specialization and their established functions as owning boyars, trading townspeople, and toiling slaves. On the other hand, the church as a legal person and the clergy as an owning social group were highly significant economic factors because of their large-scale land ownership and considerable capital accumulation. Especially significant were the religious orders, male and female, located in all major cities and towns, numbering close to 70 in the Kievan Empire. These orders amassed wealth in lands and riches, both from donations and from their own hard work. They pioneered in progressive agriculture by developing intensive farms of fruit orcharding and vegetable gardening; they financed and managed many commercial and industrial enterprises, such as mills, distilleries, textile-factories, and mines; and they also participated in the export business. The religious orders also contributed toward colonization and founded some new settlements in sparsely populated areas. This expansion, however, took place in the late periods to a much greater extent than during the Kievan-Galician era.

Foreigners were always well received in Ukraine, and they always enjoyed the friendly protection of the Ukrainian rulers.

This privilege was a direct consequence of the very ancient and well developed foreign trade of the Ukrainians and their acquaintance with foreign lands and peoples. Since time immemorial, foreigners traveled, settled, and traded in Ukraine, just as the Ukrainian merchants undertook their business journeys to distant countries and places. Arabs, Iranians, Greeks, Armenians, Wallachians, Jews, and Khazars were well known. No doubt, the medieval Ukrainians were aware of the fact that there was a great opportunity to learn something advantageous and profitable from strangers, either in the way of business or culture.

At first, the wealth and prosperity of the Ukrainian economy attracted foreigners to settle among the Ukrainian Slavs. Indeed, the Northmen came to Ukraine, lured by her wealth. They soon settled there. The Varengians were scarcely ever treated as foreigners in Ukraine; rather they joined the upper class of medieval Ukrainian society. The Khazars, Jews, Bulgars, Greeks, Germans, Poles, Hungarians, and later, the Armenians, Wallachians, and others, came into Ukraine in a continuous stream of immigration. Then things changed fundamentally. At the end of the 13th century and in the course of the 14th century, the great attraction of Ukraine declined because of continuous warfare and the Mongol danger. Yet, in this later period, the Galician-Volhinian dukes especially called on foreigners to settle in their towns and villages, and granted them the privileges of the extensive Magdeburg self-government, exemption from taxes and military service, and the special protection of the state. It was also not difficult for the foreigners, particularly the Poles and Hungarians in Galicia, to be admitted to boyardom and to the princely team-guard. The Germans and the Poles were called to advance the colonization and development of new settlements in Galicia and Volhinia according to the progressive methods of either the German or Polish patterns, which seemed to be more alluring and more efficient than colonization on the traditional Ruthenian basis (*ius Ruthenum*).<sup>29</sup>

The Jews were put directly under the protection of the dukes, as the so-called "servi camerae," and were allowed to trade without restrictions.<sup>30</sup> The Cumans also settled among the Ukrainians, and were rapidly assimilated. Another great national minority, which lived in the framework of the Kievan Empire, were the Uro-Finns, who over a long period of time amalgamated with the Northern Slavs to form the ethnic group known as the Great Russians. They were certainly considered at the beginning, probably the ninth and tenth centuries, as enemies or second-class citizens.

but eventually became the full-fledged co-creators of the later Muscovy-Russia.

In Ukraine all foreigners enjoyed full religious and national tolerance, as well as the privilege of self-government which directly contributed to their gradual Ukrainization. Foreigners usually lived in towns and villages, concentrating within certain city quarters, such as the German quarter, the Polish quarter, and the Jewish quarter, where they were able to develop their national customs and traditions freely. Accordingly, they were able to avoid immediate assimilation, a process which was then postponed for several generations. Because of the prevailing institutions, foreigners were somewhat restricted by law. Such restrictions were accepted, however, as natural. Thus, foreigners could not freely buy or sell or inherit real estate. They were severely punished in the case of sex crimes committed against native females.

This particular provision of Ukrainian criminal law might have been founded on the generally high social position of and esteem for woman in Ukraine since ancient times. The important role of foreigners in the economic growth of the country, especially in its commerce and industry, cannot be overemphasized. They contributed skill, labor, and capital to the economy. At first the Iranians and Greeks introduced their progressive business skills and spiritual values. In the later period, the Poles, Germans, and Jews concentrated in their hands the major part of the trade and commerce in Galicia and Volhinia. These foreigners brought into Ukraine their Western civilization; they were one of the channels through which Western culture conquered Ukraine.

**The Issue of Feudalism in Old Ukraine.** The older Ukrainian historians paid little attention to the issue of feudalism in the Rus state. The whole question did not seem to them important enough nor worthy of any detailed analysis. And if they came across the problem, as did Kostomarov, Hrushevsky, or Kluchevskii, they simply denied the existence of feudalism in medieval Ukraine.

Modern Soviet historians, however, take a diametrically opposite stand in this matter. After accepting dialectical materialism and the Marxist economic interpretation of history, they had no other choice but to admit uncritically a feudal era in Ukraine (Rus). Thus, according to Marxism, the permanent, somewhat standard, evolutionary changes of the "mode of production" from a slave to a feudal society, and from feudalism to capitalism, have been



going on for centuries. Following indisputably the Marxist historical pattern, the Soviet scholars did everything possible to gather evidence of the feudal character of the Kievan economy and social constitution. The compulsory nature of that official Marxist interpretation of the medieval history of Rus was established by Lyashchenko, when he opened the relevant chapter of his celebrated work with a quotation from Marx: "...the character of the evolving feudal conditions and the emergence of the feudal state were a natural result of the primitive organization of the Norse conquests—the vassalage without fief relations, and fiefs consisting solely of tribute!"<sup>31</sup> And in another place, Lyashchenko continued: "Marx dates the beginning of the feudal period of the Kievan state, with its accompanying dispersion and feudal wars, from the middle of the 11th century... Naturally this process of assimilation consumed more than one century."<sup>32</sup> To prove the presence of feudal characteristics in the Rus economy was considered by the Soviet scholars as a most important task of a dogmatic nature, which would establish the validity of Marx's and Lenin's historical speculations as applied to Eastern Europe. For the communist student it was an article of faith.

From the point of view of objectively well established historical studies such as those of Vernadsky and Florinsky, the existence of feudalism in the Kievan Empire seems to be at least a very dubious matter. Particularly excellent is Vernadsky's treatment of the subject in his "Feudalism in Russia" and "On Economic and Social Feudalism in Kievan Russia."<sup>33</sup> After having analyzed the concept of "pure" feudalism, he showed that feudalism in the strict sense of the term, "a manorial system with the restricted status of the peasants, ... and a complete fusion of the political and economic authority," did not exist in medieval Ukraine at all. What the Marxists called "feudalism" was not feudalism, but was a form of natural economy with the essentially Ukrainian system of developing appanage.

The condition of the free peasantry in Kiev with full property rights as well as the absence of any elaborate social ladder of vassal relationships denied the existence of West European forms of feudalism in medieval Ukraine. Furthermore, the authority of the grand boyars over the tenant peasants, who were the minority of the peasant class, was still less comprehensive than that of the Western barons. And finally, there was in the Kievan Empire no developed pattern of a fusion of the political and economic authorities. "Ruska Pravda" permitted individual landownership to the

peasant as late as the 12th century, and the Kievan latifundia, as Vernadsky pointed out, did not prove *per se* the presence of feudalism.

As far as the general characteristics of the Kievan social and economic constitution were concerned, they might be described as a specifically Ukrainian, early commercial capitalism, combined with an agriculturally motivated appanage. Mavnor supplied the following definition of the institution of appanage: "Subjection to it was voluntary. If one who served a prince chose to do so, he could leave his service and enter the service of another prince without forfeiting his estate, if he had any. There was thus no relation between the prince and his subjects corresponding to a feudal relation. Their relations were not obligatory, but were the result of consent, and they could be broken at will."<sup>34</sup> And then, the economy of medieval Ukraine was no longer based exclusively on agriculture, for it had become a semi-commercialized economy of money, with advanced credit and marketing, and with the essentially capitalistic institutions of individualism and freedom, in both large-scale and small-scale enterprises, as much in farming as in trading. Feudalism was never like this. Scholars agree in this respect rather on the terms "early capitalism" or "pre-capitalism." Furthermore, the flexibility of the Kievan class structure would argue against the feudal theory. So far, the Kievan economic system was more advanced than that of its West European counterparts.

On the other hand, the prevalence of slavery in the Kievan state indicated a certain backwardness in its social relations, being in this respect not much further advanced than a primitive slave society. In the West at that time slavery was no longer known. This mixed but certainly not feudal character of the Kievan economy is explained by the situation of Ukraine as a borderland between the Occident and the Orient, influenced by both Eastern and Western institutions, and particularly by the Arabic and Byzantine, which clashed against each other on Ukrainian soil. Nevertheless, feudalism was beginning to develop in medieval Ukraine. The Mongol invasion interrupted the process, but it resumed in the Galician-Volhinian state, where, under the impact of Western civilization, feudalism took on much more definite forms. The Polish and Hungarian patterns especially influenced the feudal evolution of Ukrainian society.<sup>35</sup> This evolution continued in the political framework of the Lithuanian-Rus state and the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth of the 14th and 15th centuries, parallel with the liquidation of slavery in westernized Ukraine.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

**The over-all economic development - Hunting and fishing -  
Cattle raising - Agriculture - Mining**

**The over-all economic development** of Kievan Ukraine did not start from nothing. The previous period had already witnessed the development of great economic traditions in all areas, especially in agriculture and trading. This high level of material culture was the result of commercial intercourse with advanced foreign cultures such as those of the Arabs and the Greeks. The political unification of Ukraine by Kiev into a single, powerful state organization also had its economic impact. It brought together areas diversified and geographically specialized but richly endowed with natural resources, diversified climatic zones, numerous minerals, fertile soil, and many navigable rivers teeming with fish.

The Kievan Empire, especially in its early period of political centralization, encouraged the successful growth of a large-scale national economy based on a territorial division of labor, specialization of production by the various provinces, and the mutual exchange of their products. Vast southern steppes, producing meat, hides, and grain, exchanged their produce for furs, wax, and honey of the northern forests. The small-scale tribal economies of the Polianians, Derevlianians, Dulebians, Khorvatians, Severianians, Tiverians, and Ulichians merged into a progressive and wealthy national economy.

The growth of this national economy was also facilitated by the single and fairly unified legal system of Rus, which received expression in the code of Ruska Pravda, and by princely legislation, especially that of Volodimir the Great, Yaroslav the Wise, and Volodimir Monomakh. It is true that the historian Sergeievich doubted the practical validity of Pravda. According to him, in that primitive era nobody actually cared to read the code, because only a few knew how to read at all. Therefore, he continued, the influence of the code on the development of legal concepts and relations was very limited, or perhaps even nil. But he failed to stress one significant circumstance, namely, that the codification

was rather a written compilation of the binding principles of the customary common law, with only a few original contributions of individual dukes and codifying authors.<sup>1</sup> And as a document of the common law, *Ruska Pravda* doubtlessly did have a unifying effect.

Within the framework of the Kievan economy an important evolutionary process was accomplished. The individual tribal economies had been based primarily on hunting, fishing, and cattle raising. Although agriculture was fairly developed at that time, it was not the leading industry. Between the tenth and thirteenth centuries, however, the Ukrainian economy became decidedly agricultural-commercial, while the extractive industries of hunting and fishing were reduced to subsidiary and secondary roles. These industries retained their dominant roles only in the southern and eastern borderlands of the empire. Moreover, within the political framework of the Rus state, the crystallization of the early Kievan capitalism based on money, credit exchange, and developed commercial activities had been accomplished, and enormous wealth accumulated. The riches of these dukes frequently amazed the foreign visitors. For instance, the Nestor chronicle related under the date of 1075 the wondering reflections of the envoy of Emperor Henry IV about the princely treasures he had chanced to see. It was expressly pointed out before that the principles of economic individualism achieved a fairly mature form in the Kievan-Galician era, being considerably more advanced than in Western Europe. The Roman and Byzantinian social, legal, and economic institutions certainly had a great impact on the growth of the Kievan economic constitution, especially the acceptance of Christianity by Kiev.

The Byzantinian influences in Ukraine continuously grew in strength and aggressiveness. However, the Greek Nomocanons and Greek legal concepts, which could be directly traced back to the ancient Roman individualistic legal and economic institutions, had a much older tradition in Ukraine than the year 988, the date of her Christianization. Ukraine of the tenth and thirteenth centuries was in fact a northern borderland of the Byzantinian-Roman civilization, and as a result it was the Roman and Byzantinian capitalistic forms which molded the Ukrainian economy. Concerning this Vernadsky said, "...we are obliged to connect Kievan Russia sociologically not only with a type of commercial empire of the nomads but, in a sense, also with a type of which the highest manifestation in classical antiquity was the Roman empire—that of a 'capitalistic' formation based on slavery."<sup>2</sup> The democratic

constitution of the Orthodox Church also contributed to the capitalism of Kievan Rus, while in the West the more absolutist constitution of the Roman Catholic Church was instead conducive to the growth of feudalism.

The forms of business organization in the Kievan state were also advanced far beyond the simple partnership. The "merchant associations" in Kiev and Novgorod rather reminded one of modern limited partnerships or corporations, motivated exclusively by profit, and considerably preceding in time similar West European forms of business organization. Still another advanced feature of Kievan economy was social legislation, including protection of the poor, orphans, and the widows, and regulation of the interest rate, which could easily have developed into a form of exploitation. The feature of "absentee capitalism" might have occurred in Kiev, but the dukes, Volodimir Monomakh in particular, made an attempt to curb possible abuse.

**Hunting and Fishing.** Throughout the entire Kievan-Galician period, hunting and fishing continued to be very important industries, although at this time they were relegated to a secondary position, following agriculture and trade.

As a result of socio-economic evolution, the Ukrainian Slavs, after having undergone phases of hunting, fishing, and cattle raising, attained, during the Kievan period (from the tenth to the thirteenth century) and the Galician era (from the 12th to the 14th century), an agricultural-commercial economy. This important fact was stressed in the previous selections of this historical analysis. But, traditionally, even at that time, all social classes—royalty, boyardom, townspeople, and peasantry—were vitally interested in hunting and fishing as a supplementary way of earning a living. As far as hunting was concerned, animals were still abundant in all the forest and steppe regions. As a matter of fact, the same kinds of small and large animals, such as squirrels, martens, foxes, lynxes, sables, beavers, deer, wolves, bears, bulls, and ureoxes, began to disappear in the 16th century as a result of indiscriminate hunting practices.

Hunting provided food, and also hides and fur for boots and clothing. Fur and hides were also important articles of trade and a medium of paying taxes. Fur, especially, was exported from Ukraine, in the Kievan-Galician period, to every part of the civilized world. Large-scale hunting projects were also organized to acquire necessary reserves of food and animal raw materials to

supply warriors during their campaign.<sup>3</sup> Hunting techniques improved only slightly in contrast to the pre-Kievan era of tribal economies. The common people, who produced actually the greatest portion of their income from hunting, used old and traditional methods such as setting-up traps, spreading nets and snares between the trees to catch small beasts and birds, and hunting with bows and arrows, knives, hatchets, and spears.<sup>4</sup> But the royalty and boyardom developed a new approach to hunting, holding regular seasonal hunts, employing professional whips and falconers hired from among the slaves and peasants to scare the animals and to drive them directly against the armed hunters, and using properly trained hawks, falcons, dogs, and even leopards. The princes sometimes raised hounds for their favorite sport-like occupation.

Hunting having been mainly a way of earning a living, the institution of the professional hunter developed. Hunting was also a favorite sport of and a form of elegant social activity for the upper classes. Great occasions, like the birth of a first son or receiving state honors and offices, were celebrated by hunts. Rare and distinguished guests were always honored by great hunting expeditions for large animals such as bears, bulls, and ureoxes. By way of example, the chronicle relates a grand hunting expedition organized by Prince Yaroslav of Galicia to honor Andronikos, the Byzantine heir to the Emperor's crown. Prince Volodimir Monomakh regarded hunting as a most noble occupation for dukes and their sons, comparable to that of making war.<sup>5</sup> Not infrequently, female royalty also participated in the sport. Because hunting was generally thought to be a noble occupation, the children of the aristocrats were trained from a very early age to appreciate and to master the art of hunting. Skill and courage exhibited during the hunt were praised highly and esteemed almost as acts of heroism.

Although fishing was relegated to the lower classes, fishing rights were also owned by the boyars, monasteries, and religious orders, and were carefully protected. With the introduction of Christianity, the demand for fish considerably increased because of lenten and other abstinence regulations of the Church. But apart from that, fish was generally consumed. Fishermen were a separate occupational group. They fished on rivers, lakes, and the sea, to get food not so much for their own consumption, but rather to sell to others. Their settlements extended along the river banks. The Galician fishermen undertook fishing trips down the river Dniestr, as far as the Black Sea and the mouth of the river Danube.<sup>6</sup> Their fishing tools were nets, harpoons, and

angling rods. Angling and barring the small rivers with wooden pails were practiced by the common people in order to supplement their usual diet with fish, while the commercial fisherman preferred boats, nets, and harpoons. In the northern areas, Volhinia, Polesia, and Chernihivia, where the poverty of the soil required the people to resort to occupations other than farming, fishing was vital as a means of subsistence. The abundance of their rivers pointed to fishing as a way of making a living.

The economic importance of hunting and fishing in the Kievo-Galician society is proven by the comprehensive legislation for the protection of the private hunting and fishing rights of the princes, boyars, monasteries, towns, villages, and other individual owners. Hunting and fishing areas were regulated by law as early as the tenth century under Princess Olha. Then, *Ruska Pravda* provided penalties for the violators of private hunting and fishing rights, or for destroying and damaging hunting and fishing equipment, such as nets, snares, and traps. Monasteries were most anxious to protect their fishing rights, since fish was a highly important item in the diet of monks.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, princes were also interested in protecting their hunting areas and hunting regalias. Where a specific law or princely grant could not safeguard hunting and fishing rights they were regulated by private agreements and arrangements.

**Cattle Raising.** Slavonic linguistic studies confirm the ancient raising of cows, oxen, calves, sheep, hogs, horses, mules, donkeys, dogs, and even camels. This traditional industry, the origin of which goes back as far as the remote Indo-European era, developed successfully throughout the Kievan-Galician period, but its secondary status in the country's economy was self-evident. Numerous fowl, such as chickens, geese, ducks, pigeons, and swans, were also known in the pre-Kievan era, but they did not come into wide use until considerably later. According to Hrushevsky, this did not happen until the Kievan era or the period immediately preceding it.<sup>8</sup> Cats were the first domestic animals to be introduced into the Ukrainian household; they were unknown before the historical period.<sup>9</sup> Ibn-Faldan, the Arab traveller-merchant, related about an extensive cattle-raising and bird-raising among the Slavs, and Ibn-Dasta said that the Slavs "kept hogs as they were sheep," by which he meant in great numbers and under the open sky.<sup>10</sup>

Cattle and fowl production was mainly for food; very few were sold. No cattle exportation, but rather horse importation, was,

reported by the historical documents of the time. The archaeological excavations proved for the ancient period, and the Laurentian and Hipacian chronicles for the Kievan-Galician period, a very great consumption of meat, such as lamb, pork, beef, veal, poultry, and even horse, and of milk and milk products, like butter, buttermilk, eggs, and various kinds of cheese. Besides, hides and wool, as animal by-products, were widely used for shoe and clothing manufacturing within individual households, and were also sold in the domestic market. Horses, oxen, and mules were widely used by peasants as draft-animals in their field work.

The chronicle, relating, as of the year 1103, the preparations for a large-scale joint expedition of the Ukrainian dukes against the Cumans, pointed out also that the dukes discussed a proper timing for their military expedition, planning to arrange matters in such a way as to avoid depriving the peasants of workhorses. Furthermore, Prince Volodimir of Volhnia, before his death in 1288, ordered his horses to be distributed among the poor peasants, to assist them in working their farms more efficiently.<sup>11</sup>

Such specialized occupations of herdsmen as shepherds, cowboys, horse-herdsmen, and swineherds existed during that period. They offered their services to the dukes, boyars, and village communities as well as to individual peasants of the higher income brackets. The dukes and grand boyars often owned large cattle and horse breeding estates. These sometimes included thousands of mares and stallions.<sup>12</sup> No doubt, horse-breeding was of great military importance in furnishing mounts for the knights and warriors.

When cavalry was needed, the Ukrainian dukes hired the Norman horseback warriors if they were unable to furnish enough horses for their own troops. Special kinds of horses were imported from the Cumans, the Turkman nomads, and the Hungarians. The administration of the princely horse-breeding estates was in the hands of special officials (koniushi), and the menial work there was done by specially trained slaves and hired employees (koniukhi).

As mentioned previously, the dukes were also vitally interested in breeding special kinds of hunting hounds, while dogs were customary in the households of the boyars and commoners. Property rights with respect to horse breeding and cattle raising were regulated and protected by law. For example, the code of Ruska Pravda provided rules for cattle-trading and penalties for cattle and horse theft.



Along with cattle, horse, and fowl production, bee-keeping continued to be important to the economy. It produced wax and honey for domestic uses and for export. Wooden beehives were built in the form of pitchers, or were arranged in the holes of old trees in the forests. Bee-keeping was a separate occupation, although some peasants and even some townspeople kept bees to supplement their incomes. *Ruska Pravda* and other documents often mentioned bee-keeping and provided regulations and penalties for violations of hive rights, such as damaging hives, stealing honey and wax, and destroying the conventional ownership signs. The dukes often kept their exclusive rights on beehives in the forests, or made grants to the monasteries, which were extremely interested in apiculture.

In general, the monks were good bee-keepers, since honey and wax were important to the communal life of the religious orders. Apiculture was a profitable business because everybody, from the prince to the slave, ate honey and drank honey-drink and burned candles. Moreover, honey and wax were the most important Kievan exports. They were generally accepted as money. The state even accepted them as the means of payment of taxes and duties. The commercial significance of honey and wax from Ukraine was stressed by Sviatoslav, the Kievan duke. According to the *Lavrentian chronicle*, Sviatoslav planned to conquer, and to transfer his capital from Kiev to Pereslav on the Danube, which was a commercial center at that time. There the Greeks sold gold, textiles, fruits, and vines, the Czechs and Hungarians supplied silver and horses, and Rus supplied honey, wax, fur, and slaves. The same chronicle again mentioned honey, wax and fur as the gifts of Prince Ihor to the Byzantine envoy.<sup>13</sup> Although of secondary importance like fishing and hunting, agriculture must be regarded as highly significant to medieval Ukrainian society.

**Agriculture** was indisputedly the foundation of the national economy, and by the same token, the major source of the national income. In the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries, the Ukrainian peasant and tradesman still penetrated new regions, having pushed their frontiers even further into the southern and eastern steppe borderlands at the price of continuous frictions with the steppe nomads, the Cumans and Turkmans. Nevertheless, the Slavonic ethnic stock was in this area in the earliest times and their plows conquered new areas of unoccupied land and absorbed it into the national territory of Rus.

In the 12th century, however, circumstances changed fundamentally and unfavorably. The southeastern colonization had not only been halted by the opposition of the nomads, but some land in this area was gradually lost to them. The Ukrainian ethnic element began a slow retreat to the north. The "black soil" of the fertile steppes grew scarcer, as they moved north and west to Kiev, Cherniv, Polesia, Volhinia, and Galicia, where they introduced their form of intensive colonization. Because only poorer soil was available in this region, farming techniques had to change. Cultivation became more intensive.

The gradual retreat of the Ukrainian people from the southeastern borderlands also had its influences on their internal political structure. Civil wars among the individual princes and separate branches of the Rurik dynasty wasted much of the national energy which might have been used to retain the southern regions. Yet the historical fact is that the bulk of this population movement from the southern steppes to the northern forests was confined to Ukrainian territory. Russian historians, such as Pogodin and Kluchevskii were not justified in deducing from this migration a theory of mass migration of the population of Ukraine to the northern Russian principalities of Suzdal, Rostov, and Vladimir. The main economic consequences of this development was the concentration of its agricultural segment as a higher stage of its evolution, and this required a more stable political framework.

Wherever farming was given up because of the inability of the State to protect the farmers, the people reverted to a hunting and fishing economy. And yet these expansions and contractions of Ukrainian material culture were but a prelude to the third period of the socio-economic history of the Ukrainian people, a period which began to manifest itself with the political collapse of the Kievan Empire. As far as the whole of the Kievan-Galician farm economy was concerned, it generally featured opulence and some progress in agricultural technology.

During the Kievan-Galician period various kinds of grain were cultivated throughout the country. Among these were wheat, rye, oats, millet, barley, spelt, and even buckwheat.<sup>14</sup> Winter and spring seeds were also to some extent developed at that time. Farming in the north differed somewhat from that in the south, where, because of soil and climate the principal grains were wheat, buckwheat, and spelt. In the northern regions rye, oats, and barley were the leading crops. This distribution of crops is deduced from the chronicles. They relate, for example, that Prince Volodimir of

Volhina introduced in the city of Berest a tax on oats and rye, presumably because these grains were the leading farm products in his northern principality. Prince Daniel of Galicia, on the other hand, supplied Prince Michael of Chernihiv with wheat to help him and his people in time of distress, wheat being the chief farm product in the Galician-Podolian districts. <sup>15</sup>

Moreover, farm technology in the north differed from that employed in the south. In the southern steppe areas there was much fertile and easily accessible soil, permitting extensive farming without hard labor. The growing population in the forest areas, due to both natural increase and to the continuous influx of harassed southerners, resulted in an increasing shortage of land, forcing upon the people both the hard work of clearing more and more inaccessible wooded regions, and the introduction of the two-field and three-field systems. Moreover, the poor soils in the northern sections demanded intensive and regular plowing and fertilizing. Actually, the political developments of the floating frontiers sponsored a gradual progress in agricultural technology in the politically safer northern regions, and resulted in the depopulation and economic primitivism of the politically unsafe steppes.

In the northern sections, such as Polesia and Volhinia, there were found some iron mines, resulting in the gradual adoption of iron farming implements, or at least, implements with some iron parts. Among these were the iron plow, iron hoe, harrow, shovel, fork, sickle, and scythe. Ancient documents time and again refer to these implements, throwing considerable light on the farm techniques of the era.

Oxen and horses were introduced and extensively used as draft animals in the field and forest work, providing at the same time animal manure, now more widely used for fertilizer. <sup>16</sup> These improvements in agricultural technology resulted in enormous agricultural production. The chronicles and other written documents, such as the literary creations of the time, afford ample evidence of the huge stores of grain available all over the country, and the large-scale exports of grain, especially to Novgorod the Great, the Suzdal-Vladimir principalities, Luthiania, and the German cities and principalities. For example, the Novgorodians suffered famine in 1141 when no exports of grain arrived from Ukraine because of bad weather. In the year 1270 the Yadvingers, a tribe in southern Lithuania, having suffered a famine, sent their envoys to the Galician-Volhinian dukes asking for grain and food. Volodimir of Volhinia dispatched grain by way of the rivers Buh and Narev to

assist the Yadvingers, but the convoy was attacked and robbed by the Poles, and never reached its destination. This incident resulted eventually in a Ukrainian-Polish war.

*Ihor's Tale*, *Patericon*, chronicles, and other literary works from the time of the Kievan-Galician era supplied abundant information about the agricultural economy of medieval Ukraine: ordinary field work, implements used, the kinds of crops raised, plowing, sowing, harvesting, threshing, and even methods of crop processing, such as storage, milling, and bread baking; the use of free and slave labor, as well as the growing usage of draft animals. This information not only indicates how important farming was—that it was indisputably the main and leading industry of the Kievan-Galician economy—but it also shows clearly that Ukraine was the center of agricultural progress of the time.<sup>17</sup>

The continuous although slow progress in medieval farming in Ukraine has been admitted by Aristov, Kulisher, Grekov, Bahalii, and other students of the socio-economic history of Eastern Europe, and only this progress could explain the agricultural opulence of the country. Compared to our standards, of course, agricultural productivity was rather low, but compared to that of the Russian north at that time it was quite high. As Lyaschenko rightly said, "The technique was indeed primitive [here he meant the whole European East] but in some districts, along the Dniepr in particular (Ukraine), it was quite advanced for its time."

On the other hand, Ukrainian agriculture frequently suffered grave losses in productivity because of natural catastrophes like droughts, overabundant rainfalls, floods, and excessive cold. Often local famines followed such events. The *Patericon* of the Kievan monastery and the tales about the lives of the saints mention the so-called "hungry years." Since the tenth century, locusts also plagued the southern regions, leaving nothing behind but hungry people.

The cultivation of gardens and orchards progressed in Kievan-Galician times in an impressive way. Among the vegetables, onions, garlic, peas, beans, carrots, parsley, lentils, cabbage, turnips, beets, pumpkins, and poppies were continually cultivated. Apples, pears, plums and cherries were the leading fruits. At that time a modest beginning was made in the cultivation of nuts and grapes. Gardens and orchards were developed primarily in the vicinity of large cities, such as Kiev and Halich. That the professional gardeners had their own organizations with their own leaders and laws indicated the relatively advanced standing of the profession as well as the economic importance of the business.

Vernadsky was rather dubious about the considerable development of gardening in Kiev, but numerous references to gardening and raising vegetables made by the above mentioned *Patericon*, the story of the saints of the Kievan monastery, seem to disprove these doubts.<sup>18</sup> The monasteries were especially interested in gardening and the monks were true pioneers in the intensive and skilled work required. On the boyar estates and the peasant farms, cultivation of vegetables and fruits was also widely known, a tradition inherited from the ancient era. Prince Daniel developed in the new city of Kholm a beautiful garden, the chronicle relates, one which displayed the advanced state of horticulture in his realm.<sup>19</sup> Vegetables and fruit were important to the diets of the royalty, boyardom, and the wealthier townspeople and peasantry.

The growth of agriculture as well as the wealth derived from it in Kiev and Galicia was facilitated by the system of private enterprise. Although some authors, like Rozhkov, denied that the peasant in the Kievan state held any extensive rights to private property, such a view seems to lack any justification, since the code of Ruska Pravda and numerous copies of deeds give ample and sufficient proof of the prevalence of such rights. In these deeds the boundaries of the private estates and landholdings are described and their unilateral violation prohibited. Ruska Pravda provided penalties for plowing a field beyond its boundaries. Certain historical references imply the prevalence of private ownership in farming for all East Slavic tribes as early as the tenth century. For instance, *Lavrentievskaja letopis* (chronicle) relates for Princess Olha's time that "the Derevljanians make their own fields and their own lands," and *Hypatievskaja letopis* says that the Viaticians pay the tribute from the plow.<sup>20</sup> Of course, farms differed greatly in size in the Kievan period, since the tradition of private property was old. Ample time had already passed for differentiated skill and industry to result in considerable differences in individual land holdings. The princely estates were huge, including many villages and thousands of acres of land. The estates of the great boyars were also large, while the holdings of the country gentry and the monasteries were somewhat smaller. The peasant farms were even smaller.

The princely estates already had at that time an elaborate management, being divided into a number of administrative units under separate management and separate officials. Special personnel were in charge of the different parts of the business. Some officials supervised the field work, others cattle and horse raising,

still others were in charge of sheepherding, gardening, and orchard cultivation. These special officials were generally called "tivunes," and were often elevated from the slave class. Cattle raising was often in the hands of herdsmen of Turkish extraction, as Vernadsky indicated. The manual work and the tilling of the fields were done either by slaves or the half-free, of whom there were hundreds on the princely and boyar lands. This work was also done by hired, indentured laborers. Some portions of land meadows, and woods were leased by the dukes and grand boyars to the tenant-peasants. Sometimes the half-free (zakupi) were also made farm tenants.

Grain was stored either in the fields or in the barns, or in holes in the ground, properly arranged and protected. Hay was mowed and stored for the feeding of animals. The peasant farm was managed by the family, cultivated primarily by free labor and the extensive use of draft animals. Rarely did the peasants store their grain and hay in barns.

Initially, the bulk of agricultural production was done by free people on small farms. Later, as Hrushevski has explained, the free peasant declined in importance because of the attrition of continuous civil wars. Peasants could not survive these conditions for long, and either they voluntarily gave up their farm ownership and accepted tenant relationship together with boyar protection, or through spoliation and abuse by the nobles, peasants were forced off their farms and gradually reduced to the status of half-free or slaves. This phenomenon accounts for the growing importance of unfree labor in agriculture, on the one hand, and the slow rise of feudal relations and the decline of the traditional farm system, on the other. The peasants could not endure requisitions, ruin, disturbances in field work, and other hardships of war, while the latifundia system could progress only if cheap labor were secured to cultivate the enormous land areas.<sup>21</sup>

War supplied slaves in the form of war prisoners and impoverished peasant and half-free who had to adjust their labor to the extensive farm lands of the now depopulated country. At the end of the Kievan-Galician period, even the institution of the *glæbae adscripti* peasants appeared in Ukraine. These soil-bound peasants were a result of military developments and the wars with the Cumans, while in western Ukraine (Galicia and Volhina) the peasant was bound to the soil as a consequence of semi-feudal institutions copied from Hungary and Poland. Thus, the latifundia system slowly replaced the peasant farm in Ukraine agriculture, but this development should be regarded, from the historical philosophical point of view, as the beginning of the socio-economic

processes of the next period of the evolution of Ukrainian agriculture. It was never an essential feature of the Kievan-Galician economy as some historians have claimed.

**Mining.** While the processing of mineral resources was fairly well developed in the Kievan and Galician eras, and considerable quantities of ores were imported for that purpose, mining occupied a modest place in the economy of the times. It was limited primarily to the extraction of iron ore for the manufacture of arms and tools, the extraction of clay for ceramic production, and the mining of salt for direct consumption. Mining of ores is directly related to the metallurgic industries, but the discussion of the latter will be reserved for the next chapter. Here only a brief description of the medieval Ukrainian mining and smelting business will be given.

In the swamps and woods of northern Ukraine, in Polesia and Volhinia, there were abundant reserves of near-surface iron ores which could be mined by primitive techniques. Archeological excavations supplied ample evidence of extensive iron extraction by the Derevlians and the Polianians since early historic times. Certainly, during the Kievan period, mining and smelting continued, and perhaps, progressed. The rich southern reserves of iron and other metallic ores in the steppes, however, were not yet accessible to the early Slavs for two reasons. First of all, those regions were either occupied or continually harassed by the Cumans and other nomads so that no industry could emerge there. Secondly, the Slavs at that time were not yet able to master the method of extracting the rich but deep veins of ore.<sup>22</sup> For two reasons the iron industry was highly important to the Ukrainian Slavs. In the first place, they could produce arms and weapons for their needs, and, second, they could manufacture indispensable farm implements and household utensils from their own iron. Extraction of iron ore was done by the peasants, as well as on royal, boyar, and ecclesiastical domains. Proof of the existence of foundries and smithies is to be found in the chronicles and other early literature and in archeological discoveries.<sup>23</sup> Special artisans, miners, boilermen, and smelters were employed in the business of extracting and smelting.

Salt mining prevailed in the pre-Carpathian districts of Galicia, from which the entire Ukraine was supplied with salt. When during a civil war in 1097 the Galician rulers prohibited any export of that commodity to the other provinces of the country, Kiev and the rest of Ukraine suffered a shortage of salt, and were compelled to import it from the Crimean Peninsula and the Don-Volga region in a much larger quantity than before.

Clay was extracted and processed in various regions of the Kievan and Galician states, to produce pots, jugs, dishes, and other ceramic ware for the home. The domestic extraction of all of the above minerals, especially of iron ore, as well as the considerable importation of such metals as copper, bronze, lead, aluminum, silver, and gold, constituted the basis for the growth of medieval Ukrainian metallurgy, and must be regarded as a very important component of the material culture of the Kievan-Galician society.



## CHAPTER SIX

### URBAN CENTERS AND THEIR INDUSTRIES

**Towns in Ukraine - Crafts - Metallurgy, carpentry, and the construction industry - Ceramics, textiles, tanning and the fur business**

**Towns in Ukraine.** It has been mentioned earlier that archaeological excavations disclosed the existence of hundreds of fortified towns in ancient Ukraine. There are convincing indications that about 450 towns existed in the Kievan province, some 350 in Volhinia, and over 100 in Galicia. Since all these "towns" were situated in the northern forest belt of Ukraine, these forest areas were really the original cells of ethnical growth as well as the most densely populated part of the country.

From there, colonization was usually started in an attempt to conquer by sword and plow the Southern and Eastern steppes which were richly endowed with natural resources. Strategic and commercial considerations produced in the course of centuries these magnificent fortified towns. On the one hand, the ancient inhabitants of Ukraine—the Scythians, Roxolians, Goths, Sarmatians, Ants, and later the Slavs—desired to protect themselves by erecting fortified places against the continuous threat of repeated surprise attacks by the steppe Nomads. On the other hand, they also established commercial centers in the borderlands and on the trade routes, chiefly along the main and navigable rivers, in order to take full advantage of the location of the Ukrainian country as the crossroads of Eurasia. Erecting towns was instinctive for almost all the races and tribes which populated Ukraine at various times in its earliest periods. Some towns, like Kiev, were ancient, the origin of which might be traced back as far as the Gothic period, or even earlier. Other towns were the creation of the Ukrainian Slav, and the chronicles enumerate some of the more important, such as Cherven, Red-Towns, in general, Turiv, Iskorosten, Lubech, Peresehen, Chernihiv, and Peremishl, although the exact date of their establishment cannot be ascertained. They doubtlessly

originated as the political centers of Slavic tribal organizations. When Ukraine was still tribally organized, the townspeople, as the common people in general, were an important political factor of a democratic constitution. The wealth of the townspeople contributed considerably toward their significant political position. But the growth of the Kievan Empire and the power of the first rulers of the Rurik House reduced tribal particularism and the political role of the townspeople, making the people's meetings (viche) almost meaningless.

Then, Rurik, Volodimir the Great, Yaroslav the Wise, and Daniel of Galicia in particular, as well as some other dukes to a lesser degree, initiated a third phase in Ukrainian urban history. They began to erect new towns along the river banks or on the traditional trade routes, or in places strategically favorable from a commercial or political point of view. Frequently small towns and villages expanded into large cities. Soon the princely administrative apparatus, following this trend, moved into such cities, making them the capitals of local administration. Thus, the Laurentian chronicle related, in the year 988, that Volodimir the Great "began to erect towns along the rivers Desna, Vorskla, Trubezha, Sula and Stuchna."<sup>1</sup> Volodimir's son, Prince Yaroslav, emulated his father by establishing among other towns, Yuriiv (later called Dorpat) in Estonia. All these towns and fortresses were customarily located in the borderlands of the Empire for two reasons: first, to protect the nation against the permanent threat of foreign attack, especially against the steppe nomads in the east, and secondly to create commercial centers for trading with neighboring lands and peoples. Still a third reason might be added with respect to the Kievan dukes, namely to strengthen in this way their central authority in newly acquired territories.

Wherever necessary, new towns were established as the sites of the Kievan deputies and of the military government in order to bind those areas more closely to the Kievan capital and the Rurik dynasty. During the second half of the tenth century and during the 11th century, the political importance of the city diminished somewhat, and it did not matter any more whether it was an old center of the tribal or clan organization or a new administrative unit of the central government. The democratic principle of the people's meeting was greatly weakened at the same time by the overwhelming authority of the Kievan Grand Dukes; hence the town lost its original significance.

Economically, however, the town experienced a new growth under the protection of the centralized and pacifying rule of Kiev. Commercial activities continually expanded. Relative political peace, and the opportunity of a large-scale interprovincial and international trade added extensively to the growth of the medieval city, and, as a direct result of these developments, the townspeople accumulated wealth and enjoyed relative prosperity. Savitsky made an interesting study of economic fluctuations in the Kievan state, and, on the whole, it seems that between 980 and 1092—throughout the era of Kievan supremacy—there were approximately 22 years of depression, and the rest, some 90 years, were prosperity, near prosperity, or revival.

Later, in the course of the 12th century, these conditions were reversed. After 1092, depressions became longer and more frequent, and their ratio to periods of prosperity prior to 1237 was 50 years of depression and 70 years of relative prosperity.<sup>2</sup> Obviously, the pattern of business cycles in the Kievan Empire was determined by political developments. Political growth resulted in a prosperous economy; political decline initiated an economic depression. The reigns of Volodimir the Great, Yaroslav the Wise, Volodimir Monomakh, and Mstislav in the 11th and the first half of the 12th centuries were periods of greatest prosperity, for these were the the greatest of the Kievan dukes,

Growing political chaos, continuous civil war, frequent changes in the person of the ruling duke, and the decline of the central authority of the Kievan capital produced, however, a revival of the political influence of the town and the townspeople. The people's meeting began anew to play a significant role in political developments, calling and expelling the dukes, acquiescing in or limiting their authority, and thus the democratic principle began to supersede the monarchic once more. From that time on, dukes were dependent upon the will of the townspeople and had to pay close attention to the recommendations of the meetings. Apropos of this fact, Kluchevskii said, "The new order of phenomena represented by these conventions between princes and *viche* continued in force throughout the 11th and 12th centuries, and introduced into Russian political life an important change.... Even the Suzerain of Kiev retained his throne under him only by keeping on good terms with the local *viche*, lest his boyars and townsmen should address to him the reminder: 'Thou remainst here only so long as thou dost hold with the people of Kiev'."<sup>3</sup>

The heights in the development of the democratic institution of the *viche* (people's meeting) and of the political role of the towns-

people were reached in the latter half of the 12th century, and lasted as long as the city retained its economic position despite nationwide unfavorable political conditions. But when the deterioration of law and order became almost intolerable to merchandising in the 13th century, the city began to decline politically as well as economically, and soon the aristocratic boyar council overrode both the monarchical princely authority and the democratic people's meeting. This development was, *nota bene*, manifested most distinctly in the Galician-Volhinian state.<sup>4</sup>

The wealth, opulence, and beauty of the medieval Ukrainian town often astonished the eyes of foreigners. The Scandinavians called Ukraine "the land of towns."<sup>5</sup> Thitmar the Great related that the city of Kiev had 400 churches, eight market places and a very large population. Adam of Bremen who was in Kiev around 1072 said that Kiev was so prosperous that it might be considered a rival of the Greek Constantinople. And when Andreas of Hungary moved with his troops into the Galician-Volhinian territories and saw the city of Volodimir, he exclaimed in astonishment, "Such a city I did not see even in Germany."<sup>7</sup> At that time the German Empire was the mightiest in Europe.

The impressive monuments of the Ukrainian architecture of that era, the churches, monasteries and palaces, as well as city gates and bridges, definitely indicate the prosperity of these towns. St. Mary's Church of the Tithe, built by Volodimir the Great in the years 986-996, the Cathedral of St. Sophia, the "Golden Gate," and the Church of the Annunciation, erected by Yaroslav the Wise between 1017 and 1037, the two St. Michael's monastery buildings with churches built between 1088 and 1188, and various city buildings—all in Kiev; and then, the Church of the Transfiguration of Our Lord, 1024-1036, the Church of Sts. Boris and Hlib, 1120-1123, and the Assumption Monastery erected around 1160, in Chernihiv; and the architecture of the Galician-Volhinian realm of the later epoch, such as St. Basil's Church in Ovruch, 12th century, the Church of the Assumption in Volodimir, erected by Mstislav around 1160, St. Panteleymont's Church in Halich, 1200, and the buildings and churches of the cities of Kholm and Lviv, established by Daniel and Lev of Galicia in the 14th century—all afford ample proof of the opulence of the 14th century Ukrainian town, as Doroshenko noted.<sup>8</sup>

No doubt, the princes and boyars contributed greatly to the splendor of these buildings and towns, either by their donations or by their constructive activity, but this contribution confirms the

over-all wealth of the people and the significance of the town as the center of the cultural growth of medieval Ukrainian society. When the dukes erected new towns they encouraged foreigners to come from all over, and to contribute their genius and skill to Ukrainian economic and cultural development.

Kluchevskii and Pokrovskii, impressed by the medieval growth of the town, called the entire period the "commercial" or "urban" Rus. But they were too enthusiastic in this respect. Dovnar-Zapolski, Grekov, Lyashchenko, and some others found proof enough that the era was still a period of relative agricultural primitivism.<sup>9</sup> It was rather an emergence of a new capitalistic commercialism which was not permitted by political developments to ripen fully.

The town was populated largely by merchants and artisans. *Ruska Pravda*, however, gave but little legal protection to the artisan, a fact indicative of his low legal and social status which was comparable to that of the half-free and the hired servant. This low status might be a direct result of the artisan's low earnings and his rather modest contribution to the national income.<sup>10</sup> The real economic significance of the city was based on its traditional commercial activities and its merchant class.

The medieval town was engineered in such a way as to serve both the military and commercial needs of the country. Since time immemorial these cities were erected on the banks of navigable rivers which afforded the best trade routes. If a town were not situated on a river bank, its defense was usually given first consideration. Castles and fortresses always occupied the central position, around which the town and the suburbs emerged and grew. The castle and the town buildings, churches and market places were defended by strong stone and wooden walls, sometimes running in triple parallel lines, and surrounded by earthen walls and moats. Usually several gates, strongly built and heavily defended by drawbridges, permitted ingress and egress. Outside the city gates the suburbs extended, sometimes for miles, and here lived the townspeople, merchants, and artisans.<sup>11</sup> The medieval Ukrainian town afforded distinct proof of the high level attained by the contemporary construction industry.

**Crafts.** Having emerged from relatively scanty beginnings, restricted largely to the self-sufficient household economy, the trades developed to the level of medieval craftsmanship by the Kievan-Galician period. The code of *Ruska Pravda*, the Laurentian

chronicle, the Hipatian chronicle, the Kievan *Patericon*, and the foreign written documents, such as the Emperor Constantine Pro-  
phirogenitus' *De Imperio Administrando*, and the narrations of  
Arabic travelers, frequently referred to various artisans and their  
works, while archaeological excavations confirm the existence of  
such trades in Kiev and Galicia. Among these were tanners, fur-  
riers, weavers, fullers, basket weavers, carpenters, woodcutters,  
fence-makers, builders, bridge-makers, shipwrights, saddlers, shoe-  
makers, foundry workers and blacksmiths, coopers, jewelers, fur  
dressers, and tailors <sup>12</sup> This list is far from complete. Hat makers,  
bakers, and millers could easily be included.

These trades were largely located in the towns, and the artisans  
and craftsmen constituted the majority of the urban population. Of  
course there were also many skilled artisans among the country  
people who supplied the villages with their products. The develop-  
ment of the skilled trades was a natural result of an increase in the  
number and density of the population. The clumsy jack-of-all-  
trades was no longer able to supply sufficient quantities of manu-  
factured goods to meet the growing needs of the people. This fact  
forced specialization and its advantages of technical improvements,  
innovations, and inventions upon the Kievan-Galician society. Thus  
did population increases contribute greatly to a more refined divi-  
sion of labor. The growth of civilization, especially after the  
acceptance of Christianity, and the close commercial and cultural  
intercourse with foreign lands and peoples further encouraged the  
development of the skilled trades. A gradual accumulation of  
wealth by the Ukrainian Slavs also facilitated specialized trades,  
since the wealthy people now sought better homes, better household  
utensils, better and finer clothing, and greater conveniences; and  
they were willing and able to pay skilled artisans well for excep-  
tional work. Increasing opportunities to earn more and to live bet-  
ter encouraged specialization and promoted the development of  
fine craftsmanship.

Some trades admitted women as well as men, although there  
was considerable discrimination among the sexes. Heavy work,  
such as carpentry and metallurgy, was reserved for the male.  
Weaving, tailoring, knitting, embroidering, and, to some extent,  
ceramics were the crafts for women. The freemen as well as the  
unfree and the slaves were engaged in crafts and trades. Espe-  
cially in large manufacturing establishments operated by princes,  
boyars, and monasteries, the unfree artisans were employed as  
weavers, fullers, carpenters and builders, working for the enrich-

ment of their masters. Their products, like those of the free and independent craftsmen, ranged from the crude to the artistic. Ruska Pravda recounted various categories of the unfree artisans whose wages were very low, not exceeding one "hrivna" a year, when the earnings of free artisans for similar jobs were from 18 to 20 "hrivnas" for the same period of time.<sup>13</sup>

The craftsmen and artisans organized partnerships and corporations, and otherwise joined various organizations to foster their businesses. Some of these associations were, perhaps, similar to the Western trade guilds, and others resembled modern producer cooperatives. There were in Kiev associations of shippers who shipped wood to the river harbors and of carpenters, gardeners, coffin makers, wood workers, and builders. The building association had at one time great significance, for its chairman was a close friend of the prince himself, and was also invited to join the commission for codifying the later phases of the Ruska Pravda.<sup>14</sup> The Kievan *Patericon* and the Laurentian Chronicle, as well as other sources mention these associations.

Although the trades were fairly well developed in the Kievan-Galician period, Lyashchenko warned against overrating their economic significance when he said, "In any event, the share of all these urban industries and handicrafts in the national economy of the tenth and twelfth centuries was rather negligible since the overwhelming part of the population within the framework of a natural economy was engaged in tillage, and in the primary processing of agricultural materials."<sup>15</sup> It seems, however, that Lyashchenko and those who shared his views rather underestimated the relatively high level of material civilization among the medieval Ukrainians. In general, archaeological findings, including metal tools and household articles, pieces of clothing, and arms, are indicative of a considerable material culture at that time. Kiev was certainly inferior to Byzantium in its cultural achievements, but it was not inferior to the West.

**Metallurgy, Carpentry, and the Construction Industry.** The main classification of the crafts at that time would be approximately as follows: metallurgy and metal processing, carpentry, construction industries, ceramics and glass production, the textile and garment industries, tanning and furriery. Metallurgy and metal processing must be regarded as the foundation of the material culture of the Rus society. Metals were used in every sector of the Kievan economy. Iron ore had been mined in northern Ukraine from time

immemorial. Iron extraction and smelting were carried on for civilian as well as military purposes. Historical references point to a developed armament industry particularly among the Polianians. The chronicle related, for example, an interesting instance in the political developments in Kiev. The Khazars defeated the Polianians and demanded a tribute. The Polianians sent them two-edged swords, previously unknown to the Khazars, an alarming kind of tribute.

Ibn-Chordadbeh also reported an export of swords from the land of Rus to Byzantium. These two references seem to indicate skills in the production of arms and weapons.<sup>16</sup>

On the other hand, excavations and linguistic studies have proven extensive manufacturing and usage of iron and copper implements and utensils among the early Ukrainians. Among these were plow shares, shovels, spades, hoes, harrow teeth, wheels, axes, sickles, frying pans, candlesticks, nails, needles, knives, hammers, forks, spoons, drills, pots, ladders, saws, and chisels. Cast iron was used for manufacturing fences and stairways. For military purposes there were swords, spears, helmets, and shields produced by specialized craftsmen. As a matter of fact, archaeological excavations led the modern historian to reconstruct the state of the metal industries in Kiev and Galicia much more fully than the scanty written documents of the time. Smelting and smithing were the most important phases of medieval Ukrainian iron processing. Thus, in Kiev, for example, a special section of the city was inhabited exclusively by smiths, and the city gate nearest to this section was called "Smith Gate." The smiths were mentioned in Theodosius' *Life Story*, in the *Kievan Patericon*. Besides the smiths there were also special arms makers, shield makers, tool and appliance makers, and other specialized trades engaged in the processing of iron.

Other metals were also extensively processed in Ukraine from ores imported from foreign lands. Processing copper and the manufacture of various copper products were, no doubt, the second most important industry in the Kievan Empire. It included such activities as the production of church bells, coinage of copper coins, the manufacture of copper stairways, fences, and roofs for churches and palaces, and the production of such kitchen wares and household utensils as kettles, wash basins, pans, candlesticks, and similar items. Cyril of Turiv, for example, mentioned in his writings a copper axe.<sup>17</sup> Probably other tools were also made from copper, but the practice was soon abandoned since iron tools were more efficient.



Church bells were mentioned in the chronicles in the year 1146, in Putivl. But no doubt they existed in the Kievan Empire much earlier, and were brought to Ukraine soon after the introduction of Christianity. In Novgorod the Great the bells were mentioned under the date 1066. It is impossible to say when the Ukrainians began to make church bells, but doubtlessly this industry did develop and there were skilled artisans in this field. The Galician-Volhinian chronicle related (as of the year 1259) that "some bells were brought from Kiev and others were cast here."<sup>18</sup> The statement refers to the newly established city of Kholm, of which Prince Daniel of Galicia took special care, and where he built city walls, gates, and churches, provided market places, and developed industries. In Kholm, as in other large towns, smelting iron, smithing, and processing copper and silver took place. Copper was imported from Caucasus and Asia Minor to supply the extensive domestic needs.

Lead and tin (the Slavic language of that time was not very clear in differentiating between these two metals) were imported principally from Bohemia, and out of them, fences, roofs for churches, palaces and official buildings, some tools, and princely and government seals were manufactured by the domestic craftsmen. Jewelry was made and fine silver and gold work was also done in Kiev and Galicia. The art was learned from Greece and the West; the precious metals were imported from Bohemia, the Ural areas by way of the Suzdal and Rostov principalities, Caucasus, Byzantium, and the Cuman territory. Among the medieval fine silver and gold work one might find jewels, dishes, and especially plates, bowls, spoons, and chalices for secular use of the wealthy; chalices, crosses, gold-covered gospels, vessels, gold and silver ornaments for the inside walls and roofs of churches; and other things for religious and ecclesiastic uses. Rich gold and silver ornaments had plant, animal, and human motifs, and were strongly influenced by Byzantine art.<sup>19</sup>

Carpentry and the construction industries, which were considerably developed in the Kievan period, evolved from primitive home construction by the ancient family commune. Then, the communal clearing of the forests was followed by primitive woodcraft providing for both agriculture and the production of some primitive tools and household articles. Woodworking was a very old craft. At first forests were cleared by means of rather primitive tools. By the time of the Kievan era, tools, including axes, saws, hammers, drills, and pliers, contained at least some iron parts. Also used by the carpenters were chisels, level-arms, and wooden and

iron nails. Carpentry produced a variety of household and farm appliances, such as wagons, carts, wheels, barrels, benches, slides, tables, chairs, beds, other home furnishings, spoons, jars, cribs, cattlesheds, ladders, and baskets. These articles of carpentry ranged from very crude forms to artistic masterpieces for the princely, boyar, and wealthy merchant households. Coffin makers and shield makers were specialized carpenters.

Since the earliest times, wooden dwellings, houses, huts, stables, barns, and grain elevators were built in Ukraine. In some parts of the North, probably in the lands of the Derevliaus, sodhuts were built. Holes were dug into the earth and wooden roofs were built over them and covered with earth and clay. Ibn-Dusta said that sod huts were built by the Slavs in order to protect themselves against the cold.<sup>20</sup>

During the Kievan era wooden huts covered with straw were commonly erected by the country people. In the towns wooden houses were covered with tin or shingles. Later, with the growth of wealth among the upper classes, princes and boyars, wooden palaces were also constructed. With the acceptance of Christianity, wooden churches were built. Palaces and public buildings had deep basements, and frequently two floors. Those wooden constructions were sometimes very luxurious, with marble floors, artistically painted ceilings, and walls covered with domestic and oriental carpets.

Town builders and bridge builders constituted special occupational groups. Originally, city walls and bridges were of wood; they were strongly constructed and provided defense and security. The carpenters and bridge builders of Novgorod the Great were famous for their skill. In this connection, one historical reference is rather interesting. In 1016 the armies of the Kievan prince, Sviatopolk, facing the approaching cohorts of Yaroslav of Novgorod, shouted to them, "You carpenters! We shall put you to work on our own houses."<sup>21</sup> Ruska Pravda provided legal regulations controlling the wages of the bridge builders.

Wooden construction was a Ukrainian art, while stone construction was an imported one. Foreigners were called by the duke to erect stone and brick buildings, churches, palaces, and public buildings. The skill of masonry was also brought to Kiev from abroad. But soon both brick and stone construction were equally popular in Ukraine, and Ukrainian artisans excelled in both.

A stone building was first mentioned by the Laurentian chronicle as early as the year 945.<sup>22</sup> Beautiful must have been the palace of

Princess Olha. But in other instances luxury and beauty were also stressed in construction and ornamentation. In the 11th century stone city-walls and stone fortifications were known all over the Ukraine. Beginning with the 11th century, town churches were predominantly of stone and brick construction, while in the countryside they remained exclusively wooden.<sup>23</sup> Prince Yaroslav the Wise called in foreigners to do the masonry around St. Sophia Cathedral. Foreign masons migrated to Ukraine throughout the 10th and 11th centuries, until domestic craftsmanship began to compete against foreign skill.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in his *De Imperio Administrando*, described the subjects of Rus who cut wood, built boats, went to the city of Kiev, loaded their vessels with various goods, and then sailed down the river Dniepr to the Black Sea and to the capital of Constantinople, to trade with the Greek merchants.<sup>24</sup> The reference indicates that besides the construction of wooden houses and carpentry, shipbuilding also developed very early as an important industry until the Cumans barred the Ukrainians from the Black Sea.

But the industry continued during the Galician period to supply boats for fishermen still fishing at the mouths of the rivers Dniestr and Danube, and on the seas. Thus various types of boats and vessels were manufactured by local craftsmen as commercial vessels for trade along the river banks and the littorals of the Baltic and Black Seas, as fishing vessels, and as warships. Commercial vessels were so common on the Black Sea that it was named by some ancient travelers as the "Rus Sea."<sup>25</sup>

Boat builders were a class much in demand. At first the primitive method of burning out a hole in a large block of wood was employed. Later, however, a more complex and elaborate method came into use. Prices for boats were fixed. A small river boat was priced at one "hrivnia," while a large seaworthy vessel commanded as much as three "hrivnias."<sup>26</sup>

**Ceramics, Textiles, Tanning and the Fur Business.** Ceramics developed in Ukraine from the earliest times. First, wooden utensils were used by the ancient nomadic population. Clay and ceramic products were breakable, and therefore impractical for nomads. Archaeological excavations furnished very few examples of ceramics from the nomadic eras, indicating that in those days wooden dishes were generally used. But when the Slavs settled permanently they developed the ceramic art. At first the crosses, chalices, and drinking cups they made were the clumsy work of unskilled and usually female hands.<sup>27</sup> The Hipatian chronicle and the Kievan *Patercon* also mentioned clay pots and dishes. The excavations

from the time of the Kievan era, however, revealed examples of fine and artistic ceramics. There was, no doubt, a direct connection between the ancient Greek ceramics and the Ukrainian by way of the Tripilian culture and the Greek colonies on the northern littorals of the Pontus Euxinus (Black Sea), although the Ukrainian ceramics were inferior to those of the Greeks. Fine Greek ceramics (Ionian and Athenian) were therefore imported. Along with ceramics, brick production also developed in Ukraine. Bricks were used very early for the construction of churches, palaces, and urban official buildings.

According to Sichinsky, the old Ukrainians produced very good and exceptionally strong bricks and tiles, better than those made today. These bricks were furnished with manufacturers' trade marks, and exported to Poland and elsewhere. Bricks, tiles, and other ceramic products were made in Kiev, Chernihiv, Korsun, Halich, Zvenihorod, Belz, and Terebovla. The craftsmen in the ceramics industry were organized into business collectives. The first craftsmen were Greeks. Later on, however, the trade became Ukrainian, but the artisans were doubtlessly trained either in Greece or at least by Greek masters. The builder's trade was largely organized as journeywork. The craftsmen travelled from place to place, accepted orders, established brick and tile works, and erected brick buildings.

There is some historical evidence of glass manufacturing in the Kievan Empire. The terms "glassmith" and "glassmithy," used in the old Ukrainian language, lead us to assume the existence of at least a small glass industry in Kiev and Galicia.<sup>28</sup> But fine glassware was imported, primarily from Byzantium, but also from the West.<sup>29</sup>

Naturally, the textile and garment industries were very important since clothing is required to protect people in a harsh climate. In the written documents of the time—the chronicles, life stories of the saints, legal acts, fables and other stories—numerous references were made to weaving and spinning, and garment procurement. Hemp and flax were the primary raw materials, processed by women and men with spinningwheels, usually of the handwheel type, and hand looms. During the Kievan era, spinning was still done in homes by women, while weaving and fulling developed into special crafts and were done in separate shops. Also a great deal of spinning, weaving, and fulling was done by the monasteries, not only for their own use but for the market as well. Like members of other crafts, the weavers and fullers were organized into strong guild associations.

Various types and kinds of linen were manufactured at that time. Coarse, bleached, refined, dyed, and ornamented linens were all available in the markets of the Kievan state. Their production required professional skill and experience. Linen was needed not only as clothing material, but also for sailcloth for commercial and naval vessels. *Ruska Pravda* took special note of the stealing of linen, and provided penalties for such theft. As in all cases of special interests covered by the old code of laws, this law clearly indicates the economic importance of linen production and consumption.<sup>30</sup>

In direct relation to linen manufacturing was the production of cordage, which had its traditions from prehistoric time. Cordage was indispensable for manufacturing of hunting and fishing nets, as well as for ships. Canvas was also manufactured into tents for the army.<sup>31</sup>

Wool production and processing also progressed in the Kievan Empire. Sheep raising was quite extensive, mainly for wool. Crude woolen materials were produced domestically. On the other hand, wool was used, mostly by women, for knitting socks, stockings, and caps for winter, and for civilian as well as military needs.<sup>32</sup> But linen and woolen materials, especially those of fine qualities, and silk and silk products for consumption of the upper classes of the Kievan-Galician society, were largely imported from Byzantium, the West, and the Orient.

Tanning and furriery were both among the leading trades of the medieval Ukrainian economy. Agriculture, cattle raising, and hunting supplied large quantities of hides and skins for processing, and for the manufacture of clothing, shoes, boots, saddles, sacks, and belts. Leather was also extensively used for military purposes, such as shields, harnesses, and other materiel. Tanners, furriers, shoemakers, saddlers, and other leather craftsmen enjoyed such wealth that tanners and furriers were subject to a special tax. Probably their riches caused the dukes to look to them for another convenient source of additional public revenue.<sup>33</sup>

The social prestige of these two occupations may be demonstrated by the story told by the chronicle of tanner Kuzhumiaka, who saved the capital of Kiev from the Cuman invasion. The historical episode was mentioned already in another place. Of course, tanning was done in a rather primitive way, as the "Book of Annals" informs us about the process of leather production in the year 992. Some kind of tanning acid was used, but the bulk of the

process was accomplished by human hands alone. That leather footwear was used by the Slavs is undoubtedly admitted by the chronicle. However, according to the chronicle, probably the residents of the wealthier regions or the upper classes wore leather boots and shoes, while the poor could afford only footwear made from bast.<sup>34</sup> Especially in the northern sectors of Ukraine were there famous and expert furriers, and furs, like leather boots, were an indication of opulence and power.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### TRADE AND FINANCE

#### **Domestic trade - Foreign trade - The Byzantinian and Oriental trade - The Northern and Western trade - Finance.**

**Domestic Trade.** Trading activities, both domestic and foreign, contributed greatly to the income of the Kievan-Galician society. Their importance was widely recognized by the people themselves from the earliest times. Since that time the Ukrainian Slavs engaged extensively in trade. Whole families, not only among the city population but also among the peasants, were either fully or partially occupied with trade. For centuries merchant caravans traveled across Ukraine in all directions. Many of these crossed its borders into foreign countries.

The caravan met the need for protection in those uncertain times. Distances were great; roads were poor and dangerous; wild animals, thieves, and robbers threatened constantly; and there was literally no police protection. Therefore it was impractical to travel alone or in small groups. Usually these caravans were jointly organized by a number of merchants, or by one or more merchant associations. They were well armed when they traveled the traditional trade routes.

This caravan trading system of the merchants was known later on as "Chumatski valki," and it prevailed in Ukraine until the end of the 18th century.<sup>1</sup> The salt caravans traveled to the salt mines in Galicia, Transylvania, and Crimea, and from there carried the precious salt to all parts of the Kievan Empire. Metals and metal articles, either produced domestically or imported, iron, copper, zinc, and aluminum were important items of domestic trade. Grain caravans traveled continuously from the South to the North, where grain was scarce. According to historical sources, it would seem that salt, metal, and grain distribution presented the greatest problems of domestic commerce and exchange, and occupied a leading position in the internal marketing organization of the Kievan Empire.<sup>2</sup> At that time the major part of domestic distribution of imported articles consisted of luxurious merchandise, in particular,

gold, silver, jewelry, china, glassware, carpets, fine textiles, silk, and spices—articles usually destined for the upper classes.

Besides the overland caravans, a well developed system of waterways provided channels for domestic trade. The river Dniepr was the most important commercial water route, not only because it was, for the most part, navigable, but also because its system was extensive, connecting regions of the country which differed greatly in their economies. It linked the southern grain-producing areas with the northern bread-consuming districts. It was connected to the river Vistula and the Baltic Sea by the river Prypet. By the river Desna, it joined the river system of Oka in the North; by the river Seim it was linked to the river system of the Don and the Azov Sea in the East and South-east. As a matter of fact, the commercial routes and the waterways most naturally extended the country's domestic trading and the interprovincial exchange of the Empire into a large-scale foreign trade of intercontinental character.

The river Dniepr did not represent any hindrance to large-scale exchange between those who lived on its right and left banks, since numerous bridges crossed it, and, as Bahalii said, a number of trade routes connected these two parts of the Kievan Empire. Kiev ranked first, Chernihiv and Novgorod second, as commercial centers of trade.

Goods and merchandise from various provinces of the empire and from abroad were displayed for sale in the public market places of towns and cities. In some cities there were several market places, frequently specialized as to types of merchandise. Market places were large spaces, with booths and stands for private merchants, and approved scales operated by city officials and available for a small fee to sellers and buyers alike. Business was always being transacted in the market place. It was supervised by city clerks, who were also witnesses to credit transactions and contractual arrangements.

On certain days of the week, usually on Friday or other days sanctioned by custom and tradition, the market places were turned into fairs. Peasants came in great numbers to sell their produce, merchants displayed newly arrived merchandise, and artisans brought their manufactured articles. The entire affair became a social event. The weekly, monthly, and yearly fairs were regularly attended by the monks, who were sent by their respective monasteries to sell their output of vegetables, cloth, honey, and appliances, and to buy whatever was needed for their communal way of life.



A great variety of products was traded in these markets and fair grounds: meats of all kinds (including poultry), grain, flour and bread, honey and wax, salt, metal, wooden and metal household appliances, textiles and clothing, furs and leather, timber and wood, pottery, cattle, horses, and domestic birds. For a long time the barter system prevailed, but monetary and credit exchange quickly grew in importance and volume.

The small towns held markets within an exclusively local trading radius, while in the big cities the radius was almost nation-wide. Already at the time some advertising was used by the Ukrainian and foreign merchants in the form of displaying and announcing merchandise available for sale. Also at that time, some specialized mercantile professions existed, exclusive sellers of coffins, for example.<sup>3</sup>

The market place, moreover, was the center not only of medieval commercial life, but also of significant social and political activities. Important announcements were made by the town crier. Losses and thefts had to be first of all announced in the market place by a city official before any action to prosecute the thieves could be initiated in the courts.<sup>4</sup> And there also thieves were tried and sentenced. Finally, the market place was the site of the peoples' meetings.

Of course, commercial life was not equally developed in all sections of medieval Ukraine. The city of Kiev and its vicinity traded most extensively and must be considered the heart of the commercialized economy of the Empire. This commercialization was so striking that some foreign observers, like Emperor Constantine and Ibn-Dusta, erroneously associated the term "Rus," especially applicable to Kiev and the country of the Polianians, with the class of merchants and traders.<sup>5</sup>

On the whole, domestic trading owes its origin to two highly important factors. First, it was caused by the great diversification in the distribution of the natural resources, and in particular, by forest economy of the North. Here geography pointed to the mutual advantages of reciprocal trade. Secondly, domestic marketing was a most logical and automatic consequence of economic specialization, by which the countryside exchanged its produce for the manufactured goods of the town.

**Foreign Trade.** The grand scale of foreign commercial activities was, perhaps, the most distinctive feature of the economic life of medieval Ukrainian society from the time of the Kievan

Empire. It demonstrated, on the one hand, the considerable commercial skills and abilities of the Ukrainian Slavs which were due to geographic factors, and, on the other hand, it indicated their relatively well developed material culture. Foreign trade naturally evolved as an extension of domestic trade since domestic commercial routes, whether by land or water, were simply extended into foreign territories.

For the same reason Kiev became the center of foreign trade, as it was the heart of domestic trade because of its location at the commercial crossroads of the nation. Naturally, this pattern of international trade was subject to continuous fluctuations and to major and minor changes. Some sectors developed earlier. For example, the Oriental Arabic-Iranian trade was succeeded upon its decline by the Byzantine trade. Finally, the Byzantine trade was superseded by the growth of trade with the West. Thus from the eighth to the tenth century, the eastern part of Ukrainian international commerce was highly important. Ukrainian merchant caravans went as far as Baghdad, Derbent, Iran, Syria, and perhaps, Turkestan, while Arab merchants came to Kiev, Volin, and Novgorod, and beyond that, to Central Europe, as far as Krakov in Poland and Prag in Bohemia.<sup>6</sup> Ukraine not only exported to, and imported from the Orient, but also gained enormously from the transit trade by serving as a middleman between the Orient and Western Europe on the one hand and the Orient and the European Northeast on the other.

After Prince Sviatoslav the Conqueror put an end to the flourishing Eastern trade by destroying two major commercial centers of the European East, Ityl and Great Bulgar, the ancient Byzantinian trade became increasingly important. But territorial advances made by the nomadic Cumans in the Steppes of the Black and Azov Seas finally undercut the Ukrainian-Greek commercial ties. The liquidation of all worthwhile Greek trade began with the First and was completed with the Fourth Crusade (1096-1099 and 1204), which opened new avenues for the East-West trade via the Mediterranean, by-passing Ukraine and excluding the Ukrainian middleman.

The importance of the transit trade to the medieval Ukrainian economy cannot be overemphasized, since Ukrainian territories linked East and West, and North and South by land and water. Naturally the Ukrainians were anxious to retain their economic advantages. In the 12th century, with the growth of Western civilization and the decline of Byzantium, Ukraine became more and more interested in trade connections with the West. The Galician-

Volhinian Ukraine was already vitally and progressively engaged in trade with Poland, Hungary, Bohemia, and Germany. There is no doubt that these commercial relations represented also the most important avenues for cultural influences. Having been exposed to a cross-pollination of ideas, Ukraine developed a culture and civilization which embodied, to a great extent, those of other peoples.<sup>7</sup>

Naturally, as long as the Kievan Empire and the Galician-Volhinian state were at the peak of their political power, the growth of commerce continued. With the collapse of the Kievan realm, commercialism declined, and for a long time little trade took place in eastern Ukraine.

Although Ukraine, and Kiev and its vicinity in particular, were the heart of the Dniepr trading system, curiously enough, archaeological findings of foreign coins were much fewer in Ukraine than in the Russian north, where trading was considerably less advanced. Hrushevsky gave three reasons for this historical paradox. First of all, the credit system was well developed in Ukraine. It was especially useful for financing large-scale commercial transactions, which included both Ukrainian exports and foreign imports. To a great extent imports were paid for by exports to Greece and the Middle East. The extensive use of credit, of course, involved very little transfer of cash. This fact, together with the considerable lapse of time, accounts for the relatively few foreign coins found by modern investigators.

In the Russian north, however, the conditions were reversed. The Russian tribes were impoverished, their economy poor and under-developed. Imports were negligible and exports were paid for in cash, a fact which explains the large quantities of foreign coins—Greek, Arabic, Roman, and German—in the Russian north.<sup>8</sup>

The Ukrainians fully appreciated the value and importance of foreign trade, calling foreign merchants "guests" and according them great respect. "Ruska Pravda" gave to the "guest" special legal protection, particularly in bankruptcy cases where local merchants defaulted. The foreigner had a legal claim against the property of the bankrupt person second only to that of the prince. The position of a foreign merchant was quite different in the latter Muscovite principality where legal restrictions and suspicions enveloped the foreigner. This difference is still further evidence of the erroneous assumptions of Russian historians in associating Kiev and Moscow spiritually.<sup>9</sup> Also, commercial credit was cheaper and easier to obtain, and more leniency was granted in the

execution of the claims. For negotiating a regular loan, three witnesses were required, while for a commercial loan one witness sufficed. An oral contract was permissible. A bankrupt individual was usually sold into slavery to cover the claims of the lender, while a bankrupt merchant, if the bankruptcy occurred evidently without his personal fault, had a legal right to an extension of time to allow him to adjust the difficulties.<sup>10</sup>

To cover the problem of Ukrainian ancient and medieval trade satisfactorily, it is essential to discuss it in its individual territorial segments. These were the southern or Byzantinian trade, the West European trade, and the Northern trade. It would seem most logical to begin with the traditional Greek-Ukrainian commercial relations.

**The Byzantine and Oriental Trade.** The "Route from the Varengians to the Greeks" was an extremely important commercial avenue, running along the river Dniepr. Via this route the Kievan economy obtained a great many things from abroad, both for domestic consumption and for reshipment to other countries. The Kievan merchants wanted this trade to be as large as possible and they must have been rather aggressive in their attempt to maintain commercial relations with the Greeks, since historical sources furnish enough proof of Greek antagonism toward the northern barbarians. By orders of the Emperors, the Ukrainian merchants were required to live in only one sector of the city of Constantinople, to move about the city only in small groups, without any arms, and then only under the supervision of Greek officials, to pay a special tax and to leave the country by autumn. Since these merchants always arrived in spring, this rule meant that they could remain in the city no longer than six months.<sup>11</sup> Presumably, there were some adventurers and scoundrels among the Kurainian merchants who, by harassing the local population, largely justified these harsh regulations.

The later agreement between the Greek emperors and the Kievan dukes required that each group of incoming Ukrainian merchants bring with them a letter from a prince listing the names of all members of the group and their authorization to trade in Constantinople, in order to protect the Greek population from abuses by undesirable elements. But on the other hand, the Greeks were jealous and did not want to share their business with foreigners. For this reason the Greek authorities denied the right of permanent residence to Ukrainians. Probably, the Rus were not even admitted to the other Greek cities, except perhaps Alexandria. There are no historical

references indicating their presence in any other part of the Byzantine Empire.<sup>12</sup> Of course such restrictions infuriated the Kievan dukes, the more so because the Greek trade was a traditional source of wealth for Ukrainians in general, since the boyars and the royalty vitally participated in these commercial activities.

Greek discriminatory practices caused a number of wars between Kiev and Constantinople. The first Kievan campaign against the Greeks, in 860, led by the Varengians Askold and Dir, was rather an expedition for booty. But Oleh's campaign in 907 was concluded by a commercial treaty clearly indicating an economic motivation. Among other things, the treaty provided for the liberalization of trade relations. The Ukrainian merchants in Constantinople no longer had to pay the tax designed for them. They received more freedom when moving within the city limits. They were supposed to get gratuitous board and meals for six months when in Greece, as well as tools and naval appliances, such as linen and cordage, and also food for their journey home.

The Greeks, on the other hand, received, according to the agreement, the assurance that the Ukrainian merchants would not damage their property, would not carry arms within the city, would live only in their own section of the city, and would leave the country after a six-month period of transacting business. In addition, no merchant would be permitted to come from Ukraine without being authorized by the Kievan prince. The treaty was solemnly sworn to by both parties involved. However, the agreement may not have been detailed enough, or perhaps some new conflicts developed soon after. In 911, a new treaty was negotiated and executed. It seems to be only a more elaborate amendment to the treaty of 907. It confirmed again the willingness of both parties, the Ukrainians and the Greeks, to keep peace and friendly relations. It also regulated the punishment of criminals and the personal liabilities of the Ukrainian visitors and the Greek natives.

By the year 940, the relations between Kiev and Constantinople worsened, and their commercial problems became so acute that Prince Ihor planned a new war against Byzantium. He probably waged two wars, one ending in shameful defeat in 941, and the other resulting in a new treaty in 944. The new agreement was supposed to restore peace and unhampered trade, and to secure undisputed Greek fishing along the northern shores of the Black Sea. Furthermore, the parties involved promised not to destroy each other's vessels. The Ukrainian merchants also promised not to import any fine cloth from Greece. However, things were not

settled permanently even this time. Prince Sviatoslav the Conqueror, the son and successor of Ihor and Olha, again became involved in an economically motivated war with Byzantium. In fact, it had an even broader commercial background. Sviatoslav desired not so much to continue commercial relations with the Greeks as to conquer major commercial centers which, until that time, were under Greek domination, and to incorporate them into his empire. Thus, the later wars of Volodimir the Great in 984 and of Yaroslav the Wise in 1043 were due predominantly although not exclusively to commercial motives.<sup>13</sup> As the Ukrainian empire grew, its leaders sought all the more to extend the Byzantine trade. The Greeks became all the more suspicious and fearful. This atmosphere contributed to quarrels and antagonism and almost continuous warfare—an indication of the importance of this trade to the Ukrainian national economy.

In its early history, Ukraine exported to Greece furs, wax, honey, and slaves, but in the 12th century the exports changed. First of all, technological progress and the growth of agriculture progressively introduced various kinds of grain into the trade, replacing to some extent the exports from the forest economy. Secondly, with the introduction of Christianity, the slave trade rapidly declined and finally disappeared.

A far greater variety of items was imported from Greece, including silk and silk products, fine cloth, textiles, fabrics, carpets and rugs, gold and silver articles, brocades, glassware, ceramics, religious articles, icons, articles of art, wine, fruits, and spices. The archaeological excavations of that time definitely indicate that the Kievan-Galician era was clearly under the cultural dominance of Byzantium, especially after the year 988. Following the collapse of the Kievan Empire in 1240, the Ukrainian-Byzantine commercial exchange continued, but to a much lesser degree. The list of items imported from Greece was similar to that of the earlier periods. Among these some grain must be included. However, at that time trade with Western Europe occupied the leading place as the Greek trade continued to decline.

Commercial relations with the Crimean cities may rightly be considered both a branch of Ukraine's southern foreign trade, and an extension of the Greek commodity exchange via Crimea. Its most important article was salt.<sup>14</sup> The Ukrainian merchant caravans came again and again to the Crimean peninsula to buy this precious item which they transported to all parts of their country. Furthermore the merchants in Crimean cities served as important middlemen

for the Ukrainian-Byzantine commerce. It was especially important in those instances where the export from Greece of the articles in question was forbidden. At any rate, the Crimean trade was of secondary importance to south Ukraine, but its significance increased considerably with the domination of the Black and Azov Sea littorals and steppes by the Cumans, who cut off direct communication with Byzantium.

The Oriental or Eastern trade was no less ancient and no less important to the Ukrainian Slavs, although its leading role was soon terminated. As early as the tenth century, Sviatoslav the Conqueror destroyed the two centers of Oriental trade in East Europe, Great Bulgar and Ityl. For a while, Great Bulgar, which was the center of the European Northeast, did recover from the blow, but Ityl, the commercial center of the European Southeast, never regained its economic position and the Khazars disappeared entirely as a nation.

The radius of Kievan Oriental commerce reached as far as Bagdad, Teheran, and Turkestan. In the ninth and tenth centuries, the caravans of Ukrainian merchants were seen in these places, while Arabs and Khazars came to Kiev and Novgorod. At first, the Arabs traded directly with the Ukrainian Slavs, traveling by land and water along the Volga-Don and Dniepr river systems, and even farther west. Numerous written documents of that time were left behind by the Arab and Jewish travelers and merchants, such as Masudi, Ibn-Dasta, Ibn Jacob, Ibn-Khordadbeh, Ibn-Fadlan, and others, in the form of memoirs, travelogues, and narratives.<sup>15</sup> The Arab merchants purchased a great deal in Ukraine and in neighboring countries, and imported from those areas costly furs, such as beavers, sables, foxes, martens, and even rabbits, leather, fish, sheep, oxen, honey and wax, caps, arrows, nuts, fish teeth, fish-oil, and slaves. The Arabs brought into Ukraine such things as jewelry, precious stones, rugs and carpets, weapons and swords of Damascan steel, silk and silk materials, satin, metal goods, articles of art, fruit, and spices. Some Oriental goods were also imported through Byzantine middlemen.

In the ninth and tenth centuries, Ityl in the Khazar land and Great Bulgar in the Bulgar land progressively took over the role of monopolistic middlemen in the trade with the Arab world, Turkestan, and the Ural mountain areas, on the one hand, and between Rus and Western Europe on the other. Ityl and Great Bulgar became the chief commercial centers because of their key positions on the Volga river system which, through the river Kama, connected the

North and South, and the East and West as well. The Ukrainian merchants traveling to Ityl and Great Bulgar, either by the river routes of Dniepr-Seim-Don-Volga, or by land, supplied those two centers with all the articles of the Ukrainian eastern trade mentioned above, and bought Oriental merchandise, including cotton, from the Middle East and metal and costly furs from the Ural mountains. According to Masudi and Ibn-Fadlan, the Slavic merchants, including the Ukrainian, occupied half of the city of Ityl, engaging in business there. They had to pay a special tax to the city amounting to a tithe of their proceeds. Ibn-Fadlan related that those Ukrainian merchants operated in groups, which may indicate that their activities were operated by partnerships and mercantile associations, similar to those existing in Ukraine.<sup>16</sup>

To secure the benefits of that lucrative eastern trade, the Kievan dukes, not underestimating their Black Sea commercial interests, several times attempted to dominate the shores of the Caspian Sea and the commercial routes to the East. For example, in 909 and 910, and again in 913, Oleh undertook a campaign, going by water routes of the Don and the Volga to plunder the wealthy cities and commercial centers on the littorals of the Caspian Sea, as far down as the Baku region. This operation was initially successful but finally turned into a horrible defeat. His successor in Kiev, Prince Ihor, again organized a large-scale campaign in the years 944 and 945, in order to establish Ukrainian interests in the Caucasian and Caspian regions, as far as Derbent and Berda. Although he did not succeed in dominating those areas, his armies returned victorious with great quantities of booty, according to the chronicles.

The commercial routes actually directed the Kievan rulers in their political and strategic moves. Sviatoslav continued with the tradition, and planned to dominate the avenues and centers of the Oriental trade directly. He completely ruined Ityl, plundered the littorals of the Caspian Sea, and conquered the cities of Sarkel and Semender, opening the way for direct trade with the East, Asia Minor, and Central Asia. Politically, however, this conquest proved to be a very poor achievement, for the destruction of the Khazars liquidated an important buffer state which had effectively protected Rus from the continuous attacks of Asiatic tribes. Consequently, in the middle of the thirteenth century, the Mongol hordes struck with full force against the Kievan state, and the latter, now exposed directly to the attacks of Genghis Khan, collapsed.

Trading with the steppe nomads, the Cumans in the Black and Azov Sea areas, must be considered a segment of the Ukrainian-



Oriental commercial relations, since these nomads were primarily middlemen for the exchange of Eastern goods, and, secondly, middlemen for the Ukrainian-Greek trade as well. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus related how the Slavs purchased oxen, horses, and sheep from the Cumans.<sup>17</sup> The city of Oleshi was one of the centers of the Cuman transit trade. It was situated at the mouth of the river Dniepr. The steppe nomads, as a matter of fact, eventually put an end to any extensive trade between the Ukrainians and the Black and Azov Sea areas. Vernadsky emphasized the interest that the Kievan dukes had in the city of Tmutorokan, located on the Kerch Strait between the Black and Azov Seas. No doubt, this city was an important center for the Oriental trade as late as the 11th century. But the Cumans soon blocked Ukrainian trade with the Caspian areas as well, and the economic significance of Tmutorokan declined.<sup>18</sup>

**The Northern and Western trade** developed with the Russian tribes and the Scandinavians. In its first phase, Ukraine served simply as a middleman for the transportation of Greek products to those northern regions, and to a much lesser degree, for the exportation of northern products to Greece. The ancient "route from the Verengians to the Greeks" owed its commercial importance to its transit character. Kiev captured the key position in this commerce in earliest times, attracting the attention of the Scandinavians, who invaded and conquered the city and its vicinity, and laid the foundation for the future empire of Rus.

Ibn-Khordadbeh indicated this transit nature of the Ukrainian northern trade.<sup>19</sup> Later on, however, beginning probably with the 11th century, the Ukrainian exportation to Scandinavia, Novgorod, the Russian principalities, and Lithuania was initiated and began to play an increasingly important role in this already essentially Ukrainian foreign trade.<sup>20</sup> From the Russian north, the Ukrainians imported but little: some furs, especially costly furs, lumber, and wooden articles.

The Ukrainian trade with Central and Western European countries at first also bore extreme characteristics of transit commerce, supplying Europe with such Oriental and Byzantine articles as silk and silk fabrics, satin, brocades, rugs, and carpets. Ukrainian merchants traveled to Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, and even farther, to Germany. German custom laws from 904 mention the Slavic visitors trading in German towns. Polish, Czech, Hungarian, and German merchants visited Ukraine. Gallus Anonymus, the first

Polish chronicler, said that Poland was known only to those western travelers who visited Rus.<sup>21</sup> Certainly, those Westerners were primarily missionaries and merchants, who had either religious or commercial interest in Ukraine.

From the West, Ukraine imported raw materials, such as tin, aluminum, iron, and copper, and some manufactured goods, such as fabrics from Flanders, swords from France, helmets from Italy, some arms even from Spain, finished articles such as woolen and linen materials, needles, glassware, wines, salt, and others. She exported to Europe furs, wax, honey, flax, hemp, hops, skins, hides, and other raw materials, in addition to the resale of Oriental and Byzantinian products. Later, with the growth of agriculture, more and more grain was exported to the West, to Scandinavia and to German cities in particular. The Galician merchants owned vessels on the Baltic Sea in order to trade more effectively and more profitably with the West. Of course, the transit through Polish territory had to be taken into account, since the Cumans, and later, the Tartars closed tightly all access to the Black Sea.

There existed some commercial agreements between the Galician and the Prussian cities, as far as economic interests were concerned. In the later Galician period, cloth, textiles, metals, and manufactured goods composed most of the Ukrainian imports from the West. Commercial relations with the German towns were intensified after more Ukrainian cities had been granted the Magdeburg legal system. At the time of the Polish-Lithuanian occupation of Ukraine, the Western trade attained a predominant place, while other segments of foreign commerce either shrank to almost nothing or disappeared altogether.

**Finance**, comprising currency and credit systems and methods of private and public financing, is an essential element of any developed economy. A well developed monetary and credit system, mature credit institutions, and a properly managed public economy are indications of an advanced state of economic evolution. Such indications were present in Kievan-Galician society. Some aspects of medieval Ukrainian finance have not been explained satisfactorily by historians. For example, the monetary system of Kiev is not fully understood. The language of medieval legal documents, such as *Ruska Pravda*, is often inexact, contributing to the confusion. It is not clear what the "hrivnia"—the Kievan monetary unit—means: a "Silver hrivnia" or a "Hrivnia of martens." On the

other hand, the relation and ratio of various monetary units were neither stable nor consistent. Their values changed frequently, according to economic needs and the pattern of foreign trade. These circumstances substantially confuse the study of financial problems, and leave some detailed questions unanswered and open to discussion.<sup>22</sup>

There is no doubt that since ancient times furs were used by the Ukrainian Slavs as a medium of exchange, a form of commodity money. The names "kuna" (marten skin), and "nogata" (sable skin), and "veksha" (squirrel skin), were the ancient nomenclature of money in Ukraine.

During the hunting and fishing phase, wealth was measured in skins and furs. These items became generally accepted as a medium of exchange, replacing simple barter, and facilitating the exchange of goods. Rubrik reported the presence and circulation of fur money in Ukraine as late as 1253 as a supplementary medium of exchange employed in domestic trade.<sup>23</sup>

As a result of commercial relations with many foreign peoples, numerous foreign coins—Roman, Greek, Arabic, Iranian, and German—were found in ancient Ukraine, circulating along with furs as a medium of exchange. Foreign coins also became a means of storing value, as accumulations of ancient money indicate. Gold and silver coins were thus introduced to the Ukrainians in this manner. The outstanding grand dukes of Kiev, Volodimir the Great, Sviatopolk the Sinner, Yaroslav the Wise, and, perhaps a few others, coined their own Ukrainian money in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Later, coinage was discontinued and foreign money was used in foreign and domestic trade. These were predominantly Polish, German, and Hungarian coins.

The largest monetary unit of the Kievan currency system was the "Silver hrivnia," the value of which fluctuated widely from time to time, depending upon the changing patterns of foreign trade. Traditionally, the hrivnia was associated with the Orient, since the term originally meant a heavy necklace or neck ring worn by the Iranian and Allan chieftains in the remote past. At first, the hrivnia was a unit of weight, approximately half a pound. Later it was associated with the value of about one-half pound (troy) of silver, similar to a Byzantine monetary unit, while in the North, it was more, being adjusted to the German monetary system. With the decline of the Ukrainian-Byzantine trade and the increasing importance of that of the West, the value and silver content of the hrivnia was raised to correspond with the new financial needs.

In the Kievan period, the silver standard prevailed, and the code of Ruska Pravda and other documentary sources employed terms of silver, although a gold hrivnia was known, a unit weighing approximately six troy ounces. The valuation ratio between gold and silver was approximately one to twelve. Since the value of the silver hrivnia had a tendency to rise above one-half troy-pound of silver, the initial price of twelve silver hrivnia for one golden hrivnia must have dropped to ten or even less. Eventually, silver became relatively more expensive and the silver content of the hrivnia gradually dropped to one-third, and finally to one-fourth troy-pound of silver.<sup>24</sup> The hrivnia took the form of silver or gold bars, rather than that of coins.

There were also smaller monetary units, primarily silver coins with princely seals and heraldic figures, the names of which vividly reminded one of fur commodity money. One silver hrivnia, primarily reserved for large-scale and foreign trade operations, was equal to four "Hrivnia of kuna" (of martens), which were generally used in domestic trade and daily business, and frequently translated into terms of marten skins. One hrivnia of kuna was equal to 25 "kuna" (martens), although it was not always so, for the ratio rather fluctuated from 20 to 30 martens per hrivnia, according to commercial needs. One "rizan" (cut-off) was one-half of a kuna (marten). This meant that one hrivnia of martens was equal to 50 rizens.

On the other hand, there was also another set of currency units derived from the silver hrivnia. One silver hrivnia equaled 20 "nohat" (sables), and one sable equaled about 30 "veksha" (squirrels). The veksha was the smallest coin in the Kievan monetary system; approximately 600 of them equaled a silver hrivnia. A small church candle sold for a veksha, according to an ancient narrative.<sup>25</sup> There is no doubt that in domestic trade of a local character fur money was still in circulation as a secondary and supplementary medium of exchange until the end of the 13th century.

Probably there was a relative shortage of money in the Kievan Empire in relation to the enormous need for financing foreign trade. An even greater shortage existed in the Galician-Volhinian state where, because there was no domestic coinage, reliance was placed exclusively upon foreign coins and furs. Consequently, credit developed on a wide scale. Although historians exaggerated its costs, it certainly was not cheap. The interest rate depended upon the maturity factor. For very short-term credit (less than six months), the legal rate of interest exceeded 50 percent. This was

also the rate for a year. In long-term credit, the legitimate interest rate was considerably lower, approximately 10 per cent per annum, or ten martens on each silver hrivnia borrowed, according to Vernadsky's interpretation.

Thus, when the code of Ruska Pravda refers to one hrivnia in this connection, it is not clear which hrivnia is meant, the silver hrivnia or the hrivnia of kuna. In long-term and large-scale credit transactions, frequently international in scope, it would seem that the silver hrivnia would be the basic unit of account, similar in its value and content to the Byzantine and German monetary unit. The 40 per cent rate for long-term credit, as accepted by Hrushevsky, Kluchevskii, and others, is a confusion resulting from the misinterpretation of the term "hrivnia." Moreover, a 5.5 to 8 per cent rate, depending upon the terms of the credit, was a legitimate rate of interest in Greece at that time, a fact indirectly influencing the Ukrainian legal rate.<sup>26</sup> Hence long-term Ukrainian credit could not be entirely out of line in comparison with Greek terms, since long-term credit was used primarily in international transactions.

Actually, it was in short-term consumer credit where there were so many and such drastic abuses that they eventually led to the rebellion of 1113. This was clearly a revolt of the common people against exploitation by money-lenders who charged usurious interest rates, exploiting employees by turning them first into debtors and finally into slaves. These developments finally forced Prince Volodimir Monomakh to regulate the most pressing social problems, including the interest rates, in order to protect the common people. Interest rates exceeding 40 to 50 per cent were declared illegal, and penalties were imposed on usury, reducing although by no means eliminating the practice. The Church vehemently opposed usury, regarding it as a mortal sin. But the growing need for capital caused many to disregard both Church and State in this matter, and the cumulative results inflicted great hardship on the poor.

Short-term consumer credit was the core of the problem. It was formally negotiated in the presence of three witnesses, and rigorously executed. Defaulting or bankrupt debtors were sold into slavery. Commercial credit was legally privileged. No witnesses were required, and in the case of bankruptcy without contributory guilt of the debtor (drunkardness, crime, or hazardous speculation), the borrower always received an extension of time to repay. In addition, his long-term interest rate was considerably lower.

Capital accumulation at this time was considerable, in particular among the princes who owned large landed estates and par-

anticipated in commercial activities, and among the grand boyars and merchants. Money accumulated by the upper classes ran into thousands of gold and silver hrivnia, more than enough to finance the large-scale business operations of the time. Princes, boyars, and merchants were so wealthy that they could afford not only private palaces, but also beautiful churches for the use of the people.<sup>27</sup> Partnerships and corporate associations were organized to finance ventures too vast for any one person. But the merchants were still too undercapitalized (even when organized) to corner any market; therefore competition universally prevailed. An exception to this condition existed when the salt merchants organized a cartel in an attempt to corner the salt market for Prince Sviatopolk II of Kiev.

As far as public finance was concerned, there was no distinction between state property and the private properties and finances of the ruler. According to medieval political theory, however, individual principalities were the patrimonium (property) of the ruling ducal families, and not a popular commonwealth. This distinction may explain why it was considered unnecessary to separate public revenues and expenditures on the one hand from the private financial affairs of the prince on the other. The whole principality was held to be the private property of the prince or duke. Nor was there any elaborate financial administration, any systematic control of income and outlay, receipts, and disbursements, or any accounting system whatsoever. The prince merely paid his bills, both public and private, from what revenues he could collect regardless of source, a system similar to that employed in the West at that time.

Public revenue was collected from many sources: from princely properties in the narrow sense of the term, from the booty of successful wars, in the form of tributes from subjugated and vassal tribes, by the levy of direct and indirect taxes on the people, and from the collection of such non-tax monies as court fees, penalties, fines, and other charges. The ducal properties included, first of all, large landed estates which in many cases were well administered. On these grain was produced, and cattle, horses, and sheep were raised. It may be interesting to note that the ruling dukes could own land in other principalities under the supremacy of other dukes. This seems to indicate a slight difference between the concepts of strictly public affairs and the private property of the princes. However, the principle was largely ignored.<sup>28</sup>

The prince also held certain rights, such as mining, fishing, hunting, and bee hiving, which constituted the exclusive right to exploit these resources.<sup>29</sup> In addition, the dukes regularly participated in profitable commercial ventures, and sometimes attempted to establish and exploit monopolies.

The most ancient form of tax revenue of the Kievan dukes was the collection of tribute from Slavic and non-Slavic tribes which remained in vassalage. These tributes were paid in kind, honey, wax, fur, and grain, or in gold and silver. The chronicles record such payments. Ihor, Olha, and Sviatoslav undertook military expeditions for the purpose of imposing and collecting tribute. Dobrinia, a knight and nobleman, sought tribute-paying tribes in the name of his suzerain.<sup>30</sup> Once the tributes were imposed, they were delivered by the vassal tribes rather than collected by the officials of Kiev. If a tribe were stubborn and unwilling to pay, the dukes themselves undertook punitive expeditions against them.<sup>31</sup>

The tributes, an important princely source of revenue in the early Kievan era, declined in significance, and, in the Galician-Volhinian state, disappeared altogether. Instead, Galicia and Volhinia were obliged to pay a tribute to the Mongol suzerain and the German Emperor.

In the earliest period, booty and plunder also constituted a considerable source of revenue for the state and the duke. Thus, Askold and Dir, Oleh, Ihor, Sviatoslav, and other early princes organized numerous military expeditions for the purpose of plundering. This practice declined under such outstanding Kievan sovereigns as Volodimir the Great and Yaroslav the Wise.

Among the so-called direct taxes collected regularly, the most important were the capitation (poludia) and the service obligations owed to the sovereign duke. Initially collected either from the individual homesteads or individual tilling units (acreage), the capitation was imposed upon the entire free rural population. Cities, towns, and the upper classes were exempt. Collection was organized on a regional basis. Thus the very, a territorial administrative unit, was collectively responsible for gathering the tax as well as for the performance of the service obligations, and the payment of other financial burdens owed to the prince.

In the 13th century, the capitation was made a strictly personal tax on both property and income, levied against the entire rural population. The first Kievan dukes traveled personally from October to April of each year in order to collect the capitation. Meanwhile a tax collection system was developed with officials called

“virniks.” Cities and towns, exempt from the capitation, were obliged to pay a special tax called the “town contribution” (pohorodia). The capitation and the town contribution were paid either in produce, such as fur, skins, honey, wax, fruit, meat, or grain, or in currency.

Another type of tax was the service obligation borne by the working classes, who were obliged to labor on bridges, roads, castles, forts, city walls, and other public projects. Often the dukes abused the custom, forcing people to work on jobs not authorized by tradition. At the end of the Kievan period, peasants were compelled to work a few days in the princely fields. People attempted to evade these burdens in numerous ways. In his “Descriptions of Kiev” Zakrevsky wrote that Prince Yaroslav could not get workers to build St. George’s Church because the builders and helpers believed they would not be paid for their labor. The prince was compelled to make it quite clear that their work would not simply be considered a service obligation.

In general, it seems that there was not much certainty as far as tax rates and methods of collection were concerned. Among the service obligations, the duty to feed, house, and transport the prince and his retinue on their journeys must be included. Later this obligation developed into a separate form of burdensome tax.

Business taxes and excise taxes were very numerous in the Kievan era. Among these were taxes on storehouses, market places, taverns, shipments across rivers, sales transactions in salt, honey, and other articles, portages, and many other mercantile and marketing operations. Also prevalent were tolls and duties at the approaches to towns and cities, or for the use of ferries and bridges.

Another very large source of public revenue was such fees and charges as death money collected by the duke as a penalty for murder or killing, other court fees raised for various occasions and frequently abusive in their rates, and special fees for weighing and measuring goods sold in the market places. Especially the court fees were high, at times so excessively high that they contributed to the pauperization of the people.

The public expenditures included, first of all, the maintenance of the ducal court, and the retinue and other forms of the armed forces, particularly in national emergencies. Considerable amounts were spent on the judicial system, while policing was inadequately provided by the younger members of the princely retinue as a secondary function, or organized on a local, municipal, or communal



basis. A portion of the fees and charges collected was used to pay the officials. Maintenance of the administrative establishments, central and provincial, including those of various clerks the officials, constituted another important item in the national budget.<sup>32</sup>

Finally, public welfare, charities, education, and assistance to and Church can be included. The administration of the public and ducal finances was in the hands of a marshal and remained under the supervision of the chancellor. Matters concerning the internal revenues were taken care of by officials, called "virniks," and tolls and tariffs were administered by the "mitniks." Otherwise, no rational accounting of receipts and expenditures was kept. In case of need, money was borrowed from private capitalists just as it is done today.

**PART III**

**THE LITHUANIAN-POLISH PERIOD (1349-1648)**

/ http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.\$b90103  
tp://www.hathitrust.org/access\_use#pd-google

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

**Political developments - Ethnical changes - Social classes - Nobility - Peasantry - Townspeople - For- eigners - The feudal order - Cossacks.**

**Political Developments.** In the first half of the 11th century the whole of Europe was terrified by the menace of a Mongol (Tartar) invasion. For a while it even seemed that the European nations would be destroyed by the overwhelming masses of the Asiatic hordes of the invincible Genghis Khan, which had already succeeded in dominating about three-fourths of Asia. In fact, however, the conquest of the East European area meant the end of Mongol expansion in Europe. The invasion of the majority of the Ukrainian territories in 1240 practically liquidated the Kievan Empire. For a little more than a hundred years, the Galician-Volhinian Duchy continued the traditions of Ukrainian statehood, although formally in vassalage to the Tartar suzerain. The Galician duke, Daniel, traveled to the Mongol capital camp to accept officially Mongol protection, to promise an annual tribute, and to receive from the Khan's hands the authorization (yarlick) to rule in his ancient principalities. Soon, however, Tartar protection came to be a mere formality with respect to the Galician-Volhinian realm, while in the wide areas of the Eastern Ukraine, Mongol rule was for a century an unquestionable reality.<sup>1</sup>

The disintegration of the Kievan state, which actually began prior to the Invasion as a result of the continuous dynastic warfare among the members of the Rurik House, was fully accomplished by the Tartars. It brought also in its wake a sharp decline in the material and spiritual civilization of the Ukrainian people. The ancient cultural, political, social, and economic institutions and acquisitions were to a large extent destroyed, and in many respects the Ukrainians had to start their national evolution all over again, literally from the very beginning. From 1240, the year of the Invasion, until the middle of the fourteenth century, Ukraine experienced a "dark age" of Mongol domination, a political and cultural regression.

The first impact of the Mongol Invasion, led by Khan Batu, was an enormous devastation and destruction of the Ukrainian areas, especially of the large Ukrainian cities, like Kiev, Pereyaslav, Chernihiv, and Volodimir, and a decimation of the population. As was pointed out before, in the introductory chapters, the people of Ukraine were forced, by the severity of the Tartar invasion and subsequent frequent raids, to give up the southern and eastern steppe regions and to retreat to the safer forest belts of northern Ukraine. Thus, the ethnographical Ukrainian territory was greatly reduced. Not until the end of the 14th century were the Ukrainian people again to resume their settlement and colonization of the steppe regions. In the 15th century, under the protection of the new political giant of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian Commonwealth, the colonization of the vast steppes, once under the control of Rus, was first successfully resumed by the Ukrainian ethnic element.

Although the Invasion resulted in a considerable devastation of all Ukraine, and a depopulation of the eastern and southern steppe borderlands, actually the devastation was not as bad as it was pictured, especially by the later Polish and Russian historians.<sup>2</sup> Mainly large cities and only some parts of the country-side suffered heavily, but none of these cities, like Kiev, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, or Turiv, was ruined to the extent of total destruction. A few years after the Invasion, a papal envoy, John de Plano Carpini, traveled throughout Ukraine, and although he found enormous ruin, he met, in the city of Kiev, the Ukrainian high administrative authorities and representatives of the Ukrainian boyar aristocracy. He reported even an arrival of foreign merchants in Kiev. Accordingly, despite the horrors of the Invasion, the city was not annihilated, and the ordinary life of the capital was proceeding along its usual course. And it was no different in other towns. Nor did John de Plano Carpini notice any mass emigration of the Ukrainian people to the distant north-eastern Russian lands as had been maintained by the Pogodin-Sobolevskii theory.<sup>3</sup>

A sporadic emigration, especially of some fragments of the upper brackets of Kievan society, some boyars and church leaders, certainly did take place at that time; but this was also true prior to the Invasion. A reverse trend in the population movement on a small scale, from the North to the South, was likewise constant phenomenon. To maintain, however, that there was any mass migration from Ukraine to the Oka-Klazma basin, a resulting complete depopulation of Ukraine, and a vacuum in Kiev, Chernihiv,

Volhynia, and Podolia, appears to be a grossly fallacious historical assumption. The Mongol rule following the Invasion was not too oppressive in Ukraine, and perhaps less oppressive in Ukraine than in the Russian North. <sup>4</sup>

As a matter of fact, under the Mongol protection there was a spontaneous revival of the old democratic institutions, initiated by the lower classes all over Ukraine. Peasants and townspeople revolted against the rule of the Rurik dynastic princes and the duke-retinue system of the Kievan times, and established everywhere self-governing communities and municipalities, reminding one very much of the socio-political conditions of the era prior to 860, before the Varengians arrived in Ukraine. The Mongols wholeheartedly supported the ochlocratic or democratic movement to weaken the dynastic princes and the boyar class.

Prince Daniel of Galicia campaigned most energetically against those "self-governing communities" of the people under Tartar protection, between 1250 and 1255, considering them as guilty of high treason against the traditional political constitution of Ukraine. No doubt, the other dukes did the same, only on a smaller scale and not so openly as Daniel, who at that time was actually the mightiest man in the Ukrainian branch of the Rurik House. <sup>5</sup> The chronicles related the peasants' flight from regions under the control of the Ukrainian princes and boyars, and the peasants' voluntary submission to the direct authority of the Mongol officials. Doubtlessly, the upper classes, the princely and and boyar elements, suffered under the Tartar domination, and that is why some of them migrated to the Oka and Klazma basin. But the peasant masses did not find the Mongol rule intolerably oppressive, and there was no reason for them to leave the rich Ukrainian areas, and to go to the Russian north which was relatively poor. This trend toward a revival of the old local-territorial self-government shortly after the Invasion basically altered the political constitution of the vassal Ukraine. Although in the majority of cases the Ukrainian dukes went to the Mongol camp to receive from the Khan a confirmation of their political authority (yarlick), their power progressively declined. Their principalities disintegrated into tiny lands, either under petty princes, where the people's meetings gained more and more influence, as in the Chernihiv and Siver regions, or, where the princely order was completely abolished, under territorial government by the people, as in the Kievan and Pereyaslav provinces. Even in those tiny lands where a shadow of the princely political authority was

preserved, their constitution did not have anything in common with the old system of the Kievan federation under one Rurik dynasty. There was no political factor present which worked toward a unification of all Ukrainian territories. The political disintegration was complete, considerably damaging any economic and cultural growth. Only the traditions of the old days preserved some feeling of national unity among the Ukrainians.<sup>6</sup>

Economic and cultural regression continued in Ukraine until the middle of the 14th century, when a new power emerged, namely, the Lithuanian state, which began to incorporate progressively the majority of the Ukrainian territories. In the first half of the 14th century, Chubaty said that most northern regions of the forest Ukraine which did not have any political traditions as separate dynastic principalities, were incorporated by the Lithuanian Grand Dukes. Finally, in the second half of that century, Kiev, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, and the rest of Volhinia became dominated by Lithuania. Volhinia was acquired by the Grand Dukes by way of inheritance, Chernihiv, by conquest, and the other territories by voluntary agreements of allegiance to Lithuania.<sup>7</sup>

However, the Ukrainians and Byeloruthenians incorporated by the politically stronger and constantly growing Grand Duchy of Lithuania, were much more civilized than the "pagan conquerors". Hence, under the influence of the religious, spiritual, cultural, legal, and social institutions of the Ukrainian and Byeloruthenian nationalities, the original constitution of Lithuania also changed, and was transformed into a Lithuanian-Ukrainian (Rus) federation, under which the Ukrainian principalities and territories enjoyed autonomy.

The territorial princes, who at that time were members of the Lithuanian dynasty of Gedimin and rarely of Rurik descent, were somehow the middlemen between the Grand Dukes on the one hand, and the petty local princes and the local communities on the other. They were within the framework of the feudal ladder of the socio-political constitution of the new Commonwealth, which developed under Western influences.

The political organization of the Ukrainian territories within the federation was quite different from that in Lithuania proper, since in Ukraine the authority of the Grand Duke was a formality. But in the Lithuanian-Ukrainian state there was definitely a very vital and prevailing feeling of social and political ties with the old Kievan Empire, accepted by way of inherited traditions. The

House of Gedimin soon became spiritually Ukrainian by assimilating the Ukrainian language, the Orthodox religion, the Ukrainian-Byzantine culture, and the Ukrainian legal concepts. In the 16th century, the Ukrainians still applied the expression: "Our Christian Rus Commonwealth, the Lithuanian Grand Duchy," which defined the common Lithuanian-Ukrainian character of that political organism. <sup>8</sup>

Although in the course of the next hundred years, until the end of the 15th century, the institution of autonomous territorial principalities vanished and was replaced by a number of small vassal lands, the federative character of the Commonwealth prevailed, with the idea of a unity of national interests vitally continuing through one Gedimin dynasty, one Orthodox religion, the ancient cultural traditions of Kiev, and the common cause of struggle against the Mongols. And in the political framework of a powerful Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, the Ukrainian people revived socially and economically. The colonization and settlement of the southern and eastern steppes were resumed, and the Ukrainian ethnographical territory expanded. This expansion was also due to the gradual disintegration of the Mongol power. But in 1385 the harmonious evolution of the Commonwealth was disturbed by a Polish-Lithuanian agreement in Krevo, which initiated a new political trend toward the formation of the so-called Polish-Lithuanian Union in which the Ukrainian element, and later on also the Lithuanian, were suppressed as a result of the growth of Polish national-imperial ambitions.

Polish imperialism in the East, however, began much earlier. Already in 1340, the Polish King, Casimir the Great, attempted to dominate the Galician-Volhynian Duchy after the sudden death of the last Galician sovereign, George II, Boleslav. Casimir was not successful at that particular time, because of the Polish-Hungarian-Lithuanian rivalry for the succession in Galicia, and because of the opposition of the Galician aristocracy to Polish supremacy. Volhynia, the northern part of the Duchy, was immediately taken over by a Lithuanian Prince, Lubart, according to a previous agreement of succession by inheritance, while in Galicia the Ukrainian boyars, under the leadership of Demetrius Dietko, maintained the political independence of the country until 1349, having formally recognized Lubart's authority.

In 1349, Galicia became Polish, after King Casimir successfully liquidated the aristocratic order in that country, by means of



another war. Nevertheless, the political status of Galicia was not clarified until the years 1387 to 1389, because of the lasting Hungarian and Lithuanian pretensions to that most western province of Ukraine. A number of wars resulted among the countries involved—Poland, Hungary and Lithuania. Even in 1359, Casimir of Poland expressly recognized the Hungarian rights over Galicia, which existed there sometimes factually, and at other times only formally. In 1387 and 1389, however, after a short war, Queen Hedvig and King Yagiella of Poland finally conquered Galicia, abolished all Hungarian sovereignty there and incorporated the land into Poland where it remained for more than four centuries. A complete introduction of Polish political, legal, and administrative institutions into Galicia followed in 1435, by the so-called Privilege of Jedlno.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, the course of events was entirely different in Galicia and the Kholm and Pidliasha districts, two western borderlands of Ukraine, from those in the eastern provinces of the country. East Ukraine suffered more under the Mongol rule but enjoyed more freedom in the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, while the Ukarinian people in Galicia, Kholm, and Pidliasha immediately experienced Polish discrimination and oppression. Eventually, however, all Ukraine, except her tiny Transcarpathian region, was dominated by Poland, under the Polish-Lithuanian agreement of 1568.

The situation developed as follows: the Grand Duke of Lithuania, Yagiella, married the Polish Queen Hedvig, and in exchange for his receiving the Polish Crown, he promised by the agreement of Krevo, in 1385, to accomplish a real union between Poland and Lithuania, and to introduce Catholicism into his Grand Duchy. The Ukrainian-Lithuanian parliament, which was not asked by Yagiella for its consent to the promises which he gave, in 1401 nullified the agreement of Krevo. Accordingly the Lithuanian-Rus state continued to exist as a sovereign political body, connected with Poland by only a political and military alliance.

Nevertheless, the proposed idea of a union made its slow but sure progress among the upper classes of Lithuanian-Ukrainian society, which were more interested in their group privileges than in the national independence of their country. The privileged position of the gentry in Poland was especially attractive to the Lithuanian-Rus boyars, who expected to acquire all those rights and privileges by the unification of the Polish and Lithuanian legal and social institutions. There were also some other factors working toward the growing popularity of a union, like the growth

of Catholicism, the penetration of Western civilization into Lithuanian-Rus directly from Poland, the common cause of defending both countries against German and Muscovite aggressions, and a high-pressure Polish propaganda. Besides, for more than one and a half centuries since Krevo, various Polish institutions found their way into the social and political life of the Commonwealth, and finally, under the impact of these factors, the concept of a real union became fully ripe for realization. In 1501, in Mielnik, the union tendencies received strong expression, and in 1569, in Lublin, a real union was formally concluded between Poland and Lithuania with a common ruler, common Parliament, and a single monetary system.

One year prior to the Lublin Union, Lithuania directly ceded almost all of her Ukrainian territories to the Polish Crown. In this way all Ukraine, except her tiny northern and southern borderlands, became a part of Poland after 1389. The Polish legal and administrative system was introduced throughout the country. All traces of autonomy were liquidated, and the country was turned into a colony for about one hundred years, until 1648, when a National Revolutionary War created anew a sovereign Ukrainian state.

The fact that the political status of Ukraine was never stabilized for any length of time in the course of those three hundred years adversely affected the social and economic growth of the land and the people. First, the calamities of Mongol domination resulted in a shocking regression. But soon the vitality of the Ukrainian people produced a revival.<sup>10</sup> In many respects, the Ukrainians had to start from the very beginning. Polish religious and political discrimination and economic exploitation, and the Mongol raids, which continued to ruin the eastern and southern areas of Ukraine throughout the 16th and 17th centuries, failed to break the spirit of the Ukrainian people. Oddly enough, on the eve of the National Revolutionary War, the country was economically rather well-to-do, and was prepared to carry the burden of the prolonged military struggle.<sup>11</sup>

**Ethnic Changes.** The ethnical changes in the composition of the population of Ukraine had a profound influence on the socio-economic development of the Ukrainian people. The influx of foreign ethnic elements (mainly Polish and German), and the denationalization of the upper social classes of Ukraine, considerably strengthened the position of the foreign (Polish) rule. Thus the Polish occupational government was able to turn Ukraine into a colony so much more easily, and to exploit her so much more in-

tensively. Polish interests progressively penetrated the Ukrainian economy from 1349. At first, the Galicia, Kholm, and Pidlisha districts were turned into a colony of the Polish state. Then, following the Union of Krevo, Polish ethnic elements and Polish influences spread slowly but gradually and continuously over the entire Ukraine.

The turning point of this development was the absorption of almost all Ukrainian territories by Poland in 1568, and the immediately succeeding Polish-Lithuanian Union of Lublin. At that time Polish interests dominated the entire Ukrainian economy, being solidly based on the Polish and foreign colonists and the Polonized, once Ukrainian, aristocracy and gentry, and the Polish semi-feudal socio-political constitution.

In the course of three centuries, there were four major factors which facilitated the denationalization of the Ukrainian upper class and the growth of the foreign ethnic element throughout all of Ukraine: the legal discrimination against Orthodox Ukrainians by the Polish-Lithuanian legislation, their social and factual discrimination, the denationalization trend among the Ukrainian aristocracy and gentry to avoid discrimination and to enjoy all the privileges of first-rank citizenship, and the continuous settlement and colonization of the Ukrainian eastward-moving frontiers. As a final result of these developments, only the peasantry remained Ukrainian, devoid of any political and social rights within the caste and feudal system of the Polish Crown. The peasants, free since the time of the Kievan-Galician Empire, were turned under the Polish rule into a mass of unfree serfs, deprived of any ability to protect Ukrainian economic interests.

After the collapse of the Kievan state, a slight influx of the Mongol (Tartar) ethnic element was introduced. This process continued at the time of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian Commonwealth. The Tartars were settled in Ukraine either as prisoners or as voluntary settlers. Tartar settlements were found all over Ukraine (Kiev, Volhinia, and Chernihiv) but they were rather small and scattered, and therefore the Tartar element was soon assimilated. The main stock of the Mongol colonists was peasants, but some Tartars were also found among the gentry.<sup>12</sup> This process did not affect the socio-economic evolution of the Ukrainian people to any extent.<sup>13</sup>

With the growth of the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, the Lithuanian ethnic element appeared in Ukraine, mostly among the upper classes. It was also rapidly assimilated. In the Common-

wealth, national and religious tolerance and liberalism prevailed; there was not much discrimination among the "Lithuanians" and "Ruthenians," or among the Catholics, Orthodox, and pagans. Different religious affiliation was frequent at that time among the territorial dukes and the noble members of the Council of the Grand Duchy. Discriminatory differentiation was first introduced under Polish influence after the Union of Krevo. After 1386, the term "Lithuanian" meant the legally and socially privileged Catholics, while the term "Ruthenian" meant the underprivileged Orthodox Ukrainians.<sup>14</sup>

The legal and political oppression of the Ukrainians, as the primary factor responsible for the ethnical changes in Ukraine, was first introduced in Galicia immediately after its domination by the Poles. All the social classes of Ukrainian society experienced oppression, discrimination, and national-religious persecution. The Ukrainian nobility and gentry were denied the full rights and privileges of their class, such as all-comprehensive real and personal property rights, a lower tax burden, and admission to the high offices of the country. This discrimination, initiated by King Casimir, was continued along the same lines by King Yagiella in his initial legislation, and by his brother, Prince Vitovt.<sup>15</sup>

The privileges of the noble class were reserved for the Catholics, and the very goal of that measure was a speedy Polonization of the Ukrainian Orthodox gentry. Theoretically, the Ukrainians were granted equal rights with the Catholics by the royal decrees of 1432 and 1434, but the Orthodox were still not allowed to hold high offices. The Privileges of 1563 and 1568 granted, legally speaking, complete equality of rights to the Ukrainian-Orthodox gentry, in order to gain the Ukrainian upper class for the cause of the Polish-Lithuanian Union and for the annexation of East Ukraine by the Polish Crown. Later on, however, the decrees from the time of King Zigismundus III, and King John III (Sobieski) resumed the policy of discrimination by withholding from the Ukrainian-Orthodox gentry the right to be high officers of the royal administration and members of the Upper House (Senate).

Also a theoretical equalization in other respects was never fully borne out in practice. National and religious discrimination of the Ukrainian element was in fact even intensified in the political and social sphere after 1569, and it was then more dramatic and under more direct Polish supremacy than it had been under the Polish influenced Lithuanian rule prior to the Union and incorporation. Only the Catholic Poles were full-fledged citizens of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The discrimination was more national

than religious, and largely practiced by the courts, administrative offices, and society as a whole.

Legal equality remained a dead letter of the law until the very end of the Polish state at the time of its partition. The fact of a national rather than a religious Polish discrimination in Ukraine became self-evident after some parts of Eastern Ukraine temporarily, and the whole of Galicia permanently (in 1708), accepted Catholicism. The Catholic Ukrainians were still discriminated against and oppressed, and for a long time were not admitted to the high government offices and positions.<sup>16</sup> Along with the gentry, the Orthodox higher clergy were also not admitted to the upper house (Senate) of the country. And the Orthodox priests, denied social prestige and government protection, were exposed to insults and persecutions.

The position of the Ukrainian townspeople under Polish rule was even worse than that of the nobility. At the time of King Casimir, ghettos were established in all Galician towns and cities for the Ukrainian population, which was allowed to live only in those sections. Furthermore, Ukrainians were excluded from holding municipal offices in the larger towns. The people were thus exposed to the excesses and abuses of the local Polish-German town administration. At first, practically, and later at the time of King Zigmundus III, legally, Ukrainians were not admitted to the merchant and trade guilds. They were also denied the freedom and privileges of the local government, based on the Magdeburg law.<sup>17</sup> Any royal or parliamentary decrees of tolerance which attempted to protect the Ukrainian town population, were simply ignored by the municipal governments, and discrimination continued undisturbed in the towns.<sup>18</sup> Polish oppression of the Ukrainian-Orthodox townspeople was very drastic, and it was no wonder, therefore, that in the event of any Ukrainian national revolt, the towns joined it immediately. The Ukrainian peasantry was also subjected to oppression and discrimination. The Ukrainian peasants, like the Ukrainian town population, were also denied the privilege of settling in the villages, newly established on Magdeburg legal principles, with more freedom available to the peasant colonists.<sup>19</sup>

The legal and social discrimination against Orthodox Ukrainians resulted in an assimilation and Polonization process, especially among the Ukrainian upper class. One by one the nobles and the gentry gave up their Orthodox religion and Ukrainian nationality, and became Catholic and Polish in order to enjoy the rights and privileges of full citizenship in the Polish-Lithuanian

Commonwealth. Thus already at the end of the sixteenth century, the majority of the Ukrainian gentry were Polonized. Historical documents of the times indicate a gradual but continuous replacement of Ukrainian names by Polish names on the lists of local office holders.<sup>20</sup> The newly Polonized upper class became a stronghold of Polish semi-feudal rule and economic exploitation of Ukraine. Later on, also the Ukrainian clergy was largely Polonized under Polish pressure, deserting its people, and using as a language of the church one that the people could not understand.

The denationalization trend among the lower classes of the Ukrainian society was not so profound, but even there the Polish ethnic element was extensively strengthened by means of large-scale colonization throughout the entire Ukraine and her eastern and southern borderlands. The new settlements, villages, and townlets favored the Polish, German, and other foreign colonists, and discriminated against the Ukrainians, to whom the liberties of the Magdeburg law were denied, as pointed out above. The Magdeburg colonization system was used by the Polish regime for strengthening the Polish and foreign elements in Ukraine. Then, these foreigners, especially the Germans, were quickly Polonized, and soon built up in all the larger cities in Ukraine a national majority, ready to assume the local authority in order to control and to suppress the disloyal Ukrainian Orthodox population, which was reduced to a status of third- or fourth-rank citizenry.

**Social Classes.** Under the powerful impact of the political developments of the 13th, 14th, and 15th centuries, such as the collapse of the Kievan Empire, foreign regimes, influx of foreign ethnic elements, and foreign cultural influences, the essentially Ukrainian social constitution of an open class system was lost. The foreign patterns aimed at a definite, rigid, and hermetically sealed class structure. The changes were rather insignificant during the relatively short Mongol rule, and as long as the liberal conditions of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian constitution prevailed. The authorities of the Grand Duchy followed rather the principle of keeping traditions vital, and introducing innovations slowly.<sup>21</sup>

A rigid class structure began to evolve in Ukraine first under Polish influence, from the time of the Krevo Union, and under direct Polish rule, from the time of the Lublin Union. The trend originated in Galicia in the 14th century, and extended to the more distant Ukrainian lands much later. It reached Siver and the left-bank Ukraine in the 16th century. The need of a military force, prevailing cavalry, for the growth of the national states

in Western Europe, gave rise to a class of knights which soon turned into a class of country gentry with distinct rights and obligations. Having remained under the influence of West European developments in this respect, Poland experienced the same needs and the same evolutionary trends which were then directly projected to the Ukrainian areas after their domination by the Polish Crown.<sup>22</sup>

The four classes which crystallized under Polish influence were the gentry, the clergy, the townspeople, and the peasantry. They were rigidly separated from each other, and transition from one to another was almost impossible. No doubt, the progressive denationalization process of the upper Ukrainian class contributed considerably to the deepening of the insurmountable social cleavages among the individual classes. The gentry, the privileged upper stratum enjoying the fullness of private and constitutional rights, was prevailingly Polish. Other classes, the townspeople and the peasants, were either partially or prevailingly Ukrainian, and antagonistic to the Polonized country gentry, who were marked by a feeling of superiority. Both lower strata were underprivileged. The legal and political position of the town was subject to ever increasing restrictions and limitations in the Polish state, finally concluding in the political decay of the town at the end of the 16th century. From the peasants, all rights were taken away, private as well as constitutional. The entire class was relegated to the status of serfs in bondage, and placed under the patrimonial authority of their owners, the country gentry. The state had no direct relation to the peasants, who were the private property of the nobles. The legal and social position of the peasants was vastly different from the status of the fully free peasantry of the time of the Kievan Empire, a peasantry which enjoyed many rights and privileges granted by the civil and constitutional laws of that nation.

Naturally, in the course of these three centuries, other essentially Ukrainian social developments also took place. First of all, very early the individualistic armed adventurer and colonist appeared in the Ukrainian borderlands and steppes, a refugee who, despising the foreign rule and the social inequalities and discriminations, left the more densely populated areas which were under intensive Polish controls, and settled the southern and eastern steppes. A free Cossack, he could no longer be reached by the arm of the Polish regime and of the Polish social order. In this way, the growth of a new social phenomenon of a strongly military

characteristic began. Among the Cossacks initially, all class distinctions were completely ignored and the principle of democratic equality was persistently championed. Also, the continuous threat of Mongol raids and surprise attacks on Ukrainian villages and townlets, and the need of permanent vigilance and defense contributed greatly to the growth of the institution of the Ukrainian Cossacks.<sup>23</sup>

Moreover, another essentially Ukrainian social trend emerged at that time, to continue the traditions of equality. The so-called Brotherhoods were initiated as religious and professional associations of Ukrainian townspeople. Soon they evolved into charitable and cultural organizations, owning hospitals, orphanages, and printing shops, and running schools and other educational establishments. Being at first only guild-like associations of townspeople, they subsequently developed into all-Ukrainian institutions with a strong national-separatist view.

These Brotherhoods, along with the Cossack host, formed the basis of the Ukrainian national resistance and liberation movement. In the brotherhoods also, class distinctions were largely ignored, and in their schools all students, regardless of their class origin, were treated equally.<sup>24</sup> These essentially Ukrainian social phenomena, however, did not affect the course of the economic life of the country to as great an extent as did the foreign developments (denationalization policies and rigid class distinctions). Obviously, the frictions among the nationalities and among the classes, discrimination against the Ukrainian population, exploitation of the peasants, and suppression of the townspeople affected the economic growth of Ukraine adversely and negatively.

**Nobility.** A separate, legally distinct, and socially limited class of nobility, or gentry, was partly crystallized in Ukraine at the beginning of the 17th century. In the course of the 15th and 16th centuries, within the framework of the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, while the crystallization process was in progress under Polish influences, this class was neither homogeneous nor uniform. Among the noble class, several groups of different characteristics could be identified: the princes and lords, the common gentry, the boyars under protection, and the underprivileged gentry, like the service men, the *Minores gentes Galiciae*, and the *Skartabelat*.

The princes and lords, corresponding to the grand boyars of the Kievan time, were either the descendants of the Rurik and Gedimin Houses, or the members of the Lithuanian Council of Lords to the



Grand Duke. These noblemen possessed the most comprehensive property rights. They were directly under the jurisdiction of the Grand Duke and were exempt from the competence of the local, judicial, and administrative authorities. The princes and lords fulfilled their military duty by furnishing and equipping their own troops, which were led by them under their family flags and emblems. This privileged position of the grand noblemen, which included princely titles and jurisdictional favoritism, was, however, gradually reduced. Polish legal concepts represented the ideal of absolute equality of all the gentry. Thus, the jurisdictional exemptions were nullified in 1564, and also princely and other aristocratic titles were partially prohibited.<sup>25</sup>

The principle of egalitarianism among the gentry, conscientiously carried out according to Polish legal and social concepts, also advanced the liquidation of the underprivileged groups of the noble class. The boyars under protection and the service men, as a stratum of the underprivileged nobility, with limited property rights and under the patrimonial, judicial, administrative, and military authority of the lords and princes, soon disappeared, being either elevated to the status of the common gentry, or reduced to the status of the peasants.

The same thing happened to the so-called *Minores gentes Galiciae*, a temporary phenomenon in Galicia. Those "gentes" were noblemen, with terminated property rights and tax-paying, vassalage, and rigid military obligations, a class which largely disappeared at the end of the 15th century.<sup>26</sup>

The *Skartabelat* were newly ennobled for some extraordinary deeds, but never acquired the fullness of noble privileges throughout their lifetime. But their children and grandchildren were recognized as fully privileged members of their class.<sup>27</sup> The later division of the gentry into the groups of the estateless (*holota*) and the poor (*khodachkovi*), was rather a factual division to differentiate among the wealthy and the non-wealthy, and a rather small segment of the class was subject later to some legal restrictions.

The stock of the common gentry in Ukraine developed from the old Ukrainian grand boyars, boyars, vassal dukes, immigrant nobles and other elements, which in one way or another succeeded in improving their social status. Actually, military service and the family heraldic emblem (coats of arms) were the indications of a noble descent and origin. But that principle was not very consistently carried out. Thus, in the 16th century measures were undertaken for establishing reliable criteria for determining the aris-

tocratic faculties. This was done first by a military census, by means of taking oaths, hearing the witnesses, and checking the original documents of ennoblement. The actual purpose of the census, however, was the obligation of military service.

In 1557, an Agricultural Reform, the "Voloka System," was introduced in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and it specified the land holdings of the gentry. Subsequently, the acts of the reform were used to prove one's aristocratic origin and his rightful membership in the gentry class. The upper social stratum of the gentry, crystallized and legally defined in that way, constituted the fully privileged, first class citizens. They enjoyed full personal freedom, along with the principles of *habeas corpus* and *neminem captivabimus nihil nisi iure*, and full personal and real property rights. Only the nobles could own landed estates.<sup>28</sup>

The common gentry was subject to the state judicial and administrative authorities, but never to any private patrimonial jurisdictions. The nobles enjoyed a higher degree of legal protection and were subject to a lesser degree of civil and criminal liability. Civil and criminal liability were always personal and individual and never collective, except in the case of high treason, while the peasants were still collectively responsible for crimes and damage. From the political aspect, every nobleman was a member of parliament, and had a voice in electing the king.

Among the duties of the gentry were military service and the construction of castles and fortresses. The latter duty was legally abolished in 1447. The tax burden of the noble class was negligible. The noble status was acquired either by a legitimate birth in a legal marriage, or by ennoblement. Children born out of wedlock were never noble. The noble status could be forfeited in consequence of high treason, infamy, ban, or of involvement in any mercantile activities. The last instance distinctly indicated the considerable social prejudices in Poland.

The Polish Catholic clergy constituted another privileged class in the Polish-Lithuanian society. It was a legally protected group of first class citizens, who possessed all political and civil rights, and also enjoyed some special favors through their status, like the ecclesiastic judiciary. During the Reformation, however, the Catholic clergy lost its distinctly separate court system, while retaining all other benefits of full and privileged citizenship.

The Orthodox clergy, on the other hand, were always underprivileged. The estate developed from the ancient privileged institution of the "Church people" of the Kievan period, but was dis-

discriminated against in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, where another religion had a dominant position. The Orthodox metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops were not admitted to the country's senate. The legal position of the class was never definite with respect to the rights and privileges of the black and white Orthodox priests, monks, and nuns. Even the property rights of the Orthodox Church and clergy were not always respected and protected. But the fact that the clergy, both Catholic and Orthodox, constituted a class within the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian society of that time—a class which was not as homogeneous as the gentry—definitely affected the socio-economic development of Ukraine.

Thus, from the economic point of view, the gentry and clergy maintained a key position, insofar as these two classes owned all the landed properties and raw material resources of the nation. The dukes and the state also owned considerable productive factors. In that capacity the gentry and the clergy were the two most important and authoritative elements in the national income production of the agricultural economy of the Commonwealth in general, and of Ukraine, in particular. In their hands were the production of food and agricultural raw materials, and domestic and foreign agricultural marketing. The agricultural and commercial interests of the gentry and clergy, and their manorial system, set the pace of the economic growth of Ukraine, and largely sponsored the colonization and development of the virgin areas of the Ukrainian steppe.

**Peasantry.** In the Kievan Empire, the peasants were a free class, of secondary importance. Things changed a great deal in this respect in the course of the next three centuries. At the end of the 17th century, the peasants in Ukraine were no longer considered a social class; they were regarded as the property of the gentry, without any personal freedom or any personal or real property rights. They had become soil-bound serfs.<sup>29</sup> This sweeping change was accomplished under the impact of Western and Polish social and legal patterns. This regression from freedom to bondage was gradual and not uniform in all Ukrainian territories.

At the time of the Mongol Invasion, the peasants were still a free social stratum. Even the trend toward reducing some segments of the peasantry to slavery, which was apparent in the late days of the Kievan state because of the growing powers of the boyardom and royalty, was considerably weakened. The Mongol suzerain favored the peasant in order to break the authority of the

Ukrainian upper classes and to strengthen his own position in the newly acquired East European areas.

During the entire Lithuanian-Rus era, a new peasant class was in the process of crystalizing, destined to become a stratum of the new society. It was highly differentiated and extremely heterogeneous until the time of the Lublin Union. Slaves, semi-free, free peasants, soil-bound peasants, manorial servants, peasants of the Ruthenian and Polish law, and the peasants of the Wallachian and German settlements constituted a variety of different peasant groups with diversified rights and obligations. At the end of the 16th century all these differentiations largely disappeared, and the uniform class of peasant-serfs took their place.

The old Ukrainian institution of slavery withered away very early, sooner in Galicia than in the eastern Ukrainian provinces, since there the Western and Polish influences penetrated earlier, and from there gradually permeated the social constitution of Ukrainian society as a whole.<sup>30</sup> Among the two strata of slaves, the manorial servants and the agricultural or farm slaves, the former were better treated. Soon, especially under the influence of Catholicism, the law began to protect the slaves, giving them legal protection against willful abuses by their masters and reducing the number of sources of slavery. In the 15th century, mixed marriage and indebtedness no longer originated a permanent slavery, and only birth, crime, and imprisonment made a man unfree. The Lithuanian Statute of Laws, the code by which the Commonwealth tried its civil and criminal cases, in its third codification, did not use the term "slave" any more, and replaced it by the term "manorial servant," and gave him also some limited property rights.<sup>31</sup>

The Agricultural Reform of 1557 (Voloka system) liquidated the institution of slavery altogether, and made all slaves common peasants, the latter turning subsequently into soil-bound serfs. As a matter of fact, soil-bound peasants existed already in the 14th century. This group probably developed from the half-free and slaves. Being subject to the patrimonial authority of the lord, they had no direct relation to the state, paid no taxes, and did no military service, nor did they bear any other public obligations. They could be transferred by their masters from one place to another, always, however, being bound to do soil service.

During the agricultural reform, the soil-bound peasants received a smaller land allotment—about ten acres—to work, while the free peasants received up to thirty acres but were otherwise equal to the common peasantry. The Lithuanian Statute of Laws, in the

early codification, was also familiar with the small social stratum of the half-free, whose legal position was one of temporary limitation of freedom on a basis of a voluntary contract between the free and the master-to-be. This was a cultural lag from the old institution of the "zakupi," in the era of the Kievan Empire. Usually a free peasant sold himself into a half-free relationship, expressly reserving his right to get back his freedom after certain contractual conditions had been fulfilled. The Lithuanian Statute imposed various obligations upon the master, as the code of Ruska Pravda did, to take care of the half-free.<sup>32</sup> In the 16th century the institution dissolved itself in a general serfdom of the peasantry.

The common peasantry, once a class of free farm people with full personal and property rights, had been progressively restricted in its social and legal standing. By 1457 a partial soil bondage was introduced into the Polish kingdom and its Ukrainian possessions. The peasants were prohibited from leaving the soil, the village, and their noble masters, without providing a substitute. The third codification of the Lithuanian Statute of Laws introduced a complete bondage. This development was directly caused by economic motives.

Poland began at that time to participate extensively in foreign trade by means of heavy grain exports. The business was quite a profitable one, and the gentry were extremely interested in taking full advantage of it. Cheap labor provided by soil-bound serfs was very effective in reducing costs. Thus, the all-potent gentry pressed heavily to establish bondage. Initially, of course, the peasant still had full and hereditary ownership rights on his real estate and personal holdings. He could sell and buy, or acquire by "occupation" "no man's land," the wooded and steppe areas not under cultivation. The first codification of the above mentioned Lithuanian Statute substantially limited the peasant alienation rights, but did not otherwise abolish the scope of his property. At that time, if a new master purchased a village, he acquired the peasant taxes and service obligations, but not a property title in the peasant land holdings.

The Agricultural Reform of 1557, however, liquidated peasant property rights in real estate, leaving them but a semi-tenant right of use. The privilege of land-property was exclusively reserved for the gentry and clergy. Subsequently the peasants' service obligations were also increased and multiplied. In the 16th century, according to the Act of Torun (Thorn) in 1519 and the Act of Byd-

goshch (Bromberg) in 1520, the peasants had to work for the lords one day of the week. In the 17th century, things turned from bad to worse, after the gentry received unlimited authority over the serfs, and began to fix service obligations and material contributions arbitrarily. The service days were increased to 200 and 300 yearly, and by the 18th century, the serfs had to labor for the lord six days of the week. Only nights and holidays were left to them to work on their own small farms. The peasant could be sold with or without the land, his family could be separated, and the entire peasantry was subordinated exclusively to the patrimonial authority of the nobleman. Practically speaking, he did not own anything any more.<sup>33</sup> State and government were no longer interested in the peasants, who had now become fixed capital, property of the noble proprietors.

In the 15th century, the peasants still had a certain autonomy in the management of their own communal affairs. The oldest form of village autonomy was the Ruthenian system, in which the administration and judiciary were in the hands of the village "tivun" or "otaman" and the village eldest. This system followed the remote tradition of the old Kievan vev and village administration. The villages of the Polish law were also similarly governed. The novelty in the Lithuanian-Polish era was the plurality of the villages of the Magdeburg (German) law, and the so-called Wallachian villages where the most autonomy was granted to the peasant communities, while the patrimonial authority of the nobles was largely excluded. A Ukrainian, however, could not be the founder of a Magdeburg village. The Wallachian system, most popular in Galicia, extended over large areas, including several village communities under one land leader (Krainik). But at the end of the 16th century, all these forms of village autonomy largely disappeared, and the noble lord assumed all the powers, including patrimonial judiciary and supreme administration. The gentry acquired these powers either by purchase or by usurpation, and from that time on they appointed all village officials. Political and public rights were no longer granted to the peasantry.

Serfdom and bondage of the entire peasantry were the most negative developments in the socio-economic constitution of Ukraine. They were of foreign origin and completely alien to the Ukrainian mind, so that they distorted any harmonious social growth. Furthermore, as the main labor and production force, the peasants were turned into property, without any enthusiasm, ambition, or initiative. There were no incentives to labor under such a social

constitution. Therefore agricultural productivity was greatly hampered, and the result was primitivism and a low standard of living for the village population.<sup>34</sup>

**Townspeople.** The socio-economic position of the Ukrainian town and the town population also took a violent turn for the worse during the third period, the Lithuanian-Polish era, because of the predominance of the gentry, and the discrimination of the other social classes. First of all, the destructive impact of the Mongol Invasion affected the Ukrainian towns most adversely. Some of the towns were thoroughly plundered and ruined by the Tartars. The rather slow economic recovery made the social position of the townspeople vulnerable and unfit to face unfavorable new developments. The town in the Kievan era, as Chubaty said, was the commercial and cultural center of a region. The town population was not crystalized and separate, isolated from the countryside and the peasantry.<sup>35</sup> This favored the economic growth of the Kievan-Galician town, which, of course, was not a town in the Western sense. The late Galician period, and the Lithuanian and Polish rules introduced the Magdeburg legal system of municipal organization. The towns were in this way made completely separate self-governing units, isolated from the countryside, and socially differentiated from the peasantry, since the townspeople were essentially free and the peasants almost unfree. The original idea of the Magdeburg municipal autonomous administration was to increase the freedom of the town, and to facilitate its commercial growth. But the essentially Polish developments, sacrificing almost everything for the social elevation of the upper classes, fully distorted the initial idea of the Magdeburg system. As a matter of fact, the introduction of the Magdeburg municipal organization did not help the Ukrainian town in the long run, but rather accelerated its political and economic decline.

In some cases the ancient municipal self-government with people's meetings prevailed until the 17th century. Economically, the towns were relatively prosperous. In the 16th century, however, before the Magdeburg system was fully established, municipal self-government was overthrown by the nobles and municipal autonomy was almost liquidated, so great was its subjugation either to the aristocratic patrimonial jurisdiction or to the authority of the local agencies of the central government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Of course, the townspeople were always personally free and

enjoyed private property rights and freedom of economic initiative even while their political rights were greatly reduced. On the other hand, the city population, with the sole exception of Lviv, was denied the right to own landed properties.<sup>36</sup> At first, the bailiff and the municipal council under the Magdeburg privilege had extensive authority. Especially the bailiffs, the founders of the Magdeburg type of city, had a far-reaching competence in municipal affairs, and they functioned as middlemen between the townspeople and their noble masters. Subsequently, however, the noblemen, taking advantage of the loopholes in German law, abolished the office of bailiff either by buying them out or by suppressing them, and put themselves at the head of the city administration, reducing the municipal autonomy.<sup>37</sup>

The city council, built according to aristocratic principles from the upper bracket of the townspeople, maintained some authority. In the 16th century, even the city proletariat in some instances acquired some influence in municipal affairs. But at the end of the 17th century, municipal self-government was almost fully liquidated, and the towns were either delivered to the mercy of patrimonial lords, or included in the framework of the over-all administrative structure of the country. Ptasnik said that the cities had retained their autonomy as long as they had had certain economic power, but with the decline of the latter their autonomy also faded away.<sup>38</sup> It seems, however, that things developed differently. The liquidation of municipal autonomy and the introduction of an enormous tax burden on the townspeople produced a decline in the economic (commercial) significance of the Ukrainian town.

The internal social and economic life of the town was based on the guild organization. At first, craft guilds were introduced, and then merchant guilds gained some popularity. Both groups of professional organizations began to regulate city affairs and city life. The guilds were not only associations of an exclusive economic (commerce and trade) character, but they soon developed into units of administration, welfare, and military defense. Usually, certain parts of the city walls and specific city gates were assigned to individual guilds for defense in an emergency. Orphanages, hospitals, homes for the aged, funeral homes, and relief programs were the interests of the guilds.<sup>39</sup> It was mentioned that the guilds frequently discriminated against the orthodox population of the Ukrainian town. Hence the orthodox Ukrainians organized,



especially in West Ukraine, their own guilds with a similar scope of activities, to which were added the defense of their religion and nationality, and sponsorship of the development of Ukrainian culture.<sup>40</sup>

**Foreigners.** From the most ancient times, various ethnic groups inhabited Ukraine. Among others, Germans, Tartars, Greeks, Czechs, Hungarians, Serbs, Wallachians, Jews, and Armenians lived scattered throughout the entire Ukrainian country, in towns and villages. However, only the Germans, Armenians, and Jews enjoyed a special, privileged social and legal position in the Lithuanian-Polish era, while all other national minority groups were directly subordinated to the general legal and administrative system of the Commonwealth.

The social position of the Tartars (Mongols) was briefly discussed in another connection, since once they were almost the ruling class in Ukraine, subsequently changing the ethnical composition of the Ukrainian population. At the time of the Polish supremacy in Ukraine, the Tartars were discriminated against slightly; they could not hold public office, their property rights were restricted, and unlike other foreigners, they rendered military services. Eventually, the Mongol ethnic element completely denationalized and became Ukrainian.

The Germans settled in Ukraine under the German (Magdeburg) law, and their privileged position withered away along with the general decay of the town. The Wallachians brought to Galicia and Podolia their colonization system, which was liquidated by the general introduction of serfdom.

The Armenians lived in Ukraine, particularly in Galicia, from the time of the Kievan era, and always enjoyed extensive self-government. After the Polish conquest of Galicia, King Casimir the Great attempted to subordinate the Armenian group to Polish law and administration, but he failed. Thus, the later Polish rulers fully acknowledged the autonomous position of the Armenians, restricting them, however, and not according them citizenship with respect to rights of inheritance and real estate holdings, and withholding from them the political prerogatives to participate in the Commonwealth's national affairs. These limitations resulted in a denationalization trend among the Armenian people, who desired to be fully privileged citizens; they accepted Polish nationality, became Roman Catholic, voluntarily subjected themselves to the common municipal administration, and in numerous cases even attempted to acquire nobility.

Hence, in 1561, a decree, inspired by Armenian leaders, was issued by the Polish government for the purpose of preventing further denationalization and preserving the identity of the Armenian nationality.<sup>41</sup>

As an autonomous ethnic group, the Armenians governed themselves by separate laws, like the "Dagastanarik Mekhitara Gosha," the old Armenian legal code originating in Asia Minor about 1041, the "Armenian Statute," of 1519, issued by King Sigismundus of Poland, the court decisions of the Armenian judiciary, and the ancient traditions of that national group. The Atean, Council of the Eldest, existing already in the Kievan era, was the supreme authority with administrative, judicial, and religious competence.<sup>42</sup>

At this time, the Jews were the most important and most numerous ethnic group in Ukraine. They had lived there from time immemorial, in ghettos in the towns, and individually or in small groups in the villages. They were regarded by Polish law as "servi camerae," a group directly subordinated to the king. As such, they paid a separate tax, the capitation.<sup>43</sup> In 1495, King Alexander of Poland banned all Jews and confiscated all their belongings. But in 1505, the decree was repealed, and the Jewish people were fully restored to all their rights.

The Jews as a separate national group enjoyed the special protection of the law, in many instances equal to that given to the gentry and noblemen. They governed themselves by special royal decrees, called Jewish Privileges, eventually codified in 1669. The Kahal was the local, self-governing authority of the Jewish community, with extensive competence, including the representation of the national group, building and maintenance of schools, and matters pertaining to welfare, the lower judiciary, and religion. In the 17th century, Jewish parliaments were inaugurated, one for Poland and one for Lithuania. These later merged into one parliamentary body of that national minority for the entire territory of the Commonwealth, to act as an intermediary between the Jewish people and the Polish government.<sup>44</sup>

The Polish-Ukrainian townspeople, the Germans, Armenians, and Jews became pillars of trade and commerce in Ukraine. Crafts were performed largely by Ukrainians and Poles, while mercantile activities on the local, interprovincial, and international level were prevailingly concentrated in the hands of the Germans, Jews, and Armenians. The Jewish people especially acquired a very important financial and commercial position in the Lithuanian-Rus state because of their exceptional abilities in these fields.

The Ukrainians had a very rich mercantile tradition since the ancient era and the Kievan-Galician period, and considerable commercial abilities. During the Polish domination foreign ethnic elements added substantially to trade and commerce. Nevertheless, the unbearable political and social pressure of the gentry upon the town, townspeople, and national minorities did not permit trade and commerce to attain a significant position in the over-all production of the national income of the Commonwealth in general, and of Ukraine in particular.

**The Feudal Order.** The socio-political constitution of the Lithuanian-Rus state progressively absorbed some elements of Western feudalism under increasing contact with the West. Some Lithuanian dukes, like Vitovt, or aristocratic land grandees, like the Radivils, energetically attempted to introduce the feudalistic order in their domains. Consequently, along with the advancing Lithuanian rule, the old semi-feudal institutions of Ukraine, the remnants of Kievan supremacy, were made to resemble more closely the feudal patterns of the West. In Galicia, during the early period of the Polish regime, some feudal institutions were inaugurated to secure the defense of the borderland. There, precarious land grants of a temporary character were given to the "shlakhta," nobles of the Polish legal type, who accepted some kind of vassalage and the obligation of military and defense services. The institutions of the "boyar under protection" and of the "service men," of the later period, were a direct reminiscence of the old feudal-vassal relationship.

Thus, on the basis of those historical data, like Vitovt's attempts to introduce feudalism, the feudal system in some possessions of the Radivil family, the precarious land holdings in Galicia in the 14th and 15th centuries, and the boyars under protection in the 16th century, some historians like Lubavskii, Lyashchenko, and others again, primarily the Marxists, believed and argued the point that feudalism really prevailed in the Lithuanian-Rus state and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

On the other hand, Vladimirskii-Budanov, Chubaty, and a number of other Russian and Ukrainian historians of that particular era, rejected such a view absolutely. They granted that there existed in the Lithuanian-Rus era some similarities and tendencies to feudal characteristics, but they said that these trends soon disappeared. To be more specific, the trends toward feudalism and precarious land-holdings were soon superceded by the Polish socio-economic

constitution based upon the full individual property rights of the gentry class to its latifundia, which were cultivated through a system of widespread serfdom and bondage of the peasants.<sup>45</sup>

Lyashchenko, a Marxist historian, himself admitted that "Feudal dispersion in Lithuania had thus not progressed as far as in northern Rus."<sup>46</sup> The economic system of Ukraine under Polish domination turned out to be for the most part essentially Polish, resulting from the essentially Polish socio-political developments, where the gentry held all rights. In the 18th century, the Polish system eventually caused the collapse and partition of the kingdom. Chubaty rightly said that the legal terminology of that period in Ukraine, including "feudum," "allodium," and "vassale," did not prove the prevalence of the feudal order, but merely a confusion of nomenclature used by the officials trained along West European patterns. Essentially, the question as to whether Ukraine was feudal in the Lithuanian-Polish era of her history is a matter of defining the term "feudalism."<sup>47</sup>

**Cossacks.** The 15th century already witnessed in Ukraine the origin of a new social class, which from its very beginnings was called "the Cossacks." The origin and subsequent growth of this new social phenomenon, which was to take over the future political leadership of the Ukrainian people, were induced and facilitated by many historical factors of a social, national, political, cultural, and religious nature. The continuous pillaging raids of the Mongols, the availability of the wide steppes, the rich no man's land, the Polish sponsored national and religious oppression of the Ukrainian ethnic elements, and social and political discrimination were, no doubt, the principal causes of the growth of the Cossack Host.

After the incorporation of the majority of the Ukrainian territories by the Lithuanian Grand Duchy and the organization of the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, the Mongol supremacy over Ukraine was nominally ended. But the Mongols began to harass the Ukrainian people with ceaseless plundering raids. For three centuries the Tartars repeatedly invaded Ukraine to ruin and to pillage her towns and villages, and to take slaves wherever and whenever possible. This epoch of the "Tartar Dark Years" (Likholyttia), decimated and impoverished the population. An urgent need of self-defense against the surprise attacks of the Tartars gave rise to the organization of the Cossacks, a semi-military class which soon made war against the Tartars and Turks its sacred duty and historical

mission. It seemed that wherever Mongol met with Arian and clashed in a struggle for ethnic survival, a Cossack-like population immediately developed. As a matter of fact, the Cossack class in Ukraine, in its original form, withered away with the gradual elimination of the Mongol threat, at the beginning of the 19th century. Of its past glory, only the name remained.

The Mongols needed wide areas and steppes to be successful, dangerous, and victorious. Hence they developed their rule over the vast steppe territories of Asia and East Europe. Immediately, beginning with Ukraine and her Black Sea steppes, and through the wide Don-Volga steppe regions, and deep in the heart of the Central Asian steppes, various Cossack organizations were developing to resist the menace of the expanding Mongol rule. The Ukrainian Zaporozhe Cossacks, the Don-Cossacks, the Riazan Cossacks, and other semi-Cossack formations evolved on the eastern frontiers of the growing Russian Empire of the later centuries. The genesis of the Ukrainian Cossacks may be traced as far back as the later era of the Kievan Empire and the early period of Mongol supremacy, and may be associated with the military formations fighting against the Cumans and the "people under the Tartar protection."<sup>48</sup> The term "Cossack" is, without doubt, of Turkman origin, and its meaning changed with the course of time. It was used to designate light cavalry, as well as the troops used to watch over and to guard the borderlands and outposts. It also identified the free individuals, the freedom loving and adventurous people without a definite occupation. The name was used by the Cumans, Tartars, and Turks, and not infrequently was applied to vagabonds and bandits. From them the terminology was taken over by the Ukrainians and popularized in Western and Northern Europe.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, on the basis of that general, sociological, and historical background, the essentially Ukrainian Cossack Host developed as a result of the specific conditions existing in the European Southeast at that time. The growing burden of peasant serfdom, and the national and religious discrimination in Ukraine under the Polish-Lithuanian rule, on the one hand, and the vast availability of the wide steppes of the East and South of Ukraine where no authority and no discrimination prevailed, on the other, induced the dissatisfied Ukrainian elements to penetrate "no man's land" in the steppe regions in an attempt to escape the oppression of foreign domination. Freedom and natural riches, an abundance of fish and animals, attracted many who could not find decent conditions of existence in the civilized world.

At first, these "cossack" expeditions into the depths of the steppes had a temporary and seasonal character. The Cossacks led their adventurous life far from the settled areas, continuously fighting the Mongol raiders through most of the year, and coming back to their homes for the winter months. Later on, the Cossacks began to settle in the remote regions, as well as throughout the towns and villages of the densely populated South Ukraine, initiating the armed colonization of the Ukrainian steppes.

Life in the steppes was demanding and full of potential danger. Therefore, the Cossacks began to organize themselves into military units under the leadership of borderland officials and commanders or some occasional leaders (otamans). They undertook the defense of the borderlands against the surprise attacks of the Tartars. Soon they shifted from defense to offense and carried out numerous expeditions and raids deep into the territories of the Tartars and the Turks. Dashkevich, Zborovsky, Pidkova, Baida, and Ruzhynsky were the most famous among the early otamans of the Cossacks.

The strength of the Ukrainian Cossacks grew steadily, and soon they developed their organizational center in fortresses behind the cataracts of the lower river Dniepr. These cataracts were called "porophy" in Ukrainian. Since the name of that fortified center was "Zaporozhska Seetch," the fortress behind the cataracts, so the Ukrainian Cossacks were called the "Zaporozhe Cossacks."

The constitution of the Seetch was unique. It was a democratic military order where no women were allowed. The Cossacks were not required to stay at the Seetch all the time. Most of them spent a great deal of their time with their families in their homes in various parts of the steppe Ukraine, which was only nominally under Polish control. In an emergency, the Cossacks reported to the Seetch in order to participate in military raids and expeditions by land or sea. The Seetch behind the cataracts granted political asylum to all refugees from oppression and discrimination. It also served as a military school for the younger Ukrainians. Freedom-loving townspeople and noblemen migrated to the area. As a matter of fact, the first Cossack leaders were mostly aristocrats. Although the Poles, Russians, Serbs, Wallachians, and other ethnic elements frequently were represented among the Zaporozhe Cossacks, the Host was, no doubt, predominantly Ukrainian, and fully aware of its national mission to defend the Ukrainian people and the Orthodox Church.

The Cossacks regarded themselves as a separate social class, and strongly resisted any attempts by the Polish-Lithuanian

government to liquidate them as a class, to put them in bondage or to impose upon them any strict social and legal burdens or restrictions, despite the fact that they also lived scattered in towns and villages throughout the Polish controlled areas of Ukraine. They soon acquired the name of "civilian Cossacks" (Horodovi), in contradistinction to the Cossack Host beyond the cataracts. They were free of bondage, owned landed properties, manors and farms, did not recognize any supremacy of the gentry, and followed the rules of their class rather than those of the Polish regime.

Finally, the Polish government had to recognize officially and legally the phenomenon of the new social class of "civilian Cossacks," but it tried to limit its growth by means of the so-called "Register." Only officially registered Cossacks could enjoy the freedoms and privileges of their status. The rest were to be put back into bondage and serfdom, or returned to their previous social positions.

The first attempt to register the Cossacks was undertaken by King Stephen Batory in 1570. The number of Cossacks was limited from three to five hundred men. However, these official measures were not successful. The number of the Register was increased several times—up to six thousand in 1625, and sixty thousand in 1654.

The semi-military class of the Cossacks grew rapidly, while the registered Cossacks and the wealthier and more influential elements of the Host soon developed into an upper stratum and a specific form of the Cossack aristocracy. Culturally Ukrainian, the Cossacks assumed at the end of the 16th century a definitely anti-Polish attitude, and initiated a number of anti-Polish insurrections and revolts in an attempt to free Ukraine from Polish supremacy and eventually to establish a state of their own.<sup>50</sup>

## CHAPTER NINE

### EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES OF THE ECONOMY OF THE EUROPEAN FRONTIERS

**Economic growth - Hunting and fishing - Cattle raising - Agriculture - Mining**

**Economic Growth.** In the course of the four centuries from the collapse of the Kievan Empire to the National Revolution of 1648, the economy of the Ukraine experienced many striking transitions and transformations in its constitution. Although these were neither rapid nor unexpected, their impact upon all sectors of the country's economy was deep and fundamental, resulting in a 17th century Ukrainian economy which differed diametrically from that of the 14th century.

The decline of the Ukrainian economy had already begun in the second half of the 12th century as a consequence of the continuous dynastic wars among the members of the Rurik House. These cruel and ruthless wars decimated the population, ruined the cities and countryside, and strangled the economy. Furthermore, the continuous raids of the Cumans contributed extensively to a general decline of the eastern and southern borderlands of Ukraine. Eventually, the highly developed economy of the Kievan Empire began to decay, the population became impoverished, and only the enormous fertility of the soil prevented large-scale famines and starvation.<sup>1</sup> Then came the Mongol Invasion, which deepened the economic depression.

The 14th century witnessed a general economic retardation and regression in Ukraine. Eastern and southern borderlands were depopulated, and in many sections the economy reverted to hunting, fishing, and beekeeping. Fortunately, West Ukraine (Galicia, Volhinia, and Polesia) was in a more favorable economic situation since the Ukrainian state existed there much longer and the Mongol invasion did not strike it with full fury. From there the economic recovery of the entire country began. Already in the 15th century, the recolonization of the abandoned eastern and southern borderlands was resumed, this time under the protection of the Lithuanian-Rus state. The Mengli-Gerei invasion of Ukraine in 1482 interrupted this colonization but it did not halt it entirely.



In the beginning of the 16th century, the West Ukrainian economy was a well-developed agricultural one, with such other industries as hunting and fishing being supplementary in character. Export and import business existed with such Western markets as Danzig, Nuremberg, Dresden, and Regensburg. The main product of the revived economy was grain. Commercialized agriculture was just beginning, and advanced business techniques were extending over the northern parts of the right-bank Ukraine.<sup>2</sup>

In the southern part of the right-bank Ukraine and in her entire left-bank area at that time, backwardness and primitivism still prevailed. Hunting, fishing, trapping, beekeeping, and a limited cattle-raising were the leading industries. The main products of that primitive economy were meat, fish, honey, and fur. Very little agricultural activity was undertaken there. The economic life of the borderlands in some instances returned to the ancient Slavic communal forms, in order to provide some security in that era of continuous Mongol raids and to increase efficiency through a close cooperation. All of the settlements specialized collectively in certain activities: there were villages of hunters, fishers, trappers, hawk-hunters, beaver-trappers, beekeepers, ox-herders, and of other specific professions and trades. When some limited agriculture was resumed in those areas, it was also done in a communal way. Allotments of land were given to individual members of the community for cultivation, for a certain specific period of time. According to Liubavskii, primitive agricultural technique was used by the Cherkasians (Ukrainians) at that time.<sup>3</sup>

The progressing colonization and the recovery of the ancient Ukrainian territories made land plentiful, and at the same time, the intensity of the Tartar menace also lessened somewhat. The result was an immediate disintegration of communal forms of economy, whereupon the instinctive Ukrainian individualism took over fully. The Kievan revenue records from the 16th century stated that "the Cherkasians plowed their lands wherever they desired." It seems that the individual property principle had already prevailed there to the fullest extent, and that agriculture had already gained significance.

In the 15th century, however, in the deeds and contracts of sale, still more attention was paid to the forest, hunting, and fishery rights than to farm lands.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in the course of one century a significant re-evaluation was accomplished. In the 15th century, extractive industries other than agriculture were more important economically while about a hundred years later farming had already become a leading industry.

The recolonization of the southern and eastern steppe regions progressed rapidly because of various factors evolving in that era, such as the growing power of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian state, the penetration of the Polish sponsored institutions of serfdom and large land holdings into Ukraine, and the increasing density of population and the development of a profit-motivated money economy in the West. First of all, the rising power of the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, as mentioned above, to some extent reduced the Mongol threat and thus encouraged the incorporation of Ukraine's steppes into her economy. This first phase of the penetration of the steppes was discussed briefly in the preceding section, in connection with the development of the semi-military class of the Cossacks. The penetration began as hunting, trapping, and fishing trips undertaken in spring and summer by individuals and small groups of adventurers. Subsequently, armed colonization was intensified as the indirect result of the introduction in Ukraine of the Polish agricultural system, one based on serfdom and large-scale landholding by the aristocrats. The growing burden of bondage and serfdom for almost three centuries resulted in serfs constantly escaping to the steppe beyond the reach of the Polish government and Polish semi-feudalism. These peasant-refugees were the vanguard of waves of colonization. Extensive farming, together with hunting, fishing, and cattle-raising, were their main occupations.

The strong drive among the gentry and the lords to acquire more and more land provided still another impetus to the colonization process. Initially the nobles had received land as temporary grants for military and administrative services. But soon the precarious nature of those grants was lost under the impact of the Polish concept of complete and perpetual property rights for the gentry. This development was no doubt due to the decisive changes in the West European economies, where the density of population, having increased greatly in the 16th and 17th centuries, resulted in an early commercial mercantilism, a profit-motivated economy. The Western markets required more food and more raw materials; the East European extractive and agricultural production, if properly organized, could supply them.

The gentry of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were quick to recognize the opportunities. Thus their appetite and demand for even more land grew steadily. At first they developed commercial cattle-raising to export meat and hides. In some years the livestock exported to the West through the city of Peremishl (Prezemysl) alone exceeded eighty thousand heads. With the Torun Treaty

the Western markets were wide open for the Polish export business. Especially, Ukrainian grain, wood, and raw materials were in great demand abroad.

The colonization process was enormously intensified. Slabchenko said that unbelievably large sums of money were invested to acquire landed properties. Zamojski, a Polish grandee, for example, bought the Povolok district for one million and two hundred thousand gouldens. Tyshevich paid for a few villages over four hundred thousand gouldens. In both of these cases enormous land resources were required to proceed with production.<sup>5</sup>

The growing Western demand for grain and bread, however, developed the greatest profit opportunity for the Polish gentry, who then applied all available measures, fair and foul to enlarge their land holdings, including even spoliation of the peasant farm land, and exploitation of serf labor. As a result of these developments, small-scale peasant farming rapidly decreased and the burden of bondage swiftly increased. This caused peasants to run away in increasing numbers and drastically reduced the labor supply at a time when it was most needed.

In order to secure more labor for their intensified manorial farming, the nobles also undertook a large-scale colonization program. They established many villages, townships, and settlements under the "Magdeburg Law," granting to the settlers temporary personal freedoms, tax exemptions, and property rights. Everywhere castles were built, towns founded, new villages built, old settlements reorganized, and new market places and fairs initiated. While Ukrainians remained the principal stock of the population, settlers were also attracted from Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Germany, Wallachia, Serbia, and Muscovy. Due to immigration and a high birth rate, the density of population increased rapidly, and new areas were populated. After a few years the new settlers usually lost their freedom and privileges under the Magdeburg law, and were relegated to the general pattern of bondage and serfdom. This happened either in accordance with the original provisions of the colonization agreements with the bailiffs or settlers, or by direct violations of these agreements on the part of the gentry. But the new serfs began to run away into the steppes, pushing the frontiers further and further eastward and southward. This exodus gave rise to a new wave of settlements along the Magdeburg principles to replenish the labor supply in the manorial economy of the Polish-Lithuanian state, by granting freedoms and exemptions to the colonists

for a number of years (10, 15, or 20 years). The same processes were repeated over and over again, always, however, resulting in the addition of new areas to the Ukrainian ethnical territory

A commercialized agriculture accompanied by the advanced business techniques and social disadvantages of early capitalism became the foundation of the entire Ukrainian economy in the 17th century. This seems to be quite a change when it is realized that three centuries before, large areas of Eastern and Southern Ukraine were deserted steppes where a primitive subsistence economy prevailed. The main credit for this positive evolution in the economy must be given to the Cossack armed colonization, for the nobles colonized only those wild fields where some degree of security and safety had already been established by the Cossacks. Later the Cossack uprisings at the end of the 16th and in the first half of the 17th centuries, in their unsuccessful attempt to free Ukraine from Polish domination, also had a favorable effect on the colonization process. In order to avoid Polish reprisals, the insurgents were again compelled to migrate.

They moved far to the East, to the so-called "Slobidska Ukraine", on the banks of the rivers Donets and Don. There Polish government could not reach them since those areas were theoretically under Russian supremacy. The Cossack refugees who established villages (slobody) there, were fully free and had extensive lands for agriculture, cattle-raising, and hunting. For the most part, they were not troubled by the authorities. The entire Slobidska Ukraina later developed into a semi-military Cossack society. The colonization on a large scale of the Donets and Don area by the Ukrainians was initiated by Ostrianin, the leader of an unsuccessful uprising against the Polish oppression in 1638. <sup>6</sup>

**Hunting and Fishing.** Now that the general economic evolution of Ukraine during the Polish-Lithuanian period has been briefly described, and the over-all socio-political background of the economic life of the Ukrainians in that period also discussed, attention may be turned to the individual sectors of the economy and business. There is no doubt that for this entire era of the 14th and 15th centuries, hunting was still a very important and even a predominant industry in certain sections of the country, like the northern forest districts, the southern and eastern steppes, and in the Carpathian mountain areas in particular. In the 15th century, more attention was paid in deeds and sale contracts to the description of hunting, fishing, and beekeeping areas, and the exclusive rights and privileges connected with them, than to farm land. This

emphasis reflects the greater economic importance of the former occupations. The 16th century brought a full appreciation of farming and grain production. The civil law of that era, the Lithuanian Statute, in all of its three codifications, paid considerable attention to hunting, fishing, and beekeeping rights. Such violations as killing or stealing of animals on the hunting grounds of others and hunting and fishing in areas reserved for the Grand Dukes or lords, fishing without permission, damaging traps, nets, or beehives, damaging ownership signs and marks or territory boundaries, and similar cases were punished by monetary penalties.<sup>7</sup> Thus, a violation of the hunting rights was to be compensated by a fine of twelve guldens; an illegal killing of an elk, by a fine of six guldens; of a deer or bear, three guldens; of a lynx or boar, one gulden; of a bull or auroch, twelve guldens, the same as for killing a human being.<sup>8</sup>

After beavers became scarce, the beaver hunting in certain areas was reserved for the Grand Duke as a regal privilege, and the animals themselves were put under the legal protection of the law.<sup>9</sup> In Galicia, beavers were scarce in the 16th century, and similarly, were protected by law. At that time two guldens were paid for a beaver skin, the price for which one could buy more than ten hundred weights of rye.<sup>10</sup> In the manorial economies of the nobles, beaver preserves were established to prevent extermination of that valuable fur bearing animal.

The legal provisions, quoted above, the reports of the contemporaries, and the deeds and other source material of the era, indicate unquestionably the significance of hunting, as well as of fishing and beekeeping for the economic life of the country within the political framework of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On this point Hrushevsky said that in those days agricultural interests were simply sacrificed for the sake of other extractive industries, hunting in particular.

The forests, woods, steppes, and mountain regions of Ukraine housed enormous resources of animals and birds exactly as in the previous Kievan epoch. The contemporary written reports strongly stressed this fact. Bulls, aurochs, wild horses, elks, deer, harts, stags, bears, lynxes, wolves, beavers, foxes, wild goats, rabbits, squirrels, eagles, hawks, falcons, wild ducks, geese, swans, and many other kinds of animals and birds were mentioned in the documents, chronicles, and narratives. For example, wild goats were so numerous that in winter time, when there was nothing for them to eat in the fields and woods, they came to the settlements and

villages, and there they were killed in thousands by the peasants—thus supplying meat and skins.<sup>12</sup> In the 16th century, however, some kinds of wild animals began to disappear, like bulls, aurochs and beavers above mentioned. Intensive hunting threatened their extermination. Accordingly, by the 17th century the nobles began to establish beaver preserves and breeding stations for bulls and ureoxes. While hunting for beasts was, economically speaking, an important industry, hunting for birds remained a sport with little economic significance.

Hunting techniques did not change much in comparison to those of the Kievan era, except that the weapons used—spears, axes, bows, arrows, swords, knives, and hatchets—were made with more and better iron and were widely known and owned. Large nets of flax or hemp were still used to catch small animals, like rabbits, squirrels, and beavers; and small nets, to catch birds. Other animals were caught in traps or pursued on foot or on horseback.

Hunting for big beasts, like bulls and bears, was usually organized by the nobles, with extensive participation of the common people as beaters and helpers. Under the system of serfdom and bondage, the peasants were obliged to be ready to hunt for the lord a few days—as many as twelve—every year. Entire villages in the hunting areas specialized in certain hunting skills, such as hunters for beavers, wolves, and bears, serving as beaters and falconers, or catching hawks and falcons and training them for future hunting undertakings of their noble lords.

The annual contributions paid by the serfs to their lord consisted of a large portion of meats, hides, and skins. This evidence indicates that the peasants also engaged in hunting on their own. The peasants set up traps and hunted, but rather for smaller beasts, like martens, rabbits, foxes, squirrels, and, sometimes, wolves. Later on, these contributions in kind were replaced by one or more monetary taxes.

Meat acquired through large-scale hunting, or contributed by the serfs, was salted and packed in barrels at the manors, and delivered to the royal court and various cities throughout the Commonwealth, and also exported.<sup>13</sup> Until the 16th century, only the better qualities of meat were used and processed, while a great portion of it, considered inferior, was simply abandoned to scavengers.

Beekeeping was another ancient and significant extractive industry in the Ukrainian forests and steppes, cultivated by the peasant and manorial economies. The industry was a very popular one,

especially because of a very great demand for drinking honey, a favorite drink of all social classes, and because of a large demand for wax for the domestic production of candles, as well as for export. This extensive demand for honey and wax, a traditional one from prehistoric and Kievan times, made them for a long time the major components of the peasant's annual tax contributions, paid to the state or to the noble lords, who acquired that privilege in the process of the disintegration of the Polish state authority. It was simply called the "honey tax." Beekeeping rights were, as pointed out, a special concern for the legislation of the Polish-Lithuanian era, a fact that proved its relative importance.<sup>14</sup> But beekeeping as such had only a secondary significance from the over-all economic point of view. It was more important in the northern regions of Ukraine than in the southern.

No less important than beekeeping but secondary to hunting was fishing. Again, certain villages, located on the banks of large rivers or close to the lakes where fish was abundant, specialized in fishing, and their peasant inhabitants were primarily fishermen. Usually, fishing rights were the exclusive property of the gentry, and the peasants received only a privilege or a permission to fish, for which they had to supply part of their catch to the manors. Naturally, during the season of Lent the demand for fish increased.

In the 16th century, the nobles began to dig artificial ponds to produce fish for export. Western demand for fish and an abundance of salt in Galicia made this industry profitable. Fish were produced on a large scale, salted, and exported to Germany, Poland, Lithuania, and Muscovy. In the 17th century, the Ukrainian fishing industry was largely a commercialized and profit-motivated export business.

In comparison to the technology of the extractive industries of the Kievan era, hunting, fishing, and beekeeping indicated some technical progress in the later years of the Polish-Lithuanian period. Better arms, eventually firearms, were used in hunting, and a more elaborate organization was applied to hunting projects. The technology of beekeeping improved considerably at that time, since beehives were now specially constructed and properly arranged, and hollow trees no longer served primarily as natural hives. All three industries became commercialized and profit-motivated, and established on a larger scale. They were no longer confined to supplying a bare subsistence. Over all, however, hunting, fishing, and beekeeping remained extractive and extensive. Hence, with the progress of time and the growth of population, they had to be

replaced by the more intensive economies of agriculture and manufacturing which could more adequately meet the demands of an expanding population.

**Cattle-raising**, chronologically speaking, preceded farming. It was highly important up to the 16th century. The deeds, court acts and records, bills, last wills, and records of various offices and agencies of that era supply ample proof of the economic significance of animal-raising, including bull-breeding, sheep-raising, and horse-raising. Dogs and birds were bred and trained for hunting purposes. Enumerating the obligations and services of the peasants to the manor and lord, for example, those documents and records name first such various service obligations as going to hunt, serving as beaters, raising horses for the manor, supplying fish, honey, chickens, ducks, cheese, butter, eggs, hogs, skins, hides, and other products of the extensive economy, and in particular, cattle-raising. Oats and hay were also among the contributions of the peasant population to the manor, while wheat and rye were scarcely mentioned. Oats and hay were indispensable to raising cattle and horses.<sup>15</sup> The emphasis placed on services and the type of products indicated above point out the very character of the Ukrainian economy prior to the 16th century. Eventually, in the 16th century, this was replaced by new developments, including intensive agriculture.

Verdum, Beauplan, Litvin, and other foreigners who visited Ukraine in the 15th and 16th centuries, repeatedly wrote about the pasture lands, enormous herds of cattle, sheep, and goats, the rich and abundant grass resources, the strong, enduring, and speedy horses, large stallions, the swine, and the uncounted wild birds and animals in the steppe and forest regions.<sup>16</sup> The fact that these things impressed foreign visitors indicates their economic importance. Especially in the steppe regions, the breeding of horses developed to a great extent, although the continuous Tartar raids prevented their smooth and speedy growth. When a certain degree of pacification of the "wild fields" occurred as a result of the slow disintegration of the Crimean Khanate and, the growing power of the Cossack Host, cattle and horse-raising and sheep-breeding penetrated the steppes even farther.

In the forest areas, in the Carpathian mountains, as well as in the densely populated Western sections of the country, cattle and horse-raising was widely carried on. There was ample land not required for other purposes. Raising cows, oxen, and bulls was a



widely spread practice in the royal possessions, noble manors, and peasant households, in order to secure meat, hides, milk, and milk products for domestic consumption, as well as for the exportation of livestock and meat. While the importance of hunting in this respect progressively declined, meat production and exportation increased. Grey Ukrainian bulls were particularly popular in the foreign markets. The Cossacks, on the other hand, raised in the "wild fields" (beyond the cataracts) a special breed of very strong and fertile cows.

Cattle were usually kept under the open sky most of the year, and only during the winter months were they brought under shelter. In the mountain areas, in the Carpathians, the mountaineers soon developed the practice of driving the cattle and sheep far into the high mountains where there was plenty of grass. The big drive took place in early spring, and in the late fall the herds came down to winter shelter. Specially trained herdsmen took care of the herds throughout the year, while women milked the cows and performed other light jobs. Herdsmen were a specialized and respected occupation as in Kievan times. They were socially stratified according to the breed of animals to be taken care of, like oxen-herdsmen, horse-herdsmen, shepherds, swineherds, and whippers. The latter drove the cattle to distant markets, and their job was both demanding and dangerous.

In the domestic market, cattle, in particular oxen, were used also as draft animals in farm work and for the transportation of bulky goods, especially among the peasants who could not always afford horses. The traveling tradesmen, the "chumacks", even used oxen for their long-distance commercial voyages, crossing Ukraine from the North to the South, and from the West to the East, and in their expeditions abroad to get salt, cloth, and certain other items. Thus, cattle-raising provided food, raw materials, and means of transportation. Horse-breeding developed chiefly in the royal and manorial economies to provide for the needs of transportation and warfare. The horse was at that time unquestionably the most important draft power. It was used in farming, for wagons and carriages, for horseback riding, for hunting and to provide mail service, and to wage wars. The peasants also raised horses extensively, although on a small scale. In Galicia, for example, peasants were required to render their manorial services such as delivering manure to the manorial fields, bringing wood, and supplying oats and hay for the manorial herds and stallions with their horses and wagons. In some instances the peasants had to pay a

"horse tax," on each horse they owned. The most famous horse breeding stations were kept by the royalty and nobility, and the serfs in each case had to render particular services, related to the breeding economies of the upper classes. Thus, all villages like Medika and Buchach in Galicia had to take care of manorial stallions, raise and supply food, and provide premises. As long as general serfdom and bondage were not yet introduced, no other services were required of the peasants than taking care of the horse breeding. In the 16th century, when general bondage was established, the burdens of those "horse breeding" villages were considerably increased. The peasants desperately opposed such a new unfavorable trend, but naturally without success.<sup>17</sup>

Several breeds of horses were known in Ukraine at that time. In particular, the so-called Tartar or Crimean horses were very popular among the Cossacks, who also raised horses on a large scale in the wide steppes beyond the Dniepr cataracts. Beauplan said that these horses were very strong and very well trained.<sup>18</sup>

Sheep raising also grew in importance, especially in the mountainous areas of Galicia and in the Kholh and Belz districts. The industry was scarcely known in the Kievan era. Since the middle of the 16th century, numerous villages were organized according to Wallachian legal principles in these Galician and Podolian districts. Although inhabited by the Ukrainian people, these villages were called Wallachian villages. The exclusive peasant occupation in these areas was the rearing of sheep. Hence the contributions to be paid by the peasants under the general bondage system consisted mainly of the products of sheep raising, such as wool, woolen cloth, woolen rugs, and various kinds of cheese. Hog and goat raising also took place in the Wallachian villages, as well as in other settlements in different parts of Ukraine, but to a lesser degree. Hog raising was most common in maple wood districts, where the industry could be carried on at relatively low costs.

The Wallachian system developed primarily in those areas where the soil was poor and grain farming could not be very successful. Moreover, sheep raising progressed as long as the opportunities of commercialized grain production were not yet fully realized. With the growth of modern corn farming, the Wallachian economies declined whenever any chance for the export-motivated grain farm business existed, said Hrushevsky. The growth of grain economy brought also the burden of serfdom and soil bondage to the peasantry of the Wallachian villages, whose lot was rather mild and easy before.

Rearing falcons, hawks, and dogs for hunting, breeding chickens, ducks, geese, and swans for food and trade, and raising cats for pets and catching mice and rats, and various kinds of birds, completed the picture of this phase of the Ukrainian economy in the Polish-Lithuanian period.

**Agriculture.** The normal agricultural economy of Ukraine of the Lithuanian-Polish period consisted, as before, of three economic sectors: grain production, vegetable gardening, and fruit raising. All three segments, and especially grain production, experienced some basic technological and organizational changes in the course of these three centuries. These three individual industries originated and developed in a certain evolutionary sequence, until they resulted in the well developed agricultural economy of the 18th century.

The process was completed in the next period of Ukrainian history, the Cossacko-Hetmanic. Thus, grain production followed cattle-raising. Whereas vegetable and fruit raising, as the most intensive divisions of agriculture, arrived very late. Vegetable and fruit production were developed already in the Kievan era, no doubt, but they neither were advanced nor achieved any economic importance at that time. Arabic travelers reported large quantities of fruit even in ancient prehistoric Ukraine, but gardens and orchards largely disappeared as a result of the fateful political development of the 13 and 14th centuries. For gardens and orchards, as forms of intensive farming, need a favorable social and political environment in order to grow.

As a matter of fact, farming, primarily grain production, was a leading industry in Galicia and West Volhynia by the 15th century. But in the rest of the Ukrainian provinces, because of the Mongol devastations, it did not acquire economic predominance until the end of the 16th century. Accordingly, for almost two centuries longer a primitive economy prevailed there, based on hunting, fishing, and cattle raising, as was pointed out before in the previous section of this historical analysis. The type and forms of service obligations and tax contributions of the slaves and peasant serfs of that time clearly indicated the secondary and supplementary role of farming in the country's economy.<sup>19</sup>

Farming itself was extremely primitive prior to the 17th century, designed only to supply some necessities for individual households and not for market, although foreign travelers, like Beauplan and de Vigenere, reported the enormous and almost incredible fertility of the steppe areas which easily produced hundred fold crops

without much labor and literally without any manure or fertilizer.<sup>20</sup> Lack of roads, poor transportation equipment, and inadequate marketing techniques, however, did not permit efficient processing and distribution of agricultural produce.

Farming, therefore, remained stagnant for a long time. Agricultural prices were not uniform, food supply was inadequate, and the standard of living was rather low. The chief source of labor consisted of slaves, and they were not very productive. In the 15th century, farming was largely done within the framework of small private peasant estates or tenant farm holdings, duty-bound to the boyars and nobles, or to the Church. Oats, rye, barley, and wheat were the leading crops (in that order) until the early 16th century. Hrushevsky supplied the following approximate composition of farm production for the time: forty percent of all acreage was used to raise oats, thirty-five percent to grow rye, about fifteen percent for barley, and about ten for raising wheat. This pattern in farm production was derived largely from royal books and records. There are less reliable sources of information about peasant farming, but it is highly probable that the proportions were about the same.<sup>21</sup> These sources indicate unquestionably the leading importance of oats and rye and the secondary position of wheat. As has been mentioned, serfs paid their taxes in their leading products, oats and rye, until the 16th century. All this was in direct connection with the extensive cattle and horse raising in the old Ukrainian household economy. Still at that time some remnants of communal farming prevailed, and the peasant estates bore some communal material burdens which were completely lost in the next century.

In the first half of the 16th century, some fundamental changes in the farm economy were already initiated under the impact of the new developments in Western Europe. There the rapidly increasing population soon exhausted the natural resources, and the typical agricultural feudal system had to make way for a new economic constitution, early commercial capitalism. It was based on industrialization, specialization, exchange, and the wide use of money. This development caused an enormous demand in the West for food and agricultural raw materials, which could be obtained in Ukraine and other agricultural areas of East Europe. Hence, the social and economic changes in Ukraine in the 16th and 17th centuries, the rise of serfdom and latifundia-manorial agriculture in particular, were due to the emergence of capitalism in Western Europe. The price of grain rapidly increased by more than a hundred percent, creating impressive profit incentives and opportunities. In 1564,

for example, one lasht of wheat could be bought for 21.18 Polish guldens, while in 1616 the price for the same quantity of wheat increased to almost 55 guldens.<sup>22</sup>

Changes proceeded in various directions, completely altering the socio-economic constitution of Ukraine. The small individual peasant farms began to disappear rapidly, being progressively absorbed, *per fas et nefas*, into the latifundial estates of the nobility and gentry, by spoliation, seizure by force, criminal abuses, royal grants to nobles for services rendered, and unjust and discriminatory legislation. Parallel to this process, the distinction between slavery and free peasantry also disappeared, replaced by a general bondage of the rural population.

These developments and changes took place first along the main water routes, hence it was easier to export Ukrainian grain, since at that time the navigable rivers were the cheapest and the fastest means of transportation and shipping. Then, progressively, the manorial system and bondage penetrated the distant countryside and steppe regions of Ukraine. Only in left-bank Ukraine did some individual peasant land holding continue to exist in the early 17th century, although considerably reduced in scope. In the majority of the Ukrainian provinces peasant land ownership was practically obliterated. The manorial economy prevailed universally, managed by the gentry and cultivated by the peasant serf. Serfs performed plowing, harrowing, harvesting, thrashing, cattle raising, and other farm and house work for their lords. They were tenants of small farmsteads which supplied their meagre subsistence, and they were also burdened with yearly tributes to the manor.

Thus, in the 17th century, commercially motivated latifundial farming was fully developed. The vast lands, however, could not be intensively cultivated because of the relative scarcity of labor. This problem instigated a progressive enslaving of the peasants and a large-scale colonization program, both sponsored by the privileged class of the Polish gentry. The noble possessions were in some cases vast. The grandees, like the Vishnevetskys, Chorotriiskys, Ostrozhskys, Potockis, and Zamoiskis, owned entire provinces, tens of towns, hundreds of villages, and hundreds of thousands of peasant serfs. The Ostrozhskys, for example, owned thirty-five towns and seven hundred villages in Volhynia, Podolia, and Kiev, and derived from those possessions about ten million guldens of yearly income. The Vishnevetskys owned almost the entire left-bank Ukraine, where the country gentry were their service people.<sup>23</sup>

No doubt, the expenditures of these grandees were also enormous, since they had to maintain large administrative and managerial staffs, and huge police and armed forces, in order to keep peace in their possessions. With the growth of manorial, commercially motivated farming, agricultural technology was also changed. First of all, grain production was no longer limited to the needs of the individual households, but developed into a mass production largely for export purposes. The records of the 17th century indicate a leading production of wheat and rye, about thirty percent of the crops, while the output of oats declined to twenty percent, as compared to the previous century; barley took about ten percent, and the production of buckwheat, millet, peas, and other crops made up the remaining forty percent. Although the percentage of oats declined, it still remained considerable in view of the large scale holding of horses, donkeys, and mules. Buckwheat, which was totally unknown in the Kievan period, now grew in popularity and importance. In some localities and districts, the manors and the peasant farms produced as much buckwheat as rye. A little later, wheat became by far the most important crop. Millet was produced in rather small quantities. In connection with the increase in grain cultivation, the composition of the peasants' contribution and taxes also shifted from the products of hunting, fishing, and cattle raising to grain deliveries to the manorial lords.

Under the pressure of needs, there was progress in the form of intensive methods of cultivation and better tools. Thus, the extensive two-field system was soon replaced by the three-field system, and finally, by crop rotation. The field was now well manured, wherever it was necessary, and well plowed by the use of oxen or horses. Verdum related about the exceeding skills of the Ukrainians in plowing their soil. Neither the man, nor the ox, nor the horse stepped on the plowed section of the field, but moved within the furrows only.<sup>24</sup> Plows, harrows, hoes, forks, and other farm tools were frequently furnished with iron parts to accomplish better results. Only in the less advanced areas of Ukraine was wooden equipment primarily used. Iron sickles, scythes, knives, axes, and saws were known all over, and of course, generally used in the manorial economies.

As far as the efficiency of the Ukrainian farming of that time was concerned, it must be conceded that the manorial system was a rather wasteful one. The administration of the vast latifundia was not always up to standard, and the more so because the ruthless

exploitation of the serfs took away from them a great deal of enthusiasm, ambition, and zeal for work. By the same token, it required costly and considerable supervision. The peasant tenant farms were too small and too oppressed to be efficient. But the amazing fertility of the soil and the favorable climatic conditions made up for those organizational and administrative weaknesses, and produced hundredfold crops in 17th and 18th century Ukraine.

In gardening and vegetable production also, a certain progress was achieved during the Lithuanian-Polish period. New plants were introduced and more intensive and elaborate ways of gardening used, either brought by the foreign immigrants who came into Ukraine, or learned by the Ukrainians who traveled extensively. Thus, beans, totally unknown in Kiev, became very popular. Cabbage, rare in the Kievan era, was extensively cultivated from the 16th century on. Lettuce was introduced from Italy. The great variety of horticultural produce included cauliflower, parsley, carrots, celery, asparagus, spinach, turnips, parsnips, onions, garlic, cucumbers, watermelons, pumpkins, peas, hemp, and flax. Hop production was also very popular since beer was drunk throughout Ukraine.

Intensive gardening developed first in the manorial possessions, then it slowly penetrated into peasant farming. But already in the 17th century some vegetables and garden produce, like onions, garlic, caraway seeds, and poppy, were included in the lists of the peasants' annual compulsory contributions to the manor. This evidence certainly indicates that the peasants raised vegetables. The crops of onions, caraway, poppy, peas, hemp, flax, and hops sometimes extended over several acres of land, having really been done on a large scale. But despite some progress in gardening, this sector of the Ukrainian economy was on a rather low level, compared with the West. The same Verdum, quoted twice already, was not at all impressed by vegetable production, and remarked ironically that the Ukrainians probably were not able to afford the kind of intensive and exact work which was required in the gardening business.<sup>25</sup>

Perhaps fruit production was another indication of the great changes which took place in the Ukrainian economy as a result of the Mongol Invasion. Emperor Mauricius reported very extensive fruit growing in Ukraine before the Kievan era, whereas in the 15th century there was very little left of that industry. In those days orchards existed in Galicia, Volhinia, and the right-bank Ukraine, where living conditions were more certain or more easily stabilized;

they grew only around the castles and manors, and in towns and cities. There was no fruit raising in the villages and countryside. Of course, in the steppes and left-bank Ukraine, where the continuous threat of Mongol raids made intensive economies impossible, no fruit was grown.

In the western districts of the country, apples, pears, and cherries were common. Plums first appeared in Ukraine in the 16th century. Oddly enough, grape production was relatively extensive in spite of unfavorable climatic conditions. In Galicia and Podolia, grapes were raised on the manorial and monastic estates and pressed into a great quantity of a popular wine. Local wines were produced by merchants as well, and sold under their own brand names. According to contemporary reports, the Ukrainian grapes were good, but the wine was mediocre and sour.

There were several reasons why vegetable and fruit raising failed to develop impressively in Ukraine before the 18th century. First of all, the social and political conditions prior to the National Revolution in 1648 were neither peaceful nor stable, and, as has already been stressed, these conditions did not favor any intensive economies like vegetable gardens and fruit orchards. Secondly, the commercial and profit motives of the nobles and gentry placed so much stress on grain production and exportation that almost all rural labor was shifted to that industry, making impossible any impressive growth of gardening and fruit raising. Thirdly, a relatively low density of population did not demand a really intensive agriculture. And fourthly, the poor storage and transportation facilities did not permit any large-scale vegetable and fruit marketing, limiting the industries to local consumption. To be sure, these local needs for vegetables and fruits were very modest because of the relatively low standard of living of the masses.

The landed possessions of the nobles and grandees were well administered. Each individual manor was managed by an administrator who was, by rule, of noble descent. He directed the work of a number of overseers, tivunes, and helpers. A minute account of income and expenses was maintained. A number of manorial economies, the so-called "klutch" (key of possession), was managed by an "econom," supervising all manorial administrators. The entire noble latifundium was administered by a "commissioner-general of goods," selected from the gentry, who had full authority over all economies and manors. Individual manors, or individual pieces of land were frequently leased to poor gentry, peasants, or others, for rental payments.<sup>26</sup>



**Mining.** In the predominantly agricultural Ukraine of the Lithuanian-Polish period, mining remained an insignificant industry of secondary importance, unable to fill even the limited domestic needs of her farm economy. Not much progress was achieved by comparison with the Kievan era, in the extraction of such mineral and non-mineral resources as iron ore, nitrate, salt, and clay.

Mining iron ore was, qualitatively speaking, most important for the Ukrainian economy as a whole, although it was by far not the leading mining business from the quantitative point of view. Extraction of iron ore was achieved in various regions of Ukraine, largely in the framework of the manorial and monastic economies in a primitive manner. Peasants, also, did a little iron mining and processing. Iron ore deposits and mines were scattered, just as earlier in Kievan times, throughout the northern forest areas in Galicia, Volhynia, Polesia, and the Kiev district. Moreover, the specialist miners traveled all over and looked for iron deposits. When even poor iron ore deposits were found, constructions were immediately erected, exploitation initiated and blast furnaces built and put into operation.

Iron was then processed by blacksmiths. It was used most extensively for plow shares, harrows, knives, hoes, sickles, saws, scythes, axes, carpenter and construction tools, wagon wheels, home building, and firearms. The demand for iron was so great that the domestic supply was by no means adequate, and iron was imported from Germany and Bohemia. Poor roads and great distances hampered considerably the importation of this bulky material.<sup>27</sup>

With the invention of firearms, a new business came into being, the extraction of nitrate from the nitrous earth which spread throughout Ukraine. Beauplan related in his "Descriptions" that the Ukrainians had specialists in the field of saltpetre production, and that their gunpowder was very good.<sup>28</sup> Nitrate production also had considerable economic significance, as was evident from numerous court suits of that time, pertaining to the commercial benefits of nitrate production.<sup>29</sup> Later, however, saltpetre exploitation became largely a royal monopoly, the profits of which went into the country's treasury, either directly by the way of public administration or indirectly by means of leasing the mines to private individuals. Sometimes nobles received mines as compensation for services rendered to the crown. Nitrous earth was found in many places—Podolia, Kiev, Ochakiv, Bilhorod, and Putivl districts, and on the banks of the rivers Vorskla, Orel, and Psiol.

As ceramics and brick production continued to develop in Ukraine in the course of the entire Lithuanian-Polish period, so the excavation of clay was another extractive industry of considerable importance. Clay was mined in various regions of Ukraine—Galicia, Podolia, Volhynia, and in the right-bank and left-bank Ukraine as well. Extraction of clay was done in the framework of the manorial and monastic economies, as well as by the peasants for their limited use. Ceramics and brick manufacturing as industrial sectors will be treated further in this chapter.

Quantitatively speaking, the largest mining industry in Ukraine was for salt. Salt was mined largely in the southern, pre-Carpathian regions of Galicia, like the Drohobich, Stara Sil, Dolina, and Kalush districts, and to a lesser degree, in the neighborhood of Sianik, Kuty, and Kosiv. Mining salt was also a very important industry of the regional Galician economy in the Kievan period.<sup>30</sup> About 1622, news spread that salt was found in the left-bank, Mirhorod district, but the hopes for any considerable salt deposits proved to be grossly disappointing. In the 18th century, in the newly settled areas of the Slobidska (Village) Ukraine, between the Donetz and Don rivers, substantial salt reserves were actually found, and extensively exploited. Nestorenko indicated a considerable salt extraction in the Iziium district. In fact, West Ukraine produced a surplus of salt. Hence Galician salt was widely marketed in East Ukraine, and also exported to Poland, Lithuania, and Hungary, as far as the southern districts of Transylvania. But the eastern provinces of Ukraine still had to import salt to supply their needs from the Mongol dominated northern shores of the Black Sea and the Crimean Peninsula.

Contemporary sources and records afford a great deal of information: where salt was mined, how it was done, how it was processed, who owned the salt mines, where and by whom salt was sold, where it was exported, and other such details. No doubt, this great contemporary interest in the salt business most emphatically indicates its considerable economic significance at that time. Thus, wherever salt was found, wells were drilled, and big wooden wheels constructed, installed horizontally, and moved by horses or oxen to get salt or salty liquid to the surface. Then the raw material was put in large kettles for boiling out the water and dirt.<sup>31</sup> There were at that time, certainly, some skilled artisans who mined and processed or boiled out the salt. Their pay was relatively high, compared to the earnings of carpenters, wood workers, and field workers. A salt miner received eight dinars for processing a barrel

of salt, while a woodcutter was given the same amount of money for a week's work.<sup>32</sup> Besides, the job was held in high social esteem.

The salt mines, at first owned by the municipalities, monasteries, and the gentry, were soon turned into royal monopolies because of their great potential profit. It was indeed a very profitable business. At the Peremishl and Drohobich mines alone, in 1570, 35,000 barrels of salt were mined, processed, and sold, resulting in a revenue of 13,000 guildens for the treasury, including tolls and duties.

The monetary yields of salt mining declined in the 17th century when wood, so necessary for boiling the raw and liquid salt, became scarce. From that time on, it was necessary to bring wood from the distant mountainous districts, and production costs increased. Prior to that, wood delivery was simply made another obligation of the peasant serfs within the bondage relation in the given noble or royal possessions. The noble and royal forests supplied the required material cheaply. Bringing the wood from the pre-Carpathian districts involved not only a considerable purchase price but also the cost of shipping by water.<sup>33</sup>

## CHAPTER TEN

### THE INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

**Towns - Trades and crafts - Food processing, the textile, and the leather industries - Paper manufacturing and the printing industry**

**Towns.** In connection with the analysis of social stratification in Ukraine during the Lithuanian-Polish period, and, in particular, in connection with the socio-political position of the townspeople, it was pointed out that the Ukrainian town of that time had, to a great extent, lost its significance in the framework of Ukrainian society. First of all, the legal isolation of the town from the countryside resulted from the introduction of the "Magdeburg law" to municipal organization; and secondly, the discriminatory system based on the social supremacy of the nobility and gentry resulted in a decline in the urban economy. The introduction of Polish ideas and institutions into Ukraine resulted in the decay of the village and the peasantry, as well as of the city and the townspeople—social segments which once flourished and preserved a social and political balance.<sup>1</sup>

Now this constitutional balance was shaken and sacrificed for the enrichment and supremacy of the gentry. Nevertheless, the town still remained a center of commerce and trade, and the townspeople were largely merchants and craftsmen. Its life concentrated around the market place, periodic fairs—annual, monthly, and weekly—and daily trading. In the Kievan age of early commercial capitalism, the Ukrainian town exceeded the West European city in volume of mercantile business. Now, the situation was changed. The commercial significance of the Ukrainian town declined, and the relative importance of its commerce, in relation to other branches of the economy, fell far below the 16th and 17th century Western level.

But the commercial abilities of the Ukrainians and of some nationalized immigrants did not permit urban mercantilism to decay completely, despite these adverse social and political developments. Thus, the foreigners who occasionally visited Ukraine, as well as the official records of the time, reported the remarkable mercantile business and considerable wealth and prosperity in such cities and

towns in Ukraine as Kiev, Lviv (Leopolis), Kamianets, Lutsk, Zhitomir, Bilhorod, Starodub, Briansk, Novhorod, Chernihiv, Putivl, Kaniv, Cherkasi, Berest, Proskuriv, Priluki, Peremishl, Zbarazh, and others.<sup>2</sup> Kiev especially was mentioned as the capital of Ukraine, and as one of the wealthiest and most beautiful places in the country, despite the terrifying devastation it had suffered earlier at the hands of the Mongols. Mueller related that the magnificent ruins of the old structures of the city of Kiev stood witness to its past greatness and glory, while Litvin wrote that Kiev was a very rich place, where merchandise was displayed from Persia, Arabia, India, Syria, Muscovy, Sweden, and Norway.<sup>3</sup> Silk and spices were so plentiful in Kiev that they could be bought for very low prices. Precious metals and stones, perfumes, carpets, and other costly goods were brought daily to the city by the numerous caravans of native and foreign merchants. Also, Lviv (Leopolis) flourished commercially according to Lasota, although its trading and commerce were handled more by the Armenians than by the Ukrainians (Ruthenians).

Some of those Ruthenian towns were very ancient, while others were rather newly established in the course of the colonization process of the 15th and 16th centuries. The ancient towns were built very irregularly, with no planning whatsoever, and distinctly showed by their construction the different periods of their historical growth from prehistoric times. Only their newest sections, arising in the process of the Magdeburg settlement of Ukraine, exhibited some regularity and planning of structure. Kiev, Peremishl, Novhorod, and Chernihiv, for instance, belonged to that group of old cities. Priluki, Lubni, Mirhorod, and Lviv were newly constructed and more regularly planned, with the streets usually in a gridiron pattern.

The newly erected cities and towns were constructed close to castles, in well defended places, or on commercial crossroads, as was done centuries before. Strategic and mercantile considerations were also the primary criteria in erecting and developing towns in the 15th century. Since the colonization of the Ukrainian borderlands was largely sponsored by the gentry and noblemen, these newly erected towns and villages were initially owned by the nobles. But gradually they bought their freedom from the original owners for money, and became self-governing municipal communities. Acquiring freedom, however, did not help the city economically, because of other enormous social and political pressure from the upper classes. All political rights were denied to the

town, as was pointed out above, except in a few cases as in the city of Lviv. In addition, the property rights of the townspeople in real estate were limited.

The general appearance of the town did not change much, if compared with the previous Kievan period. Usually the town was built as a square, and surrounded by strong stone walls a few yards high, and deep moats, as in ancient times. Even the construction technique did not change much, except for the planning of the city within the walls. A few strongly defended gates led into the town by drawbridges over the moats. The stone walls were designed and equipped for defense and safety to give the besieged citizens cover from the arrows and the gun fire of the attacking enemy and to enable them to fight back. High stone towers, constructed at strategic points in the city walls, served as observation posts. Individual towers were specifically assigned to individual craft and merchant guilds to be defended in emergency or siege. Hence the towers frequently derived their names from the particular guilds which staffed them, such as the tailors' tower, the courtwriters' tower, the tanners' tower, or the carpenters' tower.<sup>4</sup>

In the middle of the fortified town, there was a square marketplace with the municipal building (ratush) and the mercantile premises. The suburbs extended outside the walls, and the later their erection, the more regular was their construction. The economic characteristics of the city were based on the principles of division of labor and specialization of product, where the mercantile and manufacturing enterprises were concentrated, in contrast to the village and countryside, where farming and other extractive industries developed. From there, the social and legal differentiation was projected.

**Trades and Crafts.** Although the Ukrainian trades and crafts experienced considerable progress during the Lithuanian-Polish period and were much better developed than in the Kievan state, at the same time, they were far below the levels achieved by contemporary Western European countries. As has been stressed several times, this was due mainly to the faulty and discriminatory social constitution of the Commonwealth. The trades and crafts actually developed in two different ways. Such industries as forest exploitation, iron, glass, and paper production, flour milling, saw mills, breweries, and distilleries, grew simply as supplementary activities of manorial agriculture, primarily domi-

nated and partially run by the landed gentry. Even these industries, when located in the cities and towns, being usually operated on lease by the townspeople, were prevailingly owned by the royalty and nobility as the traditional privilege of their class. The upper classes also preferred to market and distribute the products of their industries, using only local merchants as middlemen.

The noblemen enjoyed complete freedom of action and full exemption from all kinds of levies pertaining to their industrial and commercial activities. This enabled them to accumulate considerable revenues. But, being a class descended from medieval knights whose professions were military service and land cultivation, the gentry generally looked with contempt upon the trades. Trades and crafts were socially unworthy occupations according to the prejudices of that epoch. In particular, they were unworthy as occupations for aristocrats. This contempt resulted in a lack of interest for the development, improvement, and progress of the trades on the part of the gentry. There was no realistic approach to these problems by them. In most cases, the gentry simply considered those industries as secondary divisions of their manorial-agricultural economies. Nor was any initiative in expanding mining and manufacturing really shown by the nobility, who actually were the only ones with power to develop these industries. Irresponsible exploitation of resources and their fatal exhaustion by a crude technology characterized the majority of trades and crafts sponsored by the Polish gentry. Only the religious orders, in their monastic system, applied a slightly more advanced technology and a slightly more rational exploitation of the forest resources in particular. In many instances, the monasteries ran model trade and craft enterprises, although they did not always enjoy the same privileged positions as the gentry estates.<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, such crafts as carpentry, wheelwrighting, joinery, tannery, turnery, ironworking, goldworking, firearm production, shoemaking, tailoring, woodwork, ceramics, the building industry, weaving, spinning, fulling, leather working, baking, butchery, and other similar crafts were primarily the occupations of the village population, as far as the needs of the countryside were concerned. Nevertheless, due to the privileges enjoyed by the gentry, and the discrimination against the town, these occupations could not grow impressively. The townspeople were burdened with all kinds of levies and taxes; they were not permitted to dispose of and market their products freely. Their trading was legally restricted, and any competition with industries owned and

operated by the gentry, like distilleries and breweries, was prohibited. These measures contributed to the decay of the town economy. If compared with the general level of development of the trades and crafts in West Europe, where the town succeeded in acquiring more importance, the Ukrainian trades were primitive and underdeveloped, as was already pointed out.<sup>6</sup>

Information about the individual industries and industrial occupations in Ukraine, from the 14th to the 17th centuries, is to be found in the writings of Beauplan and other foreign visitors, whose accounts are substantiated by frequent references to various crafts in the contemporary records of the court of justice, tax collections, deeds, and other contracts and agreements. Those crafts and trades could be classified in a few groups according to their major economic characteristics, like metallurgy, the wood industry, leather processing and manufacturing, pottery and glass industry, textile and garment industry, and food processing. As the dark and primitive Mongol era passed slowly into oblivion, new crafts and industries were gradually introduced in order to keep pace with the growing population in the towns and countrysides. Many new skills were brought from abroad, in particular from Germany, as is clearly indicated in the nomenclature. The names of various trades and various tools at that time were simply Ukrainianized German words and terms.<sup>7</sup>

Specialized crafts developed in the city, manor and village, because only specialization could cover the extensive needs of the dense population. The period of a clumsy jack-of-all-trades, whose deficient work was acceptable in the 14th and the first half of the 15th centuries, was definitely over. The real center of the crafts was the town, where the guild organization regulated production and distribution. Prices, qualities, styles, and selling practices and procedures were fixed by the guilds or the municipal governments. Competition of any kind, and advertising and sales promotion were outlawed, and marketing was strictly planned and regulated, although otherwise private initiative was preserved. Then, in the 17th century, trades sponsored by the manorial economies gave rise to the beginning of modern industrial manufacturing and early capitalism, which crystalized in the next (Cossacko-Hetmanic) period.

Metallurgy experienced a modest growth in the course of the 15th to 17th centuries, delayed, first of all, because no rich ore deposits were discovered in Ukraine at that time. The scanty supply of domestic iron, mined and processed in the forest belt of



the country, was used to a limited extent by blacksmiths to manufacture wagon wheels, saws, scythes, sickles, hammers, axes, hoes, plow shares, candlesticks, and other farm and household appliances. At times, rails for the construction of bridges and cannons were also manufactured from domestic iron. On the other hand, iron was extensively imported for such use from Austria, Bohemia, and Transylvania, since the domestic supply was inadequate. A variety of specialized metal workers was known in the town of that epoch, such as locksmiths and blacksmiths, key-makers, kettle-makers, coopers, zinc processors, knife-makers, sword- and weapon-makers, bow and arrow fabricators, and all kinds of craftsmen, who were employed in producing certain articles of which at least some parts were made from iron or other metal. The city of Lviv was the leading center of the metallurgic crafts. The swords from Lviv were especially famous.<sup>8</sup>

At the beginning of the 15th century, the production of firearms and gunpowder was initiated. The first cannons were manufactured in Lviv in 1343, and ten years later there were everywhere, according to Krypiakevich, shops and craftsmen to manufacture and repair firearms. Primarily, cannons were produced which were at first short and wide. Bullets were made initially from stones, and later from lead and iron. Muskets and guns did not become popular until the second half of the 16th century. Concurrently with the manufacture and use of firearms, the production of gunpowder proceeded. Saltpetre, coal, and sulphur were used in various proportions to produce the gunpowder, praised by Beauplan for its quality.

Arms and gunpowder were manufactured by special craftsmen, usually residing in the cities.<sup>9</sup> On the large landed possessions of the princes and noblemen, however, there were private shops to fill the local needs of the grandees, to supply their provincial armed forces, and to equip their large-scale hunting projects. In particular, gunpowder was widely manufactured in the manors and by the peasants to supply their limited needs for hunting and protection, and, of course, by the Cossacks beyond the cataracts, to support their military expeditions against the Turks, Tartars, and Poles.

A separate branch of metallurgy was represented by goldsmithing and watch-making. The skilled goldsmiths produced jewelry for the upper classes from imported gold and silver. These craftsmen were predominantly foreigners. The first clocks were introduced in Ukraine at the beginning of the 15th century, in Lviv in 1404.

These clocks, as a rule, were placed in municipal buildings and palaces. Skilled watchmakers manufactured and repaired clocks. In particular, the watchmakers of Peremishl were nationally famous, and they were frequently asked to go to Lviv, Kiev, Krakow, or Warsaw to perform their excellent skills.<sup>10</sup> The first clocks had a full twenty-four hour dial system, and consequently, were very large; the twelve-hour dial system was first introduced in Ukraine in the 17th century. Pocket and arm watches came into use there in the 18th century.

Woodworking was another important industry. Above all, the exploitation of the forest became very profitable in view of the growing demand for lumber and timber, and their high prices, in West Europe. The forest workers evolved into a specialized and well-paid profession. Tar and potash production continued also in this period to be by-products of the ruthless, profit-motivated forest exploitation, primarily sponsored by the gentry. Underbrush and young forests were burned into ashes, subsequently used for bleaching linen. Even the contemporaries complained about the waste of the gentry, which threatened the forest with annihilation.

In the 15th century, sawmills began to come into use, representing the emergence of a more modern industry. At first, the sawmills were developed in connection with flour milling, where a special mechanism was installed to do sawing. The first sawmill in Ukraine was reported by the records under the date of 1429, in the village of Striliska, in West Ukraine. From that time on, a specialized craftsman, the sawyer, appeared in the area, enjoying respect and relatively high compensation.

The introduction of sawmills intensified the ruthless exploitation of the forests, especially in the mountainous western provinces. Contemporary records stated the alarming fact with horror. Finally, in the middle of the 16th century, legal measures were undertaken to prevent this irresponsible devastation. These measures resulted in the establishment of a government forest monopoly in the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth. However, the enormous prices offered for lumber and timber throughout that century—about six hundred gouldens for a lasht of wood—often proved too tempting in spite of the legal restrictions and prohibitions. Not only the profitable export business, but also the growing demand for potash and tar in the expanding domestic economy, contributed considerably to a wasteful exploitation of the forests. Hundreds of forest workers, called "budniks," all over the wooded areas continued a large-scale burning of the forests for ashes or

processing wood for tar. They operated either on their own account, or on the account of the nobility. Either way, they contributed to a rapid depletion of the forest resources.<sup>11</sup>

The best grades of wood were reserved for ship-building—for masts in particular. The second-best lumber was used for the construction of bridges, fortifications, palaces, and homes. The third grade was processed for shingle manufacturing, and the poorest quality went for furniture production, other home appliances, like tableware, and for paper manufacturing. Export wood was carefully checked and inspected by special government officials according to legal specifications. The Polish government was very interested in keeping a good name for its lumber in foreign markets.

Wood-processing industries employed a variety of specialized craftsmen, like bridge builders, fort and palace builders, home builders, church architects, sawyers, carpenters, turners, barrel makers, shingle makers, and wood carvers. Practically speaking, everything in the peasant household was wooden, from the house, wagon, and slides to primitive tools for field work, like plows and hoes, and the home appliances, like spoons, bowls, and plates.<sup>12</sup> All these things needed specialized craftsmanship for their production.

Construction of churches, palaces, fortifications, and homes was another leading industry. Construction, whether in stone, brick, or wood, had attained advanced status by that time. The architectural styles changed a few times. In particular, the stone constructions of Byzantine form were largely replaced by the Gothic style introduced by Western colonists, mainly the Polish and German ethnic elements, who settled the cities. However, these Gothic constructions, churches, palaces, and municipal buildings, bore distinct Ukrainian characteristics. Gothic constructions prevailed only in the West Ukrainian provinces, because the Mongol invasion had created an unfavorable atmosphere for architecture in the vast areas of the Dniepr.<sup>13</sup>

In Lviv, Halich, Kamianets, Drohobich, Peremishl, Kremainets, and other towns of West Ukraine Gothic monuments could be found in churches and fortification walls. In the beginning of the 16th century, the Renaissance came to Ukraine. The municipal buildings in Priashiv and Lviv, the Dominican Church and the Roman Catholic Cathedral of Kiev, the castles and fortifications in Peremishl, Lviv, and Berezhany, the Jewish temples in Lviv and Sata-niv, and many other buildings were erected in Renaissance style,

going as far eastward as the town of Lubni. The 16th and 17th centuries were the period of the Renaissance.<sup>14</sup> At first the foreigners, primarily Germans and Italians, introduced the new forms. Soon, however, according to the municipal and court records, Ukrainian names could be found among the most famous architects who created such Gothic and Renaissance constructions as Nichko, Luke of Priashiv, Martin Liushnia, Peter of Smolensk, and Ivan Kruhlik.<sup>15</sup>

Wooden constructions prevailed in the countryside and suburbs. Several architectural styles of wooden churches had already developed, among them the Boyko, Lemko, and Carpathian styles of West Ukraine, and the Podolian, Middle-Dniepr, Sloboda, and Cataract styles in East Ukraine. In addition, the construction of wooden fortifications was still going on during the Lithuanian-Polish period, as in the Kievan era, throughout Ukraine, but its heyday was certainly over. Wooden construction of forts, churches, palaces, and municipal buildings, was predominantly the work of Ukrainian born craftsmen of great skill and artistic ability.<sup>16</sup>

A separate branch of wooden construction, of a considerably advanced technique, was building boats. The Cossack boats used for military expeditions on the high seas were especially famous. They were well built, light, and speedy. In connection with boat construction, there developed the production of linen for sails, and the manufacture of tar, which was also an exportable naval material.

In direct relation to home furnishings were the pottery, ceramic, and glass industries. Pottery and ceramics were well developed, and far ahead of the levels achieved in the Kievan era, supplying crude, fine, and ornamented appliances, like bowls, plates, pots, jars, chalices, vases, and tiles. These crafts were so popular that frequently entire settlements and villages were engaged exclusively in pottery and ceramics, such as Politche, Hlinske, and other places in East and West Ukraine. The craftsmanship was on a very high level. Often the product was made in very attractive colors and artistically decorated, especially vases, tiles, and plates. Artisans of these crafts enjoyed respect, good compensation, and some social privileges. In the cities they were organized strictly on a guild basis, while in the countryside they were unorganized.

Ceramic manufacturing was concentrated in the towns of Pere-mishl, Kamianka Strumilova, Kolomiya, Bar, Volodimir Volinsk,

Yaroslav, and Lviv, in West Ukraine. The technology of production and the quality of the product were good, and constantly improving, while fine ceramics were also subject to importation as well. The artisans were mainly Ukrainians, heavily discriminated against by the Polish government, which desired to establish a Polish-controlled interest in this field.

Glass production was modest. During the Polish times it did not develop into a large-scale industry. Glass manufacturing was carried on primarily within the framework of the manorial economy for the household use of the grandees and gentry. Window glass, drinking glasses, and bottles were the products of the industry, which was never profitable, Hurshevsky said. The high cost of manufacturing, due to the small-scale operations, frequently forced the manorial glass works into liquidation. The demand for glass in the cities and towns was covered mainly by importation. The records made reference to the glassworks in West Ukraine, by mentioning under the year 1564 a glass mill in the Belz, and later on, in the Kalush and Horodenka districts. The records of the Brotherhood of Stavropighia, in the city of Lviv, permit one to assume that at the end of the 16th century the use of window glass there was widely popular. Glass, in particular of a better quality, was mainly imported from Bohemia, but it was also brought from Germany, and even from Venice.<sup>17</sup>

**The Food Processing, Textile, and Leather Industries.** The growth in population also caused a further development of the food processing, textile, and leather industries, to supply the basic necessities and supplementary materials for hunting, fishing, and waging war. In the 15th to 17th centuries, food processing was, no doubt, the best developed industry in Ukraine. It included flour production, baking, dairy industry, brewing, and distilling, butchery and meat processing, and honey and wax production.

Flour milling really achieved the scale of a large industry, primarily run by the gentry. Initially, it was a small and insignificant craft of hand milling for household use, performed with two grinding stones moved by human hands, and later on, by horses or oxen. The first water mills of the German style came into Ukraine in the middle of the 14th century. The very first mention of a water mill in Ukraine was in 1339, at the time of the last Galician ruler, George-Boleslave in the village of Trepche, near the city of Sianik.<sup>18</sup> But water mills did not become popular in Ukraine until the 16th century, the hand mills being still preferred by the people.

In the 16th century, however, various types of water mills became known there, such as those which operated the entire year; the spring mills, operating only in the spring and fall, when the water supply was abundant; the so-called large mills with five to six wheels, which not infrequently connected flour milling with lumber sawing and cloth manufacturing; and finally, the so-called small mills with only a single wheel.

As far as the ownership and management of those mills were concerned, there were, first of all, royal mills in the royal possessions, remaining under the general supervision of the royal district officials (starosts), and the urban mills operated by the townspeople and municipalities. Both classes of mills were organized as large-scale, commercial enterprises. On the other hand, there were countless smaller mills throughout the country, owned largely by the gentry, but operated and managed on lease by skilled millers. The monasteries also owned and operated large and small mills for their own needs as well as for profit. The leased mills in the royal, noble, and monastic possessions were of two classes, the temporary rental mills and the hereditary leased mills. The latter, being owned by the manors, royalty, or religious orders, were hereditary in the families of the millers, descending from father to son, as far as their operation and management were concerned.

At the end of the 16th century, there were approximately three thousand mills in Galicia and Volhinia alone. Already the mills were well constructed; sometimes even artificial canals were built to improve efficiency. The rents to be paid by the tenant millers to their royal, ecclesiastic, or aristocratic lords were high for that time, and included a straight sum of two or three guldens a year, a percentage from each milling, and an obligation to raise and to deliver to the manor or monastery a certain number of hogs yearly.<sup>19</sup>

In 1522, the use of hand mills was legally prohibited among the peasants in order to remove competition with the water mills, which were a source of income for the nobles, towns, and religious orders, no matter whether the water mills were operated directly by the owners, or supplied them with rental yields. Later the gentry managed to gain control over even the mills located in urban areas, and after that time not only the peasants but also the townspeople were forced to use the gentry-owned milling establishments, and to pay exorbitant fees for the privilege. Not to do

so required a special liberty privilege by the urban or rural population.<sup>20</sup> About 1520, windmills also came into wide use, mostly in Volhynia and Eastern Ukraine. The windmill, however, in contrast to the water mill, remained a small-scale enterprise filling local needs exclusively.

In the cities and towns a special craft of bread bakers developed, baking bread not only for the townspeople but for the countryside population as well. Peasants regularly bought the city bread during the fairs, although the art of bread-baking was widely known by every housewife in most parts of the country since time immemorial.<sup>21</sup> Professional bakers were numerous in some towns where twenty to forty bakers supplied the demand for bread.

Meat processing was in the hands of butchers, a craft which knew how to kill, cut, process, handle, and preserve meat and meat products. The butchers, producing in their home workshops, kept their stands in the municipal fairs, and there they sold the produce of their skill.

The supply of dairy products was almost exclusively in the hands of the peasants and the manors. Milk was processed by primitive means for sour milk, sour cream, butter, butter milk, and various kinds of cheeses. Particularly in the western mountainous areas of the country, cheese production was extensive and sometimes developed into a major export item.

The manufacture of alcoholic beverages, drinking honey, beer, wine, vodka, brandy, rye, and gin was a very important and very profitable industry. At that time Ukrainians of all social classes drank considerably, according to the reports of eyewitnesses.<sup>22</sup> Drinking honey, a processed natural honey, was the most traditional Ukrainian beverage, consumed since the most remote times. Although drinking honey was still widely consumed in East Ukraine in the 17th century, and to a lesser degree in West Ukraine, the over-all economic importance of its production progressively declined, being replaced by the growing popularity of beer and vodka (horilka). In order to protect the local needs of the domestic consumer in southern Ukraine, who was still fond of honey in the 16th century, the local authorities prohibited by law any exportation of that drink, the production rate of which rapidly diminished.<sup>23</sup> Three brands of drinking honey, dependent upon the quality of material and the age of the beverage, were differentiated: the superior, the mediocre, and the poor. Its manufacturing always had a small-scale, household character, being done in the manors, monasteries, villages, and towns. The monasteries usually excelled in the quality of their honey.

In connection with the production of drinking honey, the wax processing industry must also be mentioned briefly. This industry had a centuries-old tradition, because it was fairly developed in the Kievan era. During the Lithuanian-Polish period, wax was produced all over the country as a by-product of bee-keeping and honey manufacturing. The city of Lviv was the wax trading center for all Ukraine.

The processing and trade of wax were under strict control by the municipal government of Lviv to protect the brand quality, particularly in the case of exports. Export wax was always furnished with the municipal seal, to guarantee the good name. Any product misrepresentation in wax trading was severely punished, including death by hanging.<sup>24</sup> In the domestic market, wax was used for candle production. Poor qualities were used to manufacture soap. Candle manufacturing was handled mainly by the church brotherhoods to supply the needs of the Church. It was also locally done for lighting the households of aristocrats and public authorities.

Wine production never developed beyond the stage of household experiment. Ukrainian wine was not good.

Brewing was introduced into Ukraine by German colonists. At first it was a small retail business, but by the 16th century it had begun to assume the form of a large, separate industry. Since the beginning of the 15th century, beer enjoyed an ever wider popularity. A century later, there were famous breweries like that of Zhovkva, in Galicia, whence beer was distributed to Lviv, Kiev, and Warsaw. Large breweries were as a rule located in cities and towns, and beer production and marketing were strictly regulated by the municipal governments in order to protect the city and its brand. Transgressors and violators of the regulations and trade codes were harshly punished.

The skilled brewers (*braseatores*) were organized in guilds. Raw material for brewing was purchased from nearby manors or government lands. Sometimes the law required the urban breweries to buy hops and malt from prescribed manors in order to protect the interests of the country gentry.

Urban brewing was threatened by two later developments. First of all, in the 1550's the royal government attempted to establish a royal beer monopoly in Lithuania and Ukraine. But the experiment was unsuccessful in Ukraine, and private brewing was preserved in the cities. Secondly, the gentry wanted to make brewing one of its class prerogatives. This resulted in the restriction of free beer production in cities and villages. But the tradition of



free brewing was older than class privileges and patrimonial authority of the gentry, and consequently urban brewing was preserved.<sup>25</sup>

Manorial brewing, being just another facet of the agricultural economy of the country gentry and the religious orders, was frequently connected with mills and sawing. However, it never became a really large-scale industry, like the urban and royal breweries, and it was never as profitable as the mills. Seldom did the annual net yield of the manorial breweries reach a hundred guldens, while flour and sawmills sometimes produced as much as six hundred guldens yearly profit.

In all urban, royal, manorial, and monastic brewing, the lease system prevailed, being considered more profitable than direct brewing by the municipalities, public officials, or noblemen. Skilled private brewers received exclusive lease rights to brew and sell their product. In exchange, they had to pay rents and light taxes to the state treasury.

The free brewing of the peasantry was *de facto*, albeit reluctantly, recognized by the state and gentry. The peasants brewed freely for various occasions, holidays, anniversaries, weddings, being obliged only to pay a beer tax to the government and to make some contribution to the manor.

At the end of the 17th century, brewing became a large-scale industry with all the features of the growing commercialism of the times. But the small brewery establishments still prevailed. Large, factory-like breweries were somewhat rare.

At the beginning of the 16th century, distilling was scarcely known in Ukraine. The records of tax collections from 1508 did not mention any distilling or whiskey tax, while the records from 1545 made several references to the new industry and its receipts. Thus, vodka or horilka production was a new form of processing agricultural raw materials. Already in the second half of the 16th century, however, numerous distilleries were operating throughout the country, producing thousands of guldens of annual revenue for the owners and tenants, and large tax collections for the state. The whiskey tax was primarily used at that time to cover the costs of the provincial and district governments of the Polish Crown, as the records indicated.<sup>26</sup> In the Kholm and Volhinia districts alone, between 1570 and 1580 there were approximately 304 distilleries, and in Galicia, nearly an equal number. Distilling was a fast growing industry, although it was always confined to the small individual business establishment, as a rule connected with the tavern and retail distribution of spirits in the local area.

In contrast to drinking honey and beer production, which was freely practiced by all segments of society with little government regulation, distilling, as a new industry growing at a time when the manorial-patrimonial system was fully established, developed strictly as a monopolistic prerogative of the gentry, usually leased against certain annual rental payments to the town and village population. In its initial stage, distilling was connected with the milling business, while later it evolved into a separate industry of considerable importance. The collections of the whiskey tax clearly indicate the enormous economic and financial significance of the business. The official records showed for Galicia in 1578, over 26,447 guldens of state revenue from this tax alone. A similar financial situation prevailed in all the other Ukrainian territories.<sup>27</sup>

Distribution of alcoholic beverages was achieved by widely spread tavern establishments, operated on lease by qualified individuals. Taverns, together with breweries and distilleries, were owned primarily by the country gentry, municipalities, royalty, and monasteries, who were usually lacking either the knowledge or the willingness to manage the business directly. It was much more profitable and convenient for them to rent the establishments to skilled operators and merchants at high rentals, than to undertake the risk of inexperienced operation and to expose themselves to social prejudices.

Taverns were classified into two groups, namely, those annexed to breweries and distilleries, distributing their own product, and those which sold the spirits purchased and bought from elsewhere. But in both cases the rent-lease system prevailed. There were taverns which served all kinds of drinks, and there were those which specialized in certain beverages, selling only honey and beer, or only vodka and beer. Widely prevalent were the taverns serving drinking honey exclusively, and sometimes wine.

Finally, the development of the textile and leather industries was indispensable to meet the needs of the rapidly growing population. The variety of leather manufacturing consisted of tannery, shoe and boot manufacturing, saddlery and belt production, and cap and glove making. The leather crafts were concentrated primarily in the cities. But they were also widely scattered throughout the countryside, manors, and villages, in the form of domestic industries meeting local or manorial needs.

Tannery continued to grow from ancient times; shoemaking consisted of the manufacture of footwear of better quality for the upper

classes; bootmaking constituted the production of crude footwear for the common people. Saddlery and belt manufacturing had a prime economic and military importance. Caps and gloves of leather and fur were indispensable because of the harsh climate.

All these leather goods were manufactured by specialized and highly trained craftsmen and artisans. Furs, skins, and fur and leather products were also exported in quantity to Muscovy, Lithuania, Poland, Greece, Moldavia, and Turkey. Lviv in particular was internationally known for its excellent caps, and the city of Uhniv for its shoes.

Comb manufacturing was a by-product of cattle-raising and the processing of skins and horns. Combs were made primarily from animal horns, except for the poor who also used wooden combs.

The textile industry advanced greatly during the Lithuanian-Polish period, paving the way for the development of large-scale textile manufacturing in the following centuries. Linen from flax and hemp, wool, and woolen materials were processed for sale all over the country by special craftsmen. They were also spun and woven by individual households for domestic consumption. Women of all classes did the spinning and weaving as they had done for centuries.

Fulling, as well as bleaching and coloring, developed into a special industry of skilled craftsmen in the cities and towns. Bleaching was done in two ways. Linen was either spread out and exposed to sunshine and water for several days, or it was done in turbines on the river and lake banks. Bleaching by sunshine was performed on a small scale also by housewives for household use, in both town and countryside.

Linen was most extensively used to manufacture clothing—underwear in particular—and to produce sails. Beauplan reported extensive sail manufacturing in Eastern Ukraine, developing along with the construction of large boats for fishing and transportation, and by the Cossacks, for their military expeditions against the Turks and Tartars. Hemp and flax were also extensively processed for manufacturing cordage, ropes, threads and nets, for all possible uses in shipping, hunting, fishing, and in everyday household affairs, exactly as it was done in the previous historical periods of the Ukrainian economy. The technology of production of those numerous items neither progressed nor changed.<sup>28</sup>

The progress in sheep-raising since the late decades of the 16th century brought about an expansion of wool manufacturing and processing, and a production of woolen goods by special shops

and artisans. At first, the woolen cloth was woven in water mills, after the raw wool had been cleaned and dyed by specialists. Woolen textiles, carpets, rugs, covers, and clothing were used all over the country. Clothing was produced by tailors of two classes. The silk tailors made clothing, underwear, gowns, dresses, and suits from imported silk and other fine domestic and foreign materials, for the upper classes of society. The common tailors, working with linen and woolen materials, supplied the common people. Furriers produced fur coats and fur caps for winter.

Such was the general picture of the fairly versatile trade and craft economy and of the emergence of large-scale industry in Ukraine, from the 14th to the 17th century. It is important, however, to say here, at the end of this analysis of the industrial development of Ukraine in the framework of the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth, a few words about a new field, which was just beginning, namely, paper manufacturing and book printing. Its singular place in a country's economy is secured by its direct connection with the evolution and growth of the cultural and the spiritual and intellectual life of a given society.

**Paper Manufacturing and the Printing Industry.** Paper production was initiated in Ukraine in the first half of the 16th century. The first paper mills were established in the cities of Lviv, in 1522, and Yaniv, in Galicia. Shortly after, the paper mills began to operate in other towns of West Ukraine, in Krosno, Busk, Lutsk, and Ostroh. The mill in Lutsk began to operate in 1570; in Busk, in 1580. The mill in Ostroh was established by Prince Constantine Ostrozhsky, in his family possessions, at approximately the same time. Prince Ostrozhsky, a well known protector of intellectual and spiritual life, established a paper mill and a printing shop, and erected a college in the same city of Ostroh, in order to advance the cultural life of his countrymen.<sup>29</sup>

Paper manufacturing was associated to a great extent with the name of Valentine Kmeller, who owned and operated several small paper mills in West Ukraine. In Eastern Ukraine, the first paper factory was established by the Kievan monastery, Petcherska Lavra, between 1615 and 1624. Initially, these first paper mills were located in cities and run by skilled craftsmen, but soon small shops were established in the countryside by the nobles, to cover the local needs of the manors. In the 16th and 17th centuries there were in West Ukraine a total of eight paper mills.

From the very beginning, several kinds of paper were manufactured by these paper mills, and usually furnished with elaborate watermarks. Their output was small, however, and could not cover domestic needs. They were not very profitable, with one or two exceptions such as the Lavra mill. Some quickly became bankrupt. Hence, paper was largely an imported article. It was needed for books, for official business and for keeping records. Its consumption constantly grew, particularly after the introduction of printing, until it became very extensive.<sup>30</sup>

Book printing was initiated in Ukraine by a Russian emigrant, Ivan Fedorovich, who ran away from Muscovy to avoid persecution, arrived in Galicia, and established in 1572-74, in the city of Lviv, its first print shop. Within the next few years he published a number of books. Financially, however, his enterprise was a failure, but his idea did not die with him. His print shop was reopened by the Orthodox Brotherhood of Stavropighia, in Lviv, which was very successful in publishing numerous Church books, school textbooks, and other books for many decades to come.

In 1639, Michael Slozka established in Lviv another competing print shop. In 1619, the Kievan Pecherska Lavra started its widely known publishing business, largely ecclesiastic and religious books. Similar although smaller printing establishments existed in other Galician and Volhinian cities, such as Striatin, Krilos, Uhertsi, and Univ. The printing establishment in Ostroh, in Volhinia, started by Prince Ostrozhsy in 1580, has already been mentioned. Books printed in Ukraine were not only used there, but also were subject to extensive exportation to Orthodox countries like Wallachia, Moldavia, Byeloruthenia, and even Muscovy.<sup>31</sup>

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### COMMERCIAL GROWTH

**Domestic commerce - Foreign trade - The trade routes and the import and export items - Finance**

**Domestic Commerce.** When the social position of the townspeople in Ukraine during the Lithuanian-Polish era was analyzed before, it was pointed out that circumstances at that time were unfavorable for the growth of trade. Under the impact of the Mongol Invasion and occupation, Ukrainian commercial life could not develop. Even later, under Lithuanian protection, frequent Mongol raids presented a serious obstacle to smooth and steady commercial activity. It would be erroneous, however, to think that in the course of the 14th and 15th centuries commercial activities faded away entirely, particularly in East Ukraine.

On the other hand, in the 16th and 17th centuries, when the threat of the Mongol raids lessened considerably, another factor evolved which hampered any substantial growth of commerce. The city, in general, was oppressed by class discrimination; its interests were sacrificed to those of the rural aristocrats. Chiefly as a result of this social discrimination, and particularly because of the philosophy of Mercantilism, which was making itself felt in Ukraine, an extreme regimentation of trade developed, resulting in the decline of the town and its commercial activities.

First of all, the entire commercial and industrial life of the town was dominated by a rigid guild organization. The guilds of merchants and craftsmen did not accept the principle of free competition, therefore they applied to the town economy the principle of prohibition and regulation, presumably in order to do justice to the interests of both the producer and the consumer.<sup>1</sup> The merchant guilds, like the craft guilds, were compulsory trade associations, the membership of which was restricted to individuals qualified according to birth, nationality, creed and training. The whole life of the city was strictly regulated by prescriptions, rules, codes of behavior, and inflexible class and trade customs. Needless to say, all these factors discouraged and retarded the commercial growth of the country as a whole, and of the town in particular.

Secondly, the state issued its own laws to regiment trade and commerce; monopolies were established, commercial routes prescribed, heavy taxes imposed, and free competition prohibited. These governmental restrictions were even more intense and rigid in Poland proper. The Crown granted to a few large cities in Ukraine, namely, Lviv, Lutsk, Kolomiya, and Berest, an exclusive trade monopoly, under the provisions of which no outside merchant, foreign or from another Ukrainian town, could do any selling. The city of Lviv also received the "stapel right." It obligated each and every traveling merchant, whether he liked it or not, or whether there was a potential market for his product in the city or not, to stop there to display all his merchandise for sale for a few days.<sup>2</sup>

These privileges were just other forms of discrimination among the towns, which scarcely facilitated trading because they hurt foreign and interregional trade. The stapel right was especially harmful, since it kept merchants from seeking the best markets and exploiting competitive opportunities. Detailed state regulations regimented trade in wood, oxen, including oxen trails and routes, beverages, salt, meat, and similar commerce, and in all cases imposed substantial taxes in the form of sales taxes, excise taxes, tariffs, and tolls, all rated upon the weight, quantity, quality, and the place of origin of the merchandise.

Worst of all, however, was the practice of the government in leasing certain tax collections, like bridge and road tolls and some excises, to private persons, who usually abused their franchises. Those individuals who obtained such concessions demanded excessive rates and imposed additional and unauthorized charges on traveling merchant caravans and mercantile shipments. Later, even those who had never received a tax collecting franchise from the state undertook illegal collections. Eventually, almost every nobleman or owner of landed estates raised road, bridge, and passage tolls and excise taxes from any merchant, and any merchandise caravan which entered their domain. This form of racketeering nearly brought an end to mercantile activity in the towns and villages, since the costs of trading spiraled while profit opportunities simultaneously declined.

To make things even worse for the merchant class, the gentry had in time received full exemption from all trade restrictions and tax burdens associated with buying and selling transactions. The privilege of exemption was affirmed several times by the Parliament and King, starting with the Piotrkow ordinance of 1496.<sup>3</sup>

It was introduced into Ukraine with her incorporation into the Policy Crown in 1568. The exemption of the nobility from almost all mercantile restrictions automatically produced unfair competition for professional merchants and urban commerce. Naturally, the town, hampered by regimentation and numerous taxes lawfully and unlawfully collected, suffered a progressive decline of profits, while from their own commercial transactions the gentry gained proportionally. Hrushevsky rightfully remarked that the gentry were the largest sellers of food, and the largest consumers of finished products. In this aspect, they fully succeeded in eliminating the urban middleman, and in many instances even in illicitly replacing him. To be sure, according to the letter of the law, a nobleman was not allowed to indulge in the activities of a market middleman. When selling his product or buying for his own household, the nobleman was questioned by the authorities about the ownership and destination of the merchandise. He or his servant was required to take an oath to affirm that the products were not destined for any market speculations or did not belong to somebody else, but were exclusively his household affair. In practice, however, this regulation was frequently neglected or avoided, and individual noblemen indulged secretly in considerable marketing, greatly damaging the mercantile interests of the town.

Several revisions of the tax and toll system were undertaken by the federal and local governments of the Crown to suppress the abusive collections. But the administration and execution of those revisions were so weak and poor that actually only good intentions remained. Trade and commerce continued to decline. In a somewhat better position were the few privileged cities which were granted some degree of tax exemption. Their mercantile activities were declared duty and toll free. In Ukraine, only Lviv, Lutsk, and Kiev enjoyed that privileged position. Lviv received the exemption in 1505, and that of Lutsk and Kiev followed. Nevertheless, this was, like another previously discussed privilege of a city trade monopoly, still an additional form of discrimination. In the long run, those measures were extremely harmful to the commercial life of the country as a whole because the majority of the towns and villages had not only to withstand the malpractices of the gentry, and governmental regulation, but also to suffer discrimination through the preferential treatment of the merchants of these three cities.

Although some enlightened circles of society saw the absurdity of the situation, not much could be done, because the all-powerful



gentry protected its class interests egotistically and jealously. Since the 17th century there was no consideration for the common good in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The class interests of the nobility were the only issue there which mattered; hence, the discrimination of commerce and trade, instead of lessening, progressively increased.

Of course, the pattern and extent of domestic trading was also considerably affected by international political and economic developments. The Turks dominated Asia Minor, and in this way tied up the exchange between Europe and the Orient. The Italian cities lost their dominant commercial position; European commercial interests began to seek new trade routes. In consequence of these events, the Ukrainian transit trade and domestic commercial activities experienced a downward trend.

Engaged in domestic commercial activities at that time were the townspeople, predominantly the foreign born, Poles, Germans, Jews, and Armenians, but not excluding Ukrainians. The Polonized gentry and the rural traveling merchants, the Chumaks, also participated. The Chumaks were an exclusively Ukrainian social phenomenon of very ancient tradition.<sup>4</sup>

The two leading commercial institutions of the times were stores and fairs. The fairs still carried the main volume of commerce; the stores and shops had a rather secondary and supplementary economic significance. Annual, semi-annual, seasonal, and monthly fairs, and weekly and daily markets were the periodic meetings of producers, sellers, middlemen, and consumers. Produce and merchandise were always available at the fairs and markets. As a matter of fact, the fairs represented an ancient economic institution. The novelty, however, was the legal privilege of exemption from tolls and duties, granted by the royal government to the merchants and goods going to fairs. This was the only effective measure adopted by the government to combat discrimination and abuse and to recover urban trading.

With the progress of time, all of the larger cities in Ukraine, including Lviv, Yaroslav, Sianik, Peremishl, Lutsk, Volodimir, Dubno, Rivne, Kiev, and Pinsk were granted fair freedom. The fairs were held annually, semi-annually, or quarterly, for a few days or even a few weeks, around certain important holydays, as in Lviv on St. Agnes' and St. George's days; in Peremishl on Sts. Peter's and Paul's day in Sianik on Pentecost; or in Yaroslav on St. Andrew's. Some fairs, like those in Lviv, Yaroslav, Sniatin, and Kiev, developed into really major commercial events

of a nation-wide and international reputation, where merchants from all over, Ukraine, Poland, German, Bohemia, Wallachia, Hungary, Lithuania, Muscovy, and even Greece, met.

According to the reports of contemporaries, the Yaroslav fairs were probably the biggest. They were the center of the Ukrainian trade with the West. The volume of business done during these fairs was tremendous for the times. Bishop Piasecki related that during the fire in 1625 in Yaroslav, the merchandise destroyed at the fairs amounted to ten million guildens.<sup>5</sup> Twenty to forty thousand head of cattle were regularly driven to the fairs.

Lviv was also a major center for Western trade. Sianik and Krosno were the centers of the Ukrainian-Hungarian commercial exchange; Sniatin and Kamianets, for the Ukrainian-Wallachian trading, where in particular, good Wallachian horses were sold. Merchandise from everywhere was exchanged during the fairs: German manufactured goods, textiles, garments, metal articles such as knives, sickles, scythes and saws, of domestic and foreign origin; wines, raw silk and silk materials, jewelry, carpets and rugs, spices, fruits, hides, skins, boots, wax, salt, grain, flour, honey, meat and meat products, arms, tools, various appliances and numerous other items.

Smaller, less important fairs were held all over Ukraine on a monthly and weekly basis. There the volume of business was smaller and the variety of merchandise less manifold, primarily limited to local produce to meet everyday needs. The weekly markets were scheduled for different days in various neighborhood towns and villages in order to avoid competition among themselves and to enable the merchants to attend as many commercial events as possible.

Trading was freer and less discriminatory during the fairs. For example, in Lviv, Peremishl, and other cities, Ukrainians were allowed to trade freely, while otherwise they were either not permitted to indulge in commercial activities, or they were at least restricted in this respect. Also the free trade of meat and meat products in large quantities was allowed during the fairs. At other times, this trade was extremely regimented; only licensed butchers were permitted to process and sell meat on a strictly monopolistic basis.

Naturally, the guild merchants were hostile toward free trading in the fairs and markets since this competed seriously with them. Under the pretext of apparently diminishing government revenue

due to free trading at the fairs, guild merchants of Lviv, in particular attempted to induce the royalty and the Parliament to restrict fairs and foreign merchants, or to close the national borders.

On the other hand, the local merchants in various Ukrainian towns and villages were continuously complaining about the domination of the provincial fairs by the merchants from Lviv. These merchants enjoyed all kinds of liberties, traveled all over, and were serious rivals for their local commercial interests.<sup>6</sup> Without regimentation and discrimination, free competition would have eliminated the least efficient merchants and facilitated the growth of the Ukrainian town. Although mercantile activities were relatively free during the fairs, there still were numerous minute state and city regulations, sometimes rational, and other times irrational in their nature. Weights, measures, qualities, and services were regulated, and sanitary measures were adopted against the sale of adulterated products. Selling meat during lent was prohibited. Minimum quantities which could be sold were prescribed, business and sales taxes were collected, and competition was suppressed. Transgressors were severely punished. Tax rates levied against the fairs differed according to the quality, quantity, and the origin of the merchandise.

Stores and shops constituted the other form of merchandising. There was a strictly regulated domestic commerce. Market places were located in midtown, close to the municipal building. There the premises were provided for the stores and shops of the so-called "wealthy" merchants, the city patricians, and the outside merchants, to display their merchandise. Jewelry, carpets, wines, metal articles, spices, and other costly products were traded there. On the side streets were the stores and shops of common merchants and craftsmen, marketing cheaper commodities, primarily items for the daily use of the local consumer, like fish, meat, grain, flour, skins, furs, wax, honey, linen, and cheap textiles. Artisans usually occupied one street or one quarter of the town, where they produced and sold their own manufactured goods, like shoes, boots, materials, clothing, leather, and various tools of their specialty.

There was a strict differentiation between the wealthy merchants dealing in costly merchandise, and the common merchants who sold cheap wares. The common merchant, under penalty, was forbidden to trade in costly and luxurious merchandise.<sup>7</sup> Some merchants were wholesalers, since the law prescribed the

sale of certain goods in large quantities only, such as textiles and bulky products. The evolving store system consisted actually of specialty stores and shops, partially due to commercial regimentation, which did not permit the individual merchant or artisan to carry a variety of goods on his shelves. There were, therefore, textile stores, some specializing in fine fabrics, others in crude domestic materials, shoe shops and boot shops, butcheries, bakeries, blacksmiths, goldsmiths, tailor shops, tanneries, furriers, stores selling Oriental goods, beer and whiskey taverns, wine and honey taverns, and many other specialty establishments. At the end of the 16th century, the records listed forty-three merchants in Kaminets, forty in Lutsk, twenty-three in Kholm, and seven in Belz. All merchants had to pay numerous state and city taxes to support the federal and local governments.

Merchandise was brought from abroad or distributed throughout the country mainly by means of the traveling merchant caravans, moving in various directions along the traditional commercial routes. Usually these caravans were sponsored and financed by a group of merchants or by merchant associations and corporations, comprising fifty, sixty or more well constructed and well protected wagons to resist all the dangers of a long journey. Because of the uncertainty of the times, the caravans had to be armed or escorted by soldiers.

**Foreign Trade.** The economic life of Kievan society was greatly commercialized. In particular, it derived considerable revenues from an extensive foreign trade, which, for reasons already explained, was on the decline. Although Ukrainian foreign trade recovered to some extent during the Lithuanian-Polish era from the blow it had received from the Mongol Invasion, it never reached its previous heights and its earlier economic significance. Too many diversified factors preconditioned this low level of the international economy of Ukraine between the 14th and 17th centuries, especially the foreign domination of the country, the growth of agricultural interests, and social prejudices. Historically speaking, the foreign trade of that era cannot be discussed indiscriminately as a uniform segment of the economy of the country, diversified only in the geographical aspect. For the period following the 14th and 15th centuries, the international trade of West Ukraine (Galicia and Volhinia) was developing in an entirely different way from that of East (Dniepr) Ukraine, and so each segment must be discussed separately. For the next hundred and

fifty years, Ukrainian foreign trade may again be considered and treated as a homogeneous and uniform branch of the country's economy. These separate trends in the economic evolution of the eastern and western provinces of Ukraine for about two hundred years have already been indicated and emphasized.

Since the western provinces, Galicia, Volhinia, and West-Podolia, were not completely dominated and not so thoroughly pillaged by the Mongol Khans, their foreign commerce evolved afterwards in a more stable way. It simply continued the old traditional trends, which were subjected only to gradual changes because of the new political and social conditions. The local Ukrainian merchants continued to participate in international economic operations, although their commercial activities were progressively restricted by the hostile Polish government of occupation, and were finally reduced to a minimum. At first, Halich, Peremishl, Volodimir, and Berest played the leading roles as centers of foreign trade from the Galician-Volhinian times. Later on, however, in the 15th century, the city of Lviv in Galicia, and the city of Lutsk in Volhinia, became the leading markets for the international trade of West Ukraine. At that time, the most developed and most vital commercial ties were connecting West Ukraine with the cities of Krakow in Poland, Thorn and Danzig in Prussia, Breslau, Nuerenburg, and Regensburg in Germany, Prague in Bohemia, and the city of Constantinople in Greece.

The mercantile position of that area was already established in the 14th century, after the Galician-Volhinian Duchy settled and colonized vast Moldavian and Podolian steppes in the south, to the shores of the Black Sea. In this way direct commercial connections with Greece, the Balkan Peninsula, and Asia Minor were established, making Galicia an independent and autonomous factor in international trade, and just a transit countryside for the Kievan economy. The Invasion had an impact on the West Ukrainian foreign commerce insofar as it altered its pattern. At first, it influenced the Ukrainian-Greek exchange. This trade was soon re-established by the Ukrainians through initiating their own mercantile factories on the Black Sea shores, as in Ackerman and Oleshe, and establishing closer commercial connections with the Italian mercantile factories and agencies there. But this Greek trade did not reach the earlier volume. Therefore, the West Ukrainian merchants turned their attention more to the West European countries, and their trading with Poland, Germany, Prussia, Bohemia, and Hungary began to grow rapidly.<sup>8</sup>

The Polish domination of Galicia in 1349 produced discrimina-

tion against the Ukrainians in the country's life, resulting in a decline of the Ukrainian element among the merchant class, in general, and in a growing participation of the foreigners—Poles, Germans, Armenians, and Greeks—in the Galician-Volhinian international commerce, in particular. Still another development disadvantageous to the commercial interests of the Ukrainian urban population was introduced in the form of Polish rule. The Polish city of Krakow was progressively successful in establishing itself as a monopolistic middleman for the entire Galician-West European trade and exchange. Krakow attempted for some time to force all the merchant caravans, coming from Astrakhan, Ackerman, Constantinople, and the Ukrainian cities, going to West Europe, to stop and sell their merchandise to the Polish merchants of Krakow, by virtue of the city's unlimited stapel right. And the same measures were tried by the same city with respect to the Western merchants going to Ruthenia, but these largely ignored the Polish plan, even though it was supported by the Crown. Of course, as long as Galicia was an independent duchy all these plans for Krakow to become a commercial bottleneck for the Galician-Western exchange failed to materialize. The Polish king, Vladislaus Lokietek (Elbow), even granted a privilege of trade freedom to the Ukrainian and Western merchants shipping their goods across Polish territory. But his son, King Casimir, actually gave the city of Krakow in 1354 this prerogative of an exclusive market, controlling the entire East-West commerce, and placing it entirely in Polish hands.

Eventually, the initially successful trade monopoly of Krakow had to acknowledge the growing commercial power of the city of Lviv, and to give up its pretensions, at least to some extent. With its rise to the position of a first class commercial center in the East, Lviv soon acquired a dominant position also in distributing West European merchandise to the South-East European lands. Then, after having received the stapel right, Lviv evolved into another commercial bottleneck for Orient-Occident trading, along with Krakow. The Oriental trade had never faded away completely, and it recovered in the 16th century from the previous blows, soon reaching as far as Astrakhan and Central Asia through its connecting points—Kiev, Lviv, and Krakow.

The growing commercial significance of Krakow and its discriminatory practices forced the Galician merchants to search for other routes leading to West European markets, and this produced a growing exchange between the West Ukrainian commercial cen-

ters, like Lviv, Lutsk, and Berest, and the city of Danzig (Gdansk) in Prussia. Moreover, this was an old route which, since the 13th century, had enabled the products of Ukraine to reach Western lands. Since the 15th century, however, its significance had increased considerably. Through Danzig, and then by the Baltic Sea, Galician grain, wax, skins, lumber, and other goods often went as far as Scotland, the Netherlands, Flanders, France, Spain, England, and Germany.<sup>9</sup>

Unfortunately, however, the economic rise and development of the Ukrainian town in the 16th and 17th centuries did not enrich the Ukrainian merchant, since the towns were completely overrun by foreigners. In particular, the city of Lviv was controlled exclusively by Poles and Germans; the Ukrainians were barred from participating in its commercial life. In other towns, like Lutsk, Kamianets, Sniatin, or Berest, the discrimination was less pronounced. But native merchants were soon completely overshadowed by Polish and German merchants from Lviv.<sup>10</sup> Complaints about this were of no avail.

At one time, the city of Kamianets in Podolia centered in its hands the trade with Moldavia and Wallachia. In the 15th century, the city of Lutsk in Volhinia succeeded in concentrating the trade with Poland, Lithuania, Muscovy, and the West, for the North-Western provinces. Lutsk assembled the Ukrainian produce, and by the way of Berest, Lublin, Thorn, and Danzig, delivered it to the West European markets, or shipped it to Lithuania and Byeloruthenia or through their territories and routes, to Muscovy. Lutsk, however, never having obtained the stapel right, could not rise to economic predominance like Lviv. In the cases of the cities of Lutsk and Kamianets, the merchants of Lviv captured the key positions in the market by virtue of their wealth, experience, and privileged position. The river Buh, throughout the entire period, was a most important water way for the exportation of the produce of North-West Ukraine.

In the Eastern provinces, on the other hand, the economic evolution went in an opposite direction. Thus, as an immediate consequence of the Mongol Invasion, the Ukrainian merchant engaged in international trade disappeared completely. Throughout the 14th and 15th centuries, foreign trade in East Ukraine was almost exclusively handled by foreign merchants, Armenians, Tartars, Lithuanians, Jews, Germans, Poles, Greeks, and even Italians, as the records of that period indicate.<sup>11</sup> Only some Chumack caravans traveled to supply the rural population of the Dniepr Ukraine

with some foreign necessities, like salt from the Black Sea and Azov Sea shores, spices from the Orient via the Black Sea ports, and linen.

The Invasion naturally resulted in a considerable increase in the Ukrainian-Oriental commercial exchange penetrating far into the hearts of Asia, the Middle East, Central Asia, and India, from whence Far Eastern merchandise was also brought. The Tartar, Armenian, Greek, and Caucasian merchants and merchant caravans were seen particularly in Kiev, which still remained the mercantile center of Ukraine. The Oriental merchandise, being available in the markets of East Ukraine, attracted Western merchants and their wares. However, this East-West exchange in Dniepr Ukraine never reached any large volume.

Until the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Greek trade, once so important, also was continued on a modest scale, being primarily another middleman for the Oriental merchandise coming to Ukraine. After 1453, this commercial sector declined and was replaced by the Turkish trade through the Black Sea ports, such as Kaffa (Theodosia), Trapesunt, and Suroge-Solday, and the Azov Sea ports like Tana. Of course, commercial journeys were extremely risky during the time between 1350 and 1450. Mongols frequently robbed commercial caravans, exactly as in the late years of the Kievan Empire, when the princes had to undertake military expeditions to stop the nomads who endangered the trade of the country.

In order to provide safety for the commercial routes, first the Lithuanian, and later the Polish authorities, established heavily armed forts along these mercantile ways to protect the merchants and their caravans, and at the same time, to accomplish another objective, namely, collecting the duties and taxes on all imports, exports, and transits. The foreign merchants, in order to evade this tax burden, were inclined to detour their caravans through the "wild fields" and the Cossack possessions, and there they frequently became prey of either Tartar or Cossack surprise attacks. When foreign governments complained about the lack of security in those territories under nominal Lithuanian or Polish jurisdiction, they always received the same answer: their mercantile caravans bore the full responsibility for their willful actions, since they did not travel along the guarded and secured commercial routes.<sup>12</sup>

In the 15th century, during the Mengli-Gerey's rule, the increasing intensity of the Mongol raids was reflected in a continuous



decline of the Ukrainian foreign trade in the southern sector, and, of course, in a reduction of the tariff collections. On the other hand, however, this development caused a steady rise in the Muscovite-Ukrainian commercial exchange, northwards, along the river Dniepr. Ukrainian grain and foreign transit merchandise were shipped in large quantities to the northern principality by foreign and Muscovite merchants, and to some extent, the Chumacks. The northern trade of East Ukraine went to Moscow, Novgorod the Great Pskov, and other cities and provinces of the Grand Duchy, at a gradually rising rate.

The mercantile caravans, no matter in what directions they went, were not always a legitimate business. Traveling in order to trade, they meanwhile engaged also in robberies and pillages of competitors and even of the peaceful population, often becoming in turn, victims of robbery and pillage. The story of the Western "robber-barons" repeated itself in the East, only in a slightly different version. Retardation in the growth of commerce was the result of such circumstances. Also, the stapel right, high tariffs, and other forms of trade restrictions and discriminatory measures were progressively introduced in East (Dniepr) Ukraine by the Lithuanian and Polish government presumably to assist local commercial interests, but in reality, to produce more government revenue. They hurt international trade relations to a great extent.

Eventually, by the second half of the 16th century, the sectional differences in the characteristics of the foreign trade of West and of East Ukraine faded away, as already explained, and from that time on, the country as a whole became a rapidly growing factor in European international commerce, with a growing participation of the Ukrainian ethnic element also in this increasingly profitable business.

**The Trade Routes, and the Import and Export Items.** As a matter of fact, the main trade routes and import and export items have already been mentioned in connection with the discussion of the agricultural and industrial development of Ukraine during the Lithuanian-Polish period. But to complete the coverage of the topic, a few points must be added here. Thus, in the 16th century, Kiev and the whole Dniepr Ukraine regained, at least in some part, their traditional economic significance. In particular, the city of Kiev soon excelled all other Ukrainian major cities, with the exception of Lviv, by reason of its commercial significance, and became one of the largest international markets in East Europe.<sup>13</sup>

The international routes were now definitely established, connecting Ukraine with the Western and Eastern mercantile centers. They attained an ever growing economic importance, because of grain exportation, which traveled a route from Kiev, through Rivne, Lutsk, Berest, Lenchina, and Thorn, to Danzig, and from there by the Baltic Sea to West European markets. Another route ran from Kiev and Lviv to Krakow in Poland and Breslau in Silesia, and then, to Prag in Bohemia, and Nuerenburg and Regensburg in Germany. A third customary commercial way connected Ukraine with the Baltic sea and West Europe through Sandomir, Radom, and Thorn, or through Lublin and Thorn. The rivers San and Buh, flowing into the great Polish stream, Wisla, and with the latter also to the Baltic, continued to be the main waterway for rafting lumber and grain destined for the West. Finally, still another route ran from Kiev, through Lutsk and Berest, to Lublin, Pozen, and Germany.

There were three main southern commercial routes. One connected the city of Lviv, through the city of Kamianets, with Wallachia, Moldavia, and the distant Balkan lands. The second ran from Kiev, through the left-bank Ukraine along the river Dniepr, and through the Cossack lands beyond the cataracts, to the Black Sea and Azov Sea shores, and farther, through Perekop and the Crimean Peninsula, to the city of Kaffa (Theodosia), the important market for the Oriental trade, and other large sea ports of the Black Sea basin. The third, and less important route, led southward on the right-bank of the Dniepr. The river Dniepr in its lower course was used as a commercial waterway only to a very limited degree because of the difficulty of floating the goods through the cataracts.

An eastern route led from Kiev through the Slobozhanska Ukraina, the Don-Volga basin and the city of Astrakhan, deep into Central Asia or the Caucasian lands. Two trade routes went to the northern Grand Duchy of Muscovy-Russia: one, as was pointed out before, along the upper course of the river Dniepr, the traditional way "from the Varengians to the Greeks", and the other from the left-bank Ukraine and Slobozhanschina straight northwards.<sup>14</sup>

Imports entered Ukraine in large quantities, and exports increased from one decade to another during the 16th century, because of the internal economic strength of the country. Thus, from the Orient, via Kaffa, Trapesunt, Astrakhan, Wallachia, and Moldavia, Ukraine received for her own consumption or for furthering her transit business, spices, brocades, raw silk and silk materials, jewels,

carpets, rugs, gold and silver, velvet, citrus fruit, and other luxuries. From Muscovy, mainly furs and skins, then, wax and fish were imported. From Wallachia came horses, sheep and cattle. The Hungarian economy also gave Ukraine horses, and then, wax, fish, silver, wine, and to a lesser degree, oxen and sheep. From the West (Germany, Bohemia, Flanders) came textiles, metal goods, house appliances, tools, glass and glass goods, other manufactured articles, woolen materials, linen, leather goods, and arms. From Lithuania, wax, fish, and wooden products were imported.

The contemporary records frequently mentioned and referred to the domestic and foreign merchants, to Ruthenians, Germans, Turks, Muscovites, Lithuanians, Greeks, Armenians, Poles, and Jews, and to a great variety of merchandise, which fairly well illustrates the considerable extension of the international economic connections of Ukraine at that time. Salt importation from the Crimean Peninsula and the shores of the Black and Azov Seas was probably the most ancient and the most essential business, to supplement the domestic Galician salt production. At first, immediately after the Mongol domination of those areas, the Ukrainian salt importation from the Black Sea basin declined considerably. But it recovered very soon, and the Tartars neither limited nor discriminated the salt export transaction, largely done by the Ukrainian Chumacks, probably, because of the considerable profits involved.

From the southern Black Sea steppes, an essentially Ukrainian area, but for a long time under Mongol domination, the Ukrainian economy received various products in large quantities: wax, drinking honey, meat, salt pork, skins, fish, and other produce of the hunting and fishing economy. Especially were very large quantities of fish brought from these steppes. In the 16th century, the southern towns of Ukraine developed into a monopolistic market for southern honey, which, by virtue of certain legislation, was not supposed to be exported to any other parts or provinces of the Commonwealth.<sup>15</sup>

The pattern of Ukrainian exportation changed considerably in the course of these three hundred years. In general, however, it indicated a continuous growth and upward trend, as far as its volume and variety were concerned. From the 13th until the 15th century, a slave trade and slave export still continued, primarily in East Ukraine, in which, however, the local population did not participate to any large extent. The Mongol merchants and sheiks, the Armenians, and the Greeks, taking advantage of the Mongol rule over Ukrainian territories, hunted there for slaves, and then sold them to Greece, Italy, Spain, Northern Africa, and the Near

East. The Ukrainian slaves, particularly, the female, were in great demand and highly priced.

After the Mongol rule ceased in Ukraine, frequent Tartar raids and inroads in these areas continued to supply foreign markets with Ukrainian slaves. The Ukrainian slave disappeared from West Europe after 1453, when in consequence of the Turkish conquest of Constantinople, the Occident-Orient trade exchange was broken and the Black Sea basin was, practically speaking, shut off from any direct economic connections with the West. The Turks directed this trade exclusively to the Near East, and throughout their vast territorial possessions. At the end of the 17th century, with the decline of the Mongol threat, the slave trade also faded away from Ukraine.

Grain, which had been a traditional export item for many centuries, became already at the end of the 16th century a tremendous one in the international economic transactions of the country, exceeding in value and volume any other export of the time. The Scandinavian countries, Muscovy, and Lithuania were the oldest markets for Ukrainian grain. Then, in the 15th century, the West European lands, like Scotland, Netherlands, Flanders, Germany, and to some extent also Spain, France, and England became its importers.<sup>16</sup>

It has been stressed already several times, that this intense demand for grain in West Europe, due to the growing density of population, produced some most fundamental, constitutional change in the social and economic life of Ukraine. First of all, the growth of serfdom and of commercialized farming came as a result of it. The new trends in the Ukrainian economy actually affected all areas of the country, even the most remote and distant, and at the end of the 16th century, literally every Ukrainian province, except Polesia, exported grain by land, through Lublin, Thorn, and Danzig, and by water, via the rivers Buh and Wisla. In consequence of that enormous Western demand for Ukrainian grain, its prices rose incredibly, by 100 or more per cent.<sup>17</sup>

The contemporary records indicated very large export quantities of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and buckwheat. From the four most western and least fertile Ukrainian provinces, Krasnostav, Kholm, Luboml, and Horodlo, alone, in 1564 there were exported 331 lashts of rye, 270 lashts of oats, 50 lashts of wheat, 51 of barley, and 21 of buckwheat.<sup>18</sup> For other districts there are available some sporadic quantitative reports about grain production and grain exportation, but there are no comprehensive statistics in this matter.

Cattle export was, perhaps, the second most important branch of the Ukrainian foreign trade. The large toll and tariff collections from the cattle drives and sales indicated clearly the scale and the extent of the transactions. The so-called Urban and Territorial Acts and certain other documents of the time relate extensively about the volume of cattle and horse exportation.<sup>19</sup>

As it was pointed out before, cattle trails were strictly prescribed and regulated and enforced, for reasons of health and government revenue. These trails ran from the city of Lviv, as a main assembly place, through Horodok, Peremishl, and Sandomir, to Krakow; and also from Lutsk, through Lublin and Radom. Cattle exportation was exclusively in the hands of the subjects of the Polish crown, and the foreigners were practically eliminated from that business. Along with cattle export, meat and meat products were also supplied by Ukraine to the Western markets.

Fish exportation achieved a very considerable extent, too, since there was a great demand for that product also in the West. The noblemen and the merchant patricians constructed and maintained large artificial lakes and pools, where fish were raised in large quantities, exclusively for export purposes. Although, according to the foreign visitors, the construction of these artificial lakes and ponds was very primitive in Ukraine, as compared with West European techniques, this deficiency did not seem to affect the volume of the export business. Some lakes produced annually as much as 500 to 1000 guildens of income. Fish exportation, the center of which again was the city of Lviv, remained under very strict municipal controls, as far as qualities and price were concerned. Sturgeons were considered to be the most valuable fish, and so they were highly priced--more than 100 per cent above the value of the less sought fish, like carp and teneth.

Also, the produce of the Ukrainian forest economy maintained an important position in international trading, of which wood, fur, and skins were the leading products. Of course, furs and skins were supplied by the southern steppe areas, as well, but to a lesser degree. Foreign merchants from Germany and Prussia, in particular negotiated contracts with the administrators of the royal possessions and the nobles in order to secure a regular supply of wood for ship building, house construction, barrel manufacturing, and furniture production in the West. The price of wood was greatly differentiated according to its quality and purpose. Wood was transported to Danzig mainly by water ways--the rivers Buh, San, and Wisla. It was prepared and sorted at assembly places, or

shipped to Danzig indiscriminately, and once there, it was sorted for further exportation overseas. In the 16th century, the European demand for wood became so great that deforestation was threatened. The government had to intervene.

Fur and skin exportation, once a leading component of Ukraine's foreign commerce, experienced a continuous decline throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. Of course, both items were exchanged in Ukraine, but they were largely matter for transit operations. Imported primarily from Muscovy, furs and skins, martens, beavers, squirrels, sables, foxes, and muskrats, were then re-exported to European markets. Finally, wax and honey were also exported in considerable quantities. Especially wax was in great demand abroad. The Lithuanian government even planned establishing a public monopoly of wax to secure for itself all the pecuniary benefits to be derived from this lucrative trade. This monopoly did not succeed, but large tariff levies were collected for the fisc. The wax business was under most strict control by the municipal and federal governments, in order to maintain the good name of the product in its foreign market. Hundreds of local merchants and country noblemen were exporting wax, from two to five stones of wax each.<sup>20</sup> Not only the domestic Ukrainian wax was exported, but there was also a large transit trade of Wallachian, southern, and Muscovite wax passing through West Ukraine to the West European markets for production of candles and soap.

**Finance.** Once absorbed by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Ukraine was incorporated into the Polish-Lithuanian monetary and fiscal system. A detailed analysis of this system has no place in the socio-economic history of the Ukrainian people, since all monetary and fiscal establishments and institutions of that time in Ukraine were elements of foreign origin. The subject will be discussed only in general terms, and insofar as it affected the economic life of the Ukrainian society in those days. The financial affairs in Ukraine will be treated in two parts: (1) the monetary organization, and (2) the fiscal activities of government revenue collecting and disbursements.

The monetary system of the Commonwealth was weak and poorly organized. Consequently, Ukraine had many unfortunate experiences with it. In particular, the inflation of the Polish monetary unit adversely affected Ukrainian economic interests. Until the 15th century, the basic monetary unit in Poland was the so-called

“grosh,” which may be translated as “penny.” In order to get at least some approximate conception of the value of the Polish grosh (penny), the following price list in the year 1580 may serve as an indication:

average daily wage for an artisan	1 penny
daily pay for an infantryman	1 ¼ pennies
daily pay for a cavalryman	2 pennies
a carp	1 penny
a sturgeon	2 pennies
a carload of wood	7 ½ pennies
a jar of wine	45 pennies
a hundredweight of wheat	50 pennies
a head of sugar	180 pennies 21

Prior to the 15th century the so-called “sexageneas,” the equivalent of 60 pennies, and “marks,” equal to 48 pennies, were in circulation. But in the 15th century, a “gulden” of 30 pennies value was generally accepted as a basic currency of a higher grade in order to match it with the value of the Hungarian gulden, the most popular gold money in Poland at that time. The Polish gulden, however, soon began to suffer a decline in purchasing power and it could not be considered as equal to the Hungarian unit which, on the contrary, enjoyed a consistently rising purchasing power. Thus, when at the end of the 15th century both gulden, the Polish and the Hungarian, called “red,” contained 30 pennies, already, in 1526, 40 pennies were paid for the Hungarian red gulden; in 1545, 50; about 1600, 58; in 1611, 70; in 1662, 180; and in 1676 about 360 pennies. During the same time, the Polish gulden was equal to only 20 pennies or less. The Polish gulden depreciated catastrophically compared to the Hungarian golden currency unit.<sup>22</sup> This fact must have upset the country’s economy. Not only did the Polish currency circulate in Ukraine, but numerous other kinds of foreign money, Hungarian, German, Muscovite, Lithuanian, Italian, and even French. This profusion came as a result of increasing foreign trade and a relatively free circulation of gold and silver, which were generally identified with wealth in those days. Besides, the national governments were unable to exclude foreign monetary units from domestic markets, and to enforce at home the circulation of only national currencies.

Inflation in Europe was general between 1500 and 1640, but the

depreciation in value of the Polish gulden was extraordinary. It was caused by many factors, such as enormous economic progress in the West, and the increasing velocity of money circulation, malpractices in coinage, and the general trend of bad money putting good money out of the market.

First of all, various rulers, in order to increase their fiscal revenues, frequently called heavy and valuable coins in for retirement, and subsequently issued lighter and less valuable coins with the same face value. The metal saved represented a direct gain for the fisc or the private royal or ducal chamber. The people and the economy suffered, particularly from a flood of debased currency. Moreover, this cheap money became useless as a standard of value.

During the 16th and 17th centuries another monetary phenomenon was noticed, which economists call "Gresham's Law," and which contributed directly to further inflation. The governments of Europe discovered that less valuable money has a tendency to drive the more valuable money out of circulation. The people simply hoarded gold and silver coins, using only coins of cheaper alloys for current transactions. Consequently, the national governments, as well as the Polish-Lithuanian regime, began to issue cheaper currencies to prevent hoarding and to enable exchange to thrive, and finally, to enforce the circulation of the national money by keeping good foreign coins away from the home markets.<sup>23</sup>

Run-away inflation in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was the result. The gentry complained, and the artisans and merchants were suspected of unfair money and price speculation. At first, the gentry requested the local authorities to interfere, and to regulate or fix prices. This step was taken, but with no success. So Parliament undertook to legislate prices and to stop speculation several times after 1620. According to contemporary records, merchants and artisans plainly refused to cooperate.<sup>24</sup> A black market developed in which secret connections were necessary to buy goods at high prices. Accordingly, as Szelagowski said, the government had to abandon all price fixing by 1648.

On the other hand, the foreign currencies were still better, and through foreign trade this good money could be obtained and could benefit Polish subjects, gentry and townspeople. Thus, at the beginning of the 16th century, in order to preserve all the benefits of foreign trade and to acquire good foreign coins for his own subjects, the Polish king attempted to close the borders. This meant the surrender of all foreign commerce to Polish nationals, merchants and noblemen, and an exclusion of foreign merchants from



handling the import, export, transit, shipping and retailing in the towns and countryside of the Commonwealth. Eventually, this attempt was also unsuccessful.

Credit was extensively used in Ukraine in the 16th and 17th centuries, primarily in commercial operations, and to a lesser degree, in farming and manufacturing. A simple mercantile credit was very popular, where goods were bought and sold on terms of deferred payment. Also, lending on promissory notes and simple forms of bills of exchange, a mercantile custom brought from the West, was extensively done by rich merchants, goldsmiths, and noblemen. The credit business was in the hands of Armenians, Germans and Jews. The interest rates varied greatly. The average legal rate was about seven per cent per annum, but wherever the risk was great and the borrower either unknown or unreliable, the rate might have been 12 to 15 per cent.

The interest charges on loans to municipalities or governments were considerably higher, because their record of responsibility was usually poor. Lending money was a profitable business, even when legally done, but lending on usurious terms, at an excessive and illegal rate of interest, was, of course, exceedingly lucrative. These rates went as high as 100, 200, and even up to 2,000 per cent or more. The heavy penalties for usury did not stop that kind of morally objectionable business, because of the great demand for capital and a scarce supply of loanable funds.<sup>25</sup> In the latter period, monasteries, churches, and merchant and craft guilds also engaged in the legal loan business.

The public economy of the Commonwealth was badly organized. There was no division of the fisc, a strictly state treasury, and the private royal treasury until 1590. Because of this, confusion existed in collecting public revenues and making disbursements, with adverse effects on the country's economy. In 1590, the Parliament initiated reform by assigning certain public incomes exclusively to the fisc, like revenues from public estates, called "royalties," export and import duties, and the revenue from the government mint.<sup>26</sup> The king received the revenues from public estates, called "economies," some salt mines, transportation tax collections, and income from certain monopolies, land tax collections, coronation tribute, and other minor incomes. The trend toward separation of the fisc from the royal treasury was apparent already in the 16th century when, in 1569 and 1590, some reforms were undertaken for this purpose. The process was completed much later.<sup>27</sup>

The state and royal landed estates, which had for a long time been the most important source of public revenues, were poorly administered, resulting in a need for additional taxes. Since the tax burden was borne principally by the peasantry and townspeople, additional taxes always resulted in a new hardship for the masses. Sometimes even the nobles had to pay more levies, thus the idea of reforms in the management of public property was always acute and urgent.

The landed estates, mills, sawmills, and other public possessions were administered by leases to private persons for rents and non-tax contributions, or pawned by private capitalists for money loans, which were given to the king or the fisc. The supervision of the management of all such public property was in the hands of a federal official (starosta) who was compensated by a portion of the rental collections and certain manorial possessions which were left for his own personal use. The kings lavishly disbursed these estates among the nobles for their services to them and to the country, or pawned them excessively to get cash. This practice considerably decreased public revenues and impelled additional taxation, so despised by the gentry.

To improve the situation, the Parliament intervened by restricting the royal practices of lavish grants and willful pawning of public property. In this way it sought to prevent speculation by the nobles and to halt the rapid decline of public revenue. Since 1496, and even more since 1504, the consent of Parliament was required for any granting, leasing, or pawning of public possessions. In reality, however, the reforms remained a theory only, and the kings thereafter, as well as before, dealt abusively with those royalties and economies.<sup>28</sup> This was true not only with regard to the landed possessions, but also with respect to the royal salt mines, aluminum and silver sales, and other monopolistic rights of the king or the state.

In 1547, the Lithuanian government attempted to introduce a fiscal forest monopoly, including exploitation and importation of wood, potash, tar, and ashes. A considerable public revenue and the prevention of forest devastation were expected as a result of this move. But five years later, in 1552, under the pressure of the nobles, the monopoly principle was broken, allowing the gentry to continue its forest economy freely. In 1561, an experiment was also undertaken by the Grand Duke to establish a comprehensive salt monopoly for all the provinces of the Grand Duchy, but also without success.<sup>29</sup>

The tax system of the Commonwealth was neither better nor

worse than in West Europe at the same time. It was not well developed, it was uneven and discriminatory, poorly assessed and even more poorly administered. The major tax burden was borne by the peasants and townspeople, while nobles were largely exempt. Until the first half of the 15th century, the traditional Kievan tax system prevailed, extremely outdated, of course, with all of its direct and indirect state levies. Then the Lithuanian rulers introduced some modifications, and from that time on, a general tax, called tribute, prevailed, being paid in money and in kind. It was supposed to be a visible indication of the dependence of the subjects upon the Grand Duke of Lithuania.

Later the tribute was transferred to the treasury collections of the individual land dukes where it remained until abolished by the Polish tax system. In addition, an annual tax, the Horde levy, was generally applied to enable the local princes to make gifts to the Khan of the Golden Horde.<sup>30</sup>

With the penetration of the Polish social and political order into the economic life of Ukraine, the Polish tax system introduced deep changes into the country's public economy. The process was gradual, of course. The federal government of the Commonwealth progressively lost the ordinary and direct taxes and court charges, in favor of the growing dominal and patrimonial authority of the gentry. On the other hand, the Ukrainian nobility, acquiring step-by-step the status and prerogatives of the privileged class, were freed from the general tax burden which was then confined to the townspeople and peasants. The tax exemption of the gentry, together with other Polish institutions, was introduced in Galicia in 1430, in Volhinia in 1509, in Podolia in 1507, and in Kiev in 1529.

Direct taxes, where shifting of the tax burden had not been foreseen, were divided into two classes, the ordinary and the extraordinary taxes. The ordinary taxes were an established practice throughout the centuries, and frequently they were also paid by the nobles. The land tax, the chief form of this type of levy, was initiated at the rate of two pennies per acre. It increased, however, with inflation, up to twenty, thirty and more pennies. The tax was paid by all classes of society, including the gentry and clergy. Also, in case of an emergency or prolonged need, some ordinary taxes were introduced for a short period of time, and then reintroduced, if necessary. These taxes were also paid by all social strata; therefore, they could be introduced only by the Parliament and with the consent of all the nobility. The king did not have the

right to impose new taxes. Two forms of a station tax were paid by the churches, monasteries, cloisters, municipalities, and the Jewish population. It replaced the ancient transportation and maintenance contributions rendered by the population to the traveling king and his court. The fourth, and the last type of ordinary taxation, was the traditional capitation levy, paid by the Jewish population for its legal and administrative protection as the *servi camerae*.

The extraordinary direct taxes were levied irregularly, more from case to case, or were designed for certain specific ends, like the quarta tax. The so-called levy (pobor) was the principal tax of its kind. It was in the nature of a surtax at a relatively high rate, levied over and above the regular land tax, and paid exclusively by the peasantry and never by the gentry. Its initial rate was twelve pennies per acre of land, but because of the money depreciation and the growing needs of the state, the rate also increased up to one gulden. Not only landed possessions, but also water mills, sawmills, windmills, tenants, and village domestic craftsmen, had to pay the levy.

A kind of municipal equivalent of the levy was the so-called "shos." At first, the shos was really a local municipal taxation for the needs of the town, levied in accordance with the values of real estate, personal property, financial transactions, and volume of business. Since the middle of the 14th century, however, the federal government began to collect it, too, and the townspeople had to pay the shos at two levels, local-municipal and federal.

Once, in 1520, a capitation was raised from the entire population of the Commonwealth. The churches, monasteries, cloisters, and other religious communities paid the so-called *subsidium charitativum* to finance charities. The Orthodox Church in addition to the *subsidium* also had to pay a special tax of a discriminatory character. Then, as a remnant of the old times, the general population was obliged to render various tax-like services, such as construction of castles, bridges, forts, and highways, and transportation for the royal court and royal envoys.<sup>31</sup>

In 1563, a strictly fiscal and regular tax, the so-called quarta, was introduced as a complete innovation. The tax was collected from the royal possessions only. Practically speaking, the king had to contribute one-fourth (quarta) of his income from landed possessions to defray the costs of maintaining some standing army. In theory, all the possessors and lessees' of the royal economies had to pay the quarta levy.<sup>32</sup> Also, in the 17th century, additional

**"case-to-case" extraordinary and temporary taxes were adopted to defray the rising costs of maintaining the government. The nobility rarely paid these additional levies.**

**The indirect, shiftable taxes, in the form of excises, customs duties, sales taxes, and consumption levies, prevailed throughout the entire Polish-Lithuanian period. The nobles were largely exempt from paying the indirect taxes, and so their financial burden was borne solely by the lower classes of society. Excises and consumption taxes were levied against the sale and use of alcoholic beverages, honey, wax, textiles, groats, molasses, and many other products. Market operations were charged with some kind of business tax. Duties were imposed on exportation, importation, and transit transactions. All kinds of tolls were raised from the use of bridges, highways, or passages. Customs and toll collections were administered by special officials, called birches. Fees, license charges, and in particular, court charges, as the non-tax receipts, completed the picture of the public revenues of the Commonwealth.**

**Maintenance of the royal court, maintenance of standing armed forces, and provision for diplomatic relations with foreign powers were the three classifications of public expenditures. The costs of internal administration, education and schooling, police protection, and charities, were not within the scope of government expenditures out of tax and non-tax receipts. Therefore, the tax and non-tax receipts, from the viewpoint of the Ukrainian political and national interest, represented a direct form of economic exploitation of Ukraine by the Polish occupational regime. For these collections were used to maintain the Polish government, and little was spent by Warsaw to benefit the Ukrainian people, either socially, culturally, or economically.<sup>33</sup>**

**PART IV**

**THE COSACKO-HETMANIC PERIOD (1648-1781)**

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### POLITICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

**Political developments - Ethnic and social changes -  
Cossacks - Nobility - Peasantry - Townspeople -  
Foreigners - Eastern and southern frontiers - West  
Ukraine**

**Political Developments.** As was pointed out in previous sections of this analysis, the socio-political phenomenon of the Cossacks began to develop in Ukraine in the course of the 15th century. With the growth of their military power, the prevailing Ukrainian Cossacks soon began to dream of separating Ukraine from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This ambition was closely related to the religious and social issues of the times. The ethnocentrism of the Ukrainian people, particularly the Cossacks, was not too pronounced as long as national oppression was not too ruthless. But conditions soon changed.

At the beginning of the 16th century, the Cossack Host was organized in the South of Ukraine, beyond the cataracts of the river Dniepr, as a separate political-military order under the nominal supremacy of the Polish kings.<sup>1</sup> From its earliest days, however, the Host identified itself as a leading political factor in the national life of the Ukrainian people; it was the champion of their cause and the defender of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Its constitution was democratic, with a Supreme Cossack Council as its chief legislative and administrative authority, and a Chief Commander, endowed with broad powers. On the other hand, throughout the entire southern Ukraine, in her towns and villages and on her farms, the "civilian (horodovi) Cossacks," led by a Hetman, developed into a separate social class with an obligation to provide military service to the king. The civilian Cossacks were very loyal to Ukrainian traditions and the Orthodox faith, and refused to be polonized, unlike the aristocratic stratum of Ukrainian society. These Cossacks may be considered as a new upper class, assigned to replace the denationalized gentry. There were close social connections between the civilian Cossacks and the Cossack Host beyond the cataracts, although their political status differed. The younger generation of the civilian Cossacks usually joined the Host for a number of years to be educated in military science.

As long as the traditions of the Lithuanian-Ruthenian (Ukrainian) Commonwealth prevailed, the Ukrainian people in general and the Cossack stratum in particular showed loyalty and cooperation to the king and the legitimate government. The Cossacks actively participated in the military projects of the Commonwealth, in its wars with the Turks, Tartars and Muscovites. And the Cossack Host alone waged a war against the Mohammedans which lasted for decades.

The dissatisfaction and opposition of the Ukrainian people progressively increased, however, because of the constant penetration of Polish institutions, and the growing national and religious discrimination against the Ukrainian ethnic element on the part of the Poles. The incorporation of East Ukraine by the Polish Crown in 1568, on the very eve of the Union of Lublin, gave an immediate rise to open hostilities between both strata of Cossacks and the Polish regime. The first Ukrainian Cossack uprising broke out in 1591 under the leadership of Christopher Kosinsky. It initiated a new period in the history of Ukraine, marked by a series of Ukrainian-Polish military conflicts, led by various Cossack chiefs, like Nalyvaiko, Kishka, Triasilo, Pavluk and Ostrainin. Its ultimate goal was the overthrow of Polish rule. Finally, the Great National Revolutionary War of 1648-49, headed by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, brought a major defeat to the Polish armies in a number of battles and restored an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state by the Treaty of Zboriv in 1649.

The new Ukrainian political organization was at first called the "State of Cossack Host," and later, the "Hetmanic State." It never extended over the entire Ukrainian ethnic territory, although for a short time it included some Byeloruthenian districts in the north. Its western borders ran along the rivers Murakhva, in Podolia, and Horin, in Volhinia, leaving Carpatho-Ukraine in Hungarian control, and Galicia and West Volhinia in Polish hands. Its eastern borders were identical with the old Polish-Russian frontiers, leaving the newly colonized Sloboda Ukraine under the nominal rule of the Muscovite Grand Duchy. Furthermore, the traditional territory of the Host, beyond the cataracts, did not constitute an integral part of the Ukrainian state, but remained only in a somewhat vassal relationship to it.

Thus, approximately one-third of the Ukrainian ethnographical area was outside the new Ukrainian state. The Ukrainian national government, headed by a Hetman and a Supreme Council, was a constitutional hybrid, where monarchistic and republican elements



were interwoven. The two principles struggled for supremacy all through the entire Cossacko-Hetmanic era.

Some Hetmans, like Vyhovsky and Doroshenko, acknowledged the authority of the Council, and by so doing, accepted the republican principle, while others, like Khmelnytsky, Samoilovich and Mazepa, clearly and openly championed the monarchistic principle, paying no attention to the Supreme Council.

It seems that during the later period of Hetmanic rule, the monarchistic principle prevailed. The new Ukrainian state, surrounded and threatened by powerful enemies, like Poland, Muscovy and Turkey, urgently needed a strong and stable monarchial rule. It is no wonder, therefore, that the tendencies to establish a hereditary monarchy either in the Khmelnytsky, Mazepa or Rozumovsky family were strong among the patriotic Cossack ranks. The tendency was not materialized, however, because of Russian intrigues. Moscow, and later on St. Petersburg, preferred eventually to incorporate Ukraine into the Russian empire rather than to have a powerful independent Ukraine as a neighbor.<sup>2</sup>

The Cossacko-Hetmanic state was exhausted by the prolonged wars against the Polish Crown. Moreover, because the permanent threat of foreign aggression failed to subside, Ukraine had to seek some powerful alliance to protect its national independence. Since the Poles, Turks and Crimean Tartars were hardly acceptable as allies because of recent hostilities and traditional animosities, the Grand Duchy of Muscovy was a natural, albeit fateful choice. After prolonged negotiations, the so-called Pereyaslav Treaty was signed between Ukraine and Muscovy on January 8, 1654.

The agreement opened another era in Ukrainian history, this time featuring a growing interference by the Muscovite-Russians in the domestic affairs of the Ukrainian nation. Although the original text of the Treaty has been lost, its essence has been transmitted by two later copies, and it can also be reconstructed from similar subsequent negotiations between Ukraine and Muscovy. The agreement consisted of the following important articles. First, the Cossacko-Hetman state retained complete independence and autonomy in its domestic (in particular, financial) affairs, and freedom in international negotiations and treaties. The Ukrainian government was supposed only to notify the Czar about its diplomatic relations. Second, Ukraine recognized the Czar of Muscovy as her suzerain, and promised to pay him a tribute as a visible sign of her vassal relationship. The Czar, on his part, guaranteed to respect the ancient rights, privileges and customs of the people of Ukraine and

their individual classes, and to refrain from interfering in their domestic affairs. Third, Ukraine was to remain under the rule of a Hetman, elected for life. Fourth, some other miscellaneous items such as the size of the Ukrainian armed forces, stationing Russian troops on the Ukrainian border and Russian diplomatic representation were foreseen and regulated in the treaty.

Legally, the Pereyaslav agreement established a vassalage-protectorate relationship between Muscovy as a suzerain, and Ukraine as a vassal nation. That type of international legal relationship was prevalent in the Middle Ages, as well as in the 19th century. Russian historiography, which attempted to justify the Russian annexation of Ukraine on the basis of Pereyaslav, gave another interpretation of that treaty. Thus, for example, Nolde, Rosenfeldt and Odinez interpreted Pereyaslav as an absolute and complete subjugation of Ukraine to the authority of the Czar, by which Ukraine voluntarily gave up her political independence and was incorporated into the Muscovite Grand Duchy. Sergeyevich interpreted the treaty as a personal union, while Diakonov and Popov saw in Pereyaslav the elements of a real union.

None of these views can be substantiated either by the content of the agreement, or by later political developments. In order to get hold of Ukraine, Moscow crammed down her throat other agreements in the years 1657, 1665, 1669 and later, which progressively contradicted the Treaty of Pereyaslav of 1654, and which restricted the freedom of Ukraine. The interpretation of Pereyaslav as a vassalage-protectorate relationship, giving guarantees of a separate Ukrainian statehood, was supported by Korkunov, a Russian historian, and the Ukrainian historians, Hrushevsky, Yakovliv, Lyashchenko and Lypinsky, as well as the Byeloruthenian scholar-Okinshevich.<sup>3</sup>

Immediately after the signing of the treaty, various political difficulties began to mount up because both sides interpreted its nature, extent and ends differently. The Ukrainian side, and in particular, Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, desired first of all a loose alliance to strengthen its own political position. At any rate, Khmelnytsky continued as a sovereign ruler to negotiate freely with Turkey, Sweden and Transylvania without asking the Czar for permission. His sovereign rights in domestic affairs were unquestioned.

The Russians, however, from the very beginning considered the agreement of Pereyaslav to be the prologue to the ultimate domination of Ukraine. They agreed initially to all kinds of concessions

in order to establish a "political" bridgehead in Ukraine as a part of their long-range imperialistic ambitions in southeastern Europe and the Middle East. But soon they started to violate one article of the treaty after another. The Czar unlawfully sent more and more troops to control Ukrainian towns and began to collect taxes, to interfere with local administration, to settle Russian colonists throughout the country and to make land grants.

All these activities were in direct contradiction to the content and spirit of the Pereyaslav agreement. Hetman Khmelnytsky and the Cossack hierarchy soon understood the gravity of their error in forming an alliance with Muscovy, and began to prepare a war to dissolve the unequal partnership. Khmelnytsky's sudden death in 1656 postponed an open break between the two nations, but not for long. Two years later in Hadiach a new Hetman, Ivan Vyhovsky, negotiated with Poland a treaty according to which Ukraine, under the name of the "Ruthenian Grand Duchy," entered as a third party a federation with the Polish Crown and the Lithuanian Grand Duchy. The federation was to be a union of three nations with one king and one parliament, but with ethnic autonomy maintained and assured.<sup>4</sup> Although the union did not materialize because of Polish laxity, it was immediately followed by a Ukrainian-Russian war which ended in a splendid victory for Ukrainian arms in the battle of Konotop, on July 8, 1659. The Pereyaslav Treaty was abrogated, at least symbolically, and for a short time Russian pressure was relaxed.

But Warsaw and Moscow, although enemies for centuries, found a common objective in suppressing Ukrainian statehood and Ukrainian ethnic autonomy. In 1667 they signed a treaty in Andrusov which divided their sphere of interest in Ukraine, the right bank of the river Dniepr going to Poland and the left bank territories going to Russia. As a result of Andrusov, the temporary division of the Ukrainian state into two political organisms, the right-bank and the left-bank Hetmanates, which existed provisionally since 1663, became an established fact for years.<sup>5</sup> Several times Polish and Russian diplomatic intrigues induced civil wars between these two Hetmanic states until Hetman Ivan Mazepa succeeded in reuniting Ukraine into one political organism during the Northern War. But this reunification, accomplished in 1704, did not last long.

Russian interference in the domestic and foreign affairs of the Ukrainian state was sharply increased by such means as extortion, suppression, bribery and forging the original articles of the Pereyaslav agreement of 1654. The most notorious were the so-called

**"Articles of Hlukhiv,"** which considerably limited the autonomy of Ukraine. Finally the insincerity of Czar Peter I induced Ivan Mazepa to sign an alliance with Charles XII of Sweden, and to join the anti-Russian forces in the Northern War, 1700-1721. Unfortunately for Ukraine, however, King Charles and Hetman Mazepa were defeated by the Russian armies in the Battle of Poltava in 1709. As a result, Russian pressure on Ukrainian political autonomy was gravely intensified, and Ukraine's internal and external affairs became largely subordinate to the authority of St. Petersburg.

Immediately afterwards, in 1722, Peter the Great established in Ukraine a new institution, the "Little Russian College," composed of Russians and Ukrainians, to rule along with the Hetman. The term "Little Russia" was officially introduced to replace the traditional names, "Ruthenia" or "State of Cossack Host." This step was taken in order to create an artificial impression of national unity between the Russians, called "Great Russians" from this time on, and the "Ukrainians, renamed "Little Russians." In this way, also, St. Petersburg hoped to suppress the tradition of Ukrainian political autonomy.

After the death of Mazepa's successor, Ivan Skoropadsky, Peter opposed the election of a new Hetman. After Peter's death, the office of Hetman was restored but with severe restrictions in its functions. Daniel Apostol became Hetman under the most adverse circumstances. In violation of all the articles of the original Treaty of Pereyaslav, the Russians carried out an intensive colonization of Ukraine by Russian and other foreign ethnic elements, restricted the traditional class freedoms of the common Cossack, and exploited the economy. Foreign colonization was encouraged by St. Petersburg as a stanchion of the growing Russian rule in Ukraine, and the Cossacks were discriminated against as the most resolute and energetic defenders of Ukrainian interests.

Apostol had to move several times against the illegal actions of the Russian officials who tried to place the Cossacks in bondage or to deny them the personal freedom and private property rights which they had enjoyed for centuries. The Hetman acted as a supreme legislative authority by means of edicts and universals, such as the universal of November 29, 1727, and he performed the administrative functions of stopping abuses and protecting the shadow of Ukrainian autonomy.

In 1728, Apostol negotiated with the czar the "Deciding Articles," which redefined the autonomous status of Ukraine. These

were immediately violated by St. Petersburg through the illegal use of Ukrainian armed forces in the war against Poland. After Apostol's death in 1734 there was again no Hetman for sixteen years. The government resided in the hands of the "Hetman's Cabinet," composed of both Russians and Ukrainians to facilitate the penetration of Russian influence. The last Hetman of Ukraine, Ciril Rozumovsky, served the Ukrainian cause well. He did everything possible to secure political autonomy, to develop the culture, and to improve the economy.

In 1764, St. Petersburg abolished the Hetmanic office and re-introduced the "Little Russian College" as the supreme autonomous authority. In 1775, Empress Catherine the Great, as the champion of Russian centralism, ordered the liquidation of that symbol of Ukrainian military power and national unity, the Cossack Host beyond the Dniepr cataracts. This objective was achieved in a bloody military operation carried out by the Russian General Tekeley. Finally, in 1781, the amalgamation of Ukraine into the Russian Empire was accomplished. The Ukrainian administrative system was abolished and replaced by direct Russian rule. Twelve years later, in 1793, the right-bank Ukraine was also annexed by Russia as a consequence of the Second Partition of Poland.<sup>6</sup>

**Ethnic and Social Changes.** After 1648, the year of the National Revolution, significant and fundamental changes took place in the ethnic and social composition of Ukraine. The abolition of Polish rule in most of the Ukrainian territories, the creation of the Ukrainian nation-state and, subsequently, the growing influence of the Muscovite-Russians in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries altered the ethnic and social structure of the nation. It has already been indicated that the new political organism, the Cossacko-Hetmanic state did not extend over the entire ethnographical area of the Ukrainian people. Thus, the ethnic and social process developed somewhat differently in various parts of that area. As a matter of fact, three distinct areas could be differentiated: the Cossacko-Hetmanic state, West Ukraine, and the so-called Sloboda (Village) Ukraine.

Hetmanic Ukraine, including the vassal area of the Cossack Host, extended over approximately two-thirds of the Ukrainian ethnic territory. There the essentially Ukrainian cultural patterns predominated, although Russian influences increased constantly, especially following the Poltava defeat. The right-bank Ukraine, where the Cossack rule did not last as long, and where Polish rule

was soon restored, had a slightly different historical development which included greater Polish influences. West Ukraine, Galicia, Volhinia, Podlesia and Kholm, westward from the Murakhva and Horin rivers, were constantly under Polish rule from 1349 to 1793-1795, the time of the Second and Third Partitions of Poland. There old Polish social and legal traits prevailed, and the Ukrainian western frontiers shrank under the pressure of Polish discrimination and colonial policies. There the Polish and foreign ethnic elements increased in numbers and continued to be the privileged segment of the population. The Ukrainians, as before, both Orthodox and Uniate Catholics, were socially, economically and above all politically discriminated against. The denationalization of the upper class of the Ukrainian gentry progressed speedily.

In Sloboda Ukraine, a province on the banks of the rivers Donets and Don remaining under the political supremacy of the Muscovite Grand Duchy, the ethnical and social processes were again quite different. First of all, it was a colonization of a virtual vacuum, of the "wild fields," under close care of the Czars who required their officials (voyevodes) not only to avoid harming but also to protect the incoming Cherkasins (Ukrainians). The settlers enjoyed extensive freedom and autonomy until these were curbed by Peter the Great.<sup>7</sup> Although the Russian government planned by this settlement policy to make its rule in these areas more profitable and more effective, in fact in about a century and a half the Ukrainian character of that territory was established and the Ukrainian ethnical area thereby was greatly increased. Village Ukraine was never under the rule of the Hetmans, although plans for its incorporation were nursed by Khmelnytsky, Samoilovich and Mazepa.

In the Cossacko-Hetmanic state of this era some basic ethnic changes took place. First of all, the National Revolution wiped out the Polish element. Most of the Polish and the polonized gentry and the Polish colonists left Ukraine, were liquidated or accepted the Orthodox religion and declared themselves to be Ukrainians. Especially numerous old Ukrainian noble families who were polonized remembered their national heritage, sometimes even to the point of giving up Catholicism and returning to the nationality and faith of their ancestors. Also, a part of the foreign colonists still loyal to the Polish regime left Ukraine to avoid the hostility of the Ukrainians.

Consequently, the Cossacko-Hetmanic state was in its first years almost exclusively Ukrainian, except its northern provinces, parts of the Starodub and Chernihiv regimental districts, which

were populated by Byeloruthenians. Later on, however, the foreign element increased considerably in Ukraine because of an intensive colonization of the devastated areas during the wars. The program of internal colonization was sponsored by various Hetmans, especially Samoilovich, Mazepa and Apostol. The settlers, however, were not only Ukrainians, but also Russians, Poles, Serbs, Lithuanians, Walachians, Tartars, Czechs and Germans. Some Polish nobles returned, offering their loyalty and services to the Ukrainian government. The officials welcomed this development, but the lower strata of the population viewed it with distaste. The issue of Polish resettlement was the cause of the defeat of the political plans of Hetman Vyhovsky and his Union of Hadiach.

German settlers were recruited from mercenaries, at first in the Polish, then later in the Ukrainian service. The Tartars were settled largely as war prisoners. With the progress of time, these foreign colonial elements denationalized, and they were either Ukrainianized, like the Tartars, Walachians and Serbs, or Russianized like the Poles and Germans. Foreigners were absorbed into various classes of Ukrainian society: the gentry, the lower and upper strata of the Cossacks, the peasants and the townspeople. Numerous foreign names among the Ukrainians indicated this process of assimilation. The Jewish population was also subject to a gradual Ukrainization. The families Moscowitz, Markowitz, Herzig, and Krishanivsky were Jewish, and the families of Hetman Apostol of Walachian, and of General Orlik of Byeloruthenian descent.

After the Poltava defeat, the influx of the Russian ethnic element increased rapidly. The Russian government, systematically preparing a final incorporation of its Ukrainian satellite, enthusiastically sponsored Russian settlements all over that country. On the other hand, the Hetmans, and in particular, Apostol, made every effort possible to retard the growing colonization.<sup>8</sup> Muscovite settlers invaded Ukrainian towns and villages; they slowly penetrated the aristocracy, especially after the Samoilovich era. Russian officials and nobles were granted large landed estates all over Ukraine as a reward for military or administrative services rendered to the Czars and the Russian cause.

This trend was most energetically supported by Czar Peter the Great, even prior to the decisive Poltava battle. These Russian newcomers soon began to abuse their social position, attempting to increase the burden of bondage of the peasants, and later, to turn the common Cossacks into serfs. Only the "Old-believers" among the Russian settlers in Ukraine were really welcomed. These were

religious refugees who emigrated to northern Ukraine rather than submit to certain Russian Orthodox Church reforms. Accordingly, they were very loyal to the Ukrainian government and never supported the penetration of the Czarist regime in Ukraine. In 1781 a vigorous attempt to Russianize the Ukrainian upper classes was initiated.

The National Revolution of 1648-1649, and the creation of the Ukrainian national state deeply affected the social processes of the Ukrainian people, but these events cannot be considered a real social revolution. It is true that the majority of the older Ukrainian historians, like Hrushevsky, Efimenko, Slabchenko and others more or less influenced by socialistic doctrines, were inclined to see in the events of the 17th century in Ukraine a prologue to the social-democratic developments of the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. They interpreted these as a resolute trend toward wiping out the class structure of Ukrainian society, abolition of the old aristocratic principle, and an introduction of social equality. The later process toward restoration of the class system in the Hetmanic state was interpreted by the older historians as treason against the people's interest committed by the Cossack hierarchy. This view is erroneous since Ukraine of the 17th century certainly did not outstrip the over-all social evolution of the European countries of that time; it did not evolve faster than its neighbors.

At the time of the National Revolution some social changes favoring the proletarian strata were made. The return of normal political and economic conditions, however, resulted in an immediate reconstruction of the class system and a suppression of the premature egalitarian tendencies. But these tendencies continued to exist and to express themselves in the Cossacko-Hetmanic state, and not infrequently in revolts and civil wars. The Cossack Host, Hetman Ivan Brukhovetsky, and two revolutionary leaders, Peter Ivanenko-Petrik and Semen Palii, represented the social-democratic trend, while Hetmans like Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ivan Vyhovsky and Ivan Mazepa championed the old order. The democratic striving for equality and freedom was definitely crushed by the reactionary Russian government after its absorption of Ukraine.

However, the National Revolution of 1648-1649 did bring many social changes. First of all, a new leading class of Cossacks assumed an equal or superior status to the political elite. The upper stratum of the Cossacks took over the entire government.



The position of the peasant-serfs improved a little. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian society of that period remained essentially organized into classes headed by an elite group, as maintained by the younger generation of Ukrainian historians, Lipinsky, Hrishko and Ohloblin, and the Byeloruthenian historian of legal institutions, Okinshevich.<sup>9</sup> It must be stressed, however, that the Ukrainian class structure was comparatively liberal, influenced by traditions inherited from the Kievan era. Upward social mobility was relatively easy. Peasants could be elevated to the rank of common Cossacks. A common Cossack could rise to the Cossack aristocracy. The transition from the Cossack aristocracy to the rank of gentry and vice versa was possible.

On the other hand, a common Cossack could be reduced to the level of a peasant-serf. Wealth, occupation, intellect, services and merits decided the issue of class membership and resulted in numerous changes in the social status of individual families.

Cossack political leadership was in close cooperation with the gentry, while two other strata, the peasants and the townspeople, did not have any voice in the political and social development of the nation. The social structure of Ukraine of the Cossacko-Hetmanic era was based therefore on five major strata, the nobility, the Cossacks, the clergy, the peasants and the townspeople. In this order the social background of the Ukrainian economic evolution will be briefly discussed.

Throughout the entire Cossacko-Hetmanic period an intense social struggle raged. The upper class tried continuously to increase its prerogatives at the expense of the peasants and townspeople. The latter not only resisted this pressure, but also tried to reverse it. The fluctuation of class barriers and the social mobility constituted one segment of the social dynamism of the times. The other was the open conflicts and clashes, resulting in peasant revolts, mass flights of serfs, mass emigration of the peasants and townspeople and political conflicts among various Cossack leaders, representing different points of view. The conflicts between Doroshenko and Brukhovetsky, Vyhovsky and Pushkar, Mazepa and Palii, resulting in civil wars, also can be explained in this context.

At times serious revolts of the peasant proletariat and Cossack commoners blazed into flames, when they could no longer endure oppression. Among these were the revolts in 1687, 1688, 1691-92 and 1693 in the Hetmanic state, or 1701-1702 in the Cossack Territory. These social upheavals certainly affected the country's economic growth in a negative way, but they should not be exag-

gerated in their socio-economic significance, since they were usually local and short-lasting. Marxist students of East European economic history, such as Lyashchenko, Nestorenko and Virnik, naturally overemphasized the role of conflicts in their interpretation of the history of 17th and 18th century Ukraine. Actually, mass emigration and the abandonment of villages and towns hurt the economy more than these isolated and sporadic revolts.<sup>10</sup>

**Cossacks**, as the traditional defenders of Ukraine independence, occupied a leading position in Ukrainian society immediately after the National Revolution. Their rights, privileges and obligations were already sanctioned by historical developments in the Polish kingdom. Naturally, these were increased in the new State, but their final crystallization was never achieved, not even at the end of the Hetmanic period. Their status changed constantly, all the more so because of far reaching internal differentiations and numerous social frictions among them.

A primary differentiation was their division into two strata, the Cossack aristocracy and the common Cossacks. The former was in turn divided into various segments and groups, the outstanding associates, the banner associates and the regimental insignia associates. The stratum of the common Cossacks consisted of a variety of groups, such as the auxiliaries, the voluntaries, the vassal and electoral Cossacks, the associates and the assisting and soldiery Cossacks. This detailed differentiation which included under the term "Cossack" some elements without real Cossack social status, like the assisting and soldiery Cossacks, facilitated continuous social fluctuations and unending transitions in the class association.

The Cossack aristocracy was recruited from the old, pre-revolutionary "registered" Cossacks, numerous newcomers from the class of nobility and gentry and the really "new men," whose extraordinary services for the national cause during and after the Revolution elevated them to the top of the social ladder. The outstanding associates and banner cossacks were exempt from the competence of the ordinary land and regimental and judicial and administrative authorities, and were subordinated to the authority of the "honorable" Hetman. The regimental insignia Cossacks enjoyed special privileges in their respective regimental districts. The common Cossacks were differentiated largely according to their material status and service obligation, whether they bore arms independently and individually or jointly, and whether they had full or restricted private property rights in real estate. The vassal and

assisting Cossacks were socially dependent upon the Cossack aristocrats, and rendered them diversified and specified services, such as hunting, catching beavers and guarding property.<sup>11</sup>

There was undoubtedly a persistent trend among the Cossack aristocrats and the wealthier and more intellectual Cossacks to merge fully and completely with the old class of the nobility in order to gain its well established and privileged position, and eventually to disappear as a separate social stratum of indefinite status. On the other hand, the lower and poorer strata of Cossacks also exhibited a clear-cut tendency to disappear as a separate class by merging with the peasants. They wanted to avoid their class burden of military and government services, which proved costly and time-consuming, and which took them away from their homes on distant military and service expeditions.

In the later stage of the Hetmanic era, for example, the Czars, in accordance with alliance agreements, called upon the Cossacks to participate in various Russian foreign wars, to work on the construction of new cities and fortresses and to guard new settlements. The Hetmanic, and later also the Czarist decrees of 1669, 1723, 1728, 1729, 1772 and 1782, attempted to stop this flight of the common Cossacks from their class obligations. However, these legal measures did not have much apparent success. The Hetman and the Czar, each for his own reason, were interested in preserving the military class of the Cossacks. Nevertheless, the Cossack stratum, even before it was legally crystallized as a separate class, began to disintegrate and to merge with the other old and well established classes of the nobility, peasantry and townspeople.<sup>12</sup>

Because of internal differentiation, the class rights and privileges of the Cossacks were neither equal nor uniform for all members of the stratum. The upper aristocratic element was the bearer of political and military authority, exempt from the competence of the ordinary judicial and administrative systems of the land and regimental local governments, legally favored with a larger court compensation for losses and damages, and endowed with far reaching exemptions from such taxes and financial burdens as exercises, some direct taxes and court fees. Theoretically speaking, the common Cossacks were eligible to participate in politics; practically speaking, they seldom did. They generally bore the obligation of military service, and were subject to the ordinary judicial and administrative authorities of the regimental district, and later also partially of the land provincial systems.

The most precious class privilege of the Cossacks was their

right to private property, in particular the right to land. This right established their importance in the country's economy, agriculture, manufacturing and trading. Above all, the Cossack aristocracy, being more educated and more cultured, knew how to make good use of its property rights. Immediately after the National Revolution, the real property rights of the Cossack class throughout the entire country were officially recognized by the new government. These rights were affirmed by the Pereyaslav agreement of 1654, and certain other legal documents of a later date. Since prior to the revolution the Cossack property right in real estate was somewhat questionable in the Polish state, and since the "registered" Cossacks vehemently pressed for its recognition, the issue was one of the leading motives for the Revolution.

Thus in the new Cossacko-Hetmanic state the real property rights of the Cossacks were accepted as a distinctive feature of their class. Even where some communal properties in land had developed among them before the revolution, they soon began to break them up into private estates. This action was successful, and before long the banner and the insignia associates acquired individual ownership rights in what had been originally public estates given to them on a temporary basis. The Hetmans resolutely opposed any Czarist attempts to question or to restrict that class privilege of the Cossacks.

The principle of individual ownership in real estate established the economic significance of the Cossack class in the production and distribution processes and promoted an impressive growth of the Cossack class in particular and the nation in general. According to Slabchenko, these years of national freedom enormously increased the productive potential of Ukraine.<sup>13</sup> Actually, two classes were in charge of the economic processes of the country, the Cossacks and the gentry, and both enjoyed full freedom of property and initiative. This freedom was highly important.

**Nobility.** The old interpretation of the events of 1648-1649 as simply a sweeping social revolution bent on the overthrow of the rule of the nobility has no basis in fact. These changes brought about by the events were not so fundamental and deep as to justify such a view. From the very beginning, the Ukrainian nobility joined the National Revolution in large numbers along with the clergy, the townspeople and the peasantry. This proves the basically national character of the Revolution.

The fidelity of the majority of the Ukrainian gentry to the na-

tional cause soon brought the recognition and confirmation of its class rights and privileges by the new government. Subsequently, the Ukrainian gentry closely associated themselves with the upper segment of the Cossack stratum. Many nobles became banner and insignia Cossacks, while numerous Cossack grandees joined the ranks of the country gentry. These nobles soon became an integral component of the Ukrainian government. Hetman Vyhovsky, Hetman Teteria, Colonels Krichevsky, Nechai and Morozenko-Mrozovsky, the judge-general of Ukraine, Bohdanovich, and many other noblemen, rendered great and unforgettable services to their nation. No wonder, therefore, that Hetman Damian Mnohorishny referred to those services of the Ukrainian gentry when he confirmed its ancient privileges by the decree of 1670.<sup>14</sup>

Having retained their ancient and traditional individual property rights in land after the Revolution, the country nobles temporarily lost their right to the use of serf labor because the peasants were freed. But later, with the restoration of peasant bondage, serf labor was again made available to the nobles and the Cossack aristocracy. Serf labor was always a privilege of the Orthodox Church in the Ukrainian state. Thus in 1650, Khmelnytsky by a decree restored the patrimonial jurisdiction of the gentry nobles over the peasants in their landed possessions, and made it obligatory for the peasants to render services and to pay certain tributes, mostly in kind. Separate courts were introduced for the gentry. The separate and privileged position of the gentry in the Ukrainian Cossacko-Hetmanic state was confirmed several times, in 1763, 1767 and subsequently.

At the time of Hetman Mazepa, however, the privileges of the old gentry partially faded away, eclipsed by the prevailing position of the upper class Cossack.<sup>15</sup> At the same time, nevertheless, a new nobility began to develop because the Czars made land grants and distributed titles of nobility among those who actively contributed to the Russianization of the Ukraine.

The Orthodox clergy suffered heavy discrimination on the part of the Polish government for its role in the Ukrainian national movement. Consequently, a majority joined the National Revolution. The hierarchy of the Orthodox Church not only gave its ecclesiastical blessing to the Revolution and its leaders but also actively supported Bohdan Khmelnytsky, strengthened him in his plans and sanctioned them and, above all, preached national independence. Such loyalty and patriotism on the part of the Church and its clergy, both secular and cloistered, were fully rewarded by the Ukrainian

national government in its acknowledging the property rights of the Church and the clergy, sanctioning their huge land holdings, leaving to them the right to own serfs and to exploit their labor, and admitting them broadly to participate in the country's administration.<sup>16</sup>

This permanent privilege of the Church to use serf labor and to keep jurisdiction over the peasants in its possession, gave rise to a general restoration of bondage which, as pointed out, was temporarily abolished in the noble landed estates. In the proposed code of laws of 1743, "The Laws, according to which justice is done among the Little Russian people," it was suggested to give the Orthodox clergy all the rights and privileges of the nobility.<sup>17</sup> Later on, however, under the impact of Russian institutions, the social position of the clergy was reduced to the legal level of the townspeople. The social status of the clergy was subject to intensive fluctuation, perhaps more than that of any other social class, since the infiltration of the nobles, Cossacks, commons and foreigners into its ranks was steady and considerable. On the other hand, numerous male descendants of the Orthodox clergy joined the Cossack and noble classes, and the female descendants were married to the members of other groups. Of course, the Roman Catholic clergy was denied all these privileges.

From the economic point of view, the role of the nobility and of the Church did not change much in comparison to the previous (Lithuanian-Polish) period except that the Orthodox Church took the place of the Catholic Church. Having extensive property rights and freedom of initiative and action, the nobles, the Cossacks and the Church sponsored the majority of production, exchange and distribution. In their hands was the larger portion of all entrepreneurial and managerial activities, primarily in agriculture and manufacturing, but also in commerce.

**Peasantry.** Peasants were severely oppressed by the Polish agricultural system based upon the principle of large noble land holdings, serfdom and commercial farming. Under these conditions the individual freedom and land ownership of the peasants disappeared completely, and the social position of the peasantry became the lowest and the most degraded in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Consequently and most naturally, when the National Revolution broke out, the peasants, believing that "they cannot lose anything any more, but gain everything," joined the revolutionary tide

spontaneously. Actually, the first year or two brought to them in most cases a revolutionary change, personal freedom and real property rights, at least technically. Legally, the hated serfdom and bondage were never completely abolished, either by the Treaty of Bila Tserkva (1651), or by the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654).

The cloistered (monastic) clergy, the noblemen and the Cossack aristocrats were eager to retain and to preserve the institution of serfdom as a source of cheap labor. Thus, with the establishment of the sovereign Ukrainian nation, where the upper social strata held all the power, the peasants soon lost all their illusions and hopes of freedom, equality and first-class citizenship.

The proposed code of 1743 was never ratified. Rather, the established customs, the incoherent and fragmentary legislation by Hetmanic decrees and the factual power of other classes decided the issues.<sup>18</sup> The peasants had no political influence; since they were not even directly subordinated to state authority, as in the Polish kingdom, they could not defend their cause.

Nevertheless, the Revolution improved the social position of the peasantry to some extent. First of all, in the central and southern districts of the country, many villages which had joined the revolution acquired the status of free military communities where bondage was abolished and peasant individual or communal property in land was introduced. Furthermore, the peasants in the new settlements enjoyed freedom and property rights as well. The colonization process was constant in Hetmanic Ukraine. It was sponsored by the government, the nobility and the Cossack hierarchy in order to populate the areas devastated by war. In order to attract peasant settlers, all kinds of freedoms—from bondage, from serf labor and from contributions—were granted. But in some northern districts, such as Starodub and Chernihiv, the nobility succeeded in retaining a ruling position as compensation for loyalty to the Ukrainian state and were allowed to use serf labor. Thus the development of free villages of military status was prevented. Serfdom and bondage continued in the Church possessions and the state public domains—in the latter, in their most intolerable form.

At first free villages of military status were numerous. Under the pressure of the upper classes, however, the burdens of serfdom were gradually restored and spread over ever wider areas. Therefore, the free peasant communities of military and autonomous status (even those recently established) progressively lost their social privileges. At first they were obliged by law to render certain services called "usual obediences" to the high Cossack

officials who held landed estates in the allodial capacity, as compensation for their services to the state. These "usual obediences" gradually accumulated in the noble manorial economies, too. Later those allodial estates were partially transferred to the individual ownership of Cossack aristocrats with an immediate restoration of serfdom. The soil bondage of the peasants was first reintroduced in the second half of the 18th century. It was a normal course of things that paralleled the restoration of bondage in the Cossack possessions. The nobility received the same rights, and acquired more and more power over the peasants.

Despite all these unfavorable developments, the social position of the peasants in the 17th and 18th centuries was much better than that of the peasantry of Western Europe, Poland or Muscovy at the same time. First of all, the peasant class in Ukraine was not so tightly closed that it constituted a caste. There were many possibilities for able, lucky and intelligent peasants to improve themselves by joining the ranks of the townspeople, the clergy and the Cossacks, or even by obtaining nobility.

First, at the time of Hetman Apostol, the peasantry became a relatively closed class, and its upward social mobility became more difficult but still not impossible.<sup>19</sup> Eventually, at the end of the Cossacko-Hetmanic era, with the impact of Russian influence, the position of the peasant deteriorated greatly, down to the level of his Russian counterpart.

Secondly, the peasant had *de facto* limited property rights in land. Although numerous Hetmanic edicts and decrees denied the peasant the right to acquire or to dispose of landed estates, the peasants rather freely bought, used and sold land. And the nearer they were to the eastern and southern frontiers where flight to the "wild fields" was possible, the greater was their freedom in this and other respects.<sup>20</sup> The Hetmans, the Cossack grandes and the nobles interested in peasant labor had to be less demanding and conform with the trend in East Ukraine, if they desired to keep the village population to develop colonization in their domains and possessions. Nevertheless, the general albeit gradual growth of bondage produced several waves of emigration of peasants to the Donets and Don regions, where they could enjoy full freedom. The Hetmanic opposition to emigration was ineffective.<sup>21</sup> The trend toward obtaining individual ownership rights in land was so strong among the peasants that communally owned property, instances of which had appeared in Ukraine after the Revolution, was soon redistributed by the peasants themselves. And whenever any Hetman



or Cossack leader was in favor of the institution of private property, he at once received the general support of the peasant class.

At that time there were four main social strata of the village peasant population, each with its distinct status. The Ukrainian village populus was the highest social group, *de facto*, with limited individual, personal and real property rights, and limited inheritance rights. This group was not bound to the soil, but it rendered some services and bore some financial obligations to the lords.

The second group consisted of poor, landless peasants, who either were sharecroppers or were hired by the privileged classes as day laborers at meager pay. They frequently shared the dwellings of the wealthy peasants or the Cossack commons, and until Mazepa's time, they were free of the usual taxes and other state burdens.

The third category embraced the peasants on Russian-owned estates which grew in number in Ukraine after the catastrophe of Poltava. They were soil-bound serfs without any rights, serving their masters according to the harsh Muscovite tradition.

The peasants of the fourth strata were actually slaves, called "serfs." These were originally prisoners of war, mainly Turks and Tartars. They could be bought, sold, inherited or given away as gifts. They had no rights whatsoever. Although the institution was popular among the Cossack grandees, comparatively speaking there were very few slaves in Ukraine.<sup>22</sup>

As far as the so-called "usual obediences" were concerned, they were not the same throughout the country, nor for all segments of the peasant class. "Usual obediences" normally included some kind of rental payments, and some forest melioration and pasture work as well as field work performed for the nobles, the Cossacks, the Orthodox Church or the state. Some other peasant contributions within bondage included the so-called "carol" services and tribute at Christmas time, wedding tribute, and road, bridge and building construction and maintenance services. Moreover, the peasants as subjects of the state bore the main burden of taxes and non-tax collections. These heavy material responsibilities placed upon the rural population greatly hampered the economic development of the village, but the enormous fertility of the soil and the relative freedom of the peasants made progress possible.<sup>23</sup>

From the point of view of the country's economy of this period, the peasantry, as in the previous Kievan and Polish-Lithuanian periods, was the main labor force and the most important production factor in Ukrainian agriculture. Furthermore, the surplus of the

village population migrated to the towns to supply the necessary labor for the slowly growing manufacturing industries.

**Townspeople.** The National Revolution and the creation of the independent Ukrainian state had the least effect on the social and legal status of the townspeople. Like all other segments of Ukrainian society, the townspeople also took an active part in the Revolution, but there was a fundamental difference in the manner of its participation. While other classes served the revolution as separate entities, the city people joined the peasant insurgents (commoners, chern) or the Cossack commons, and hence did not constitute a separate fighting entity.<sup>24</sup>

The townspeople were characterized by a more rigid class structure resulting from the Magdeburg system of city organization introduced by their Polish rulers, but long since recongized by the Ukrainian government. Some Hetmans, like Khmelnytsky, Samoilovich, Mazepa and Apostol, were friendly toward the townspeople, protecting them as a worthwhile segment of society. Their class rights and privileges, in particular, their Magdeburg self-government and autonomy, were confirmed several times by Hetmanic edicts and decrees, by international agreements, such as the Pereyslav Treaty of 1654, and by the proposed code of laws of 1743, the so-called "Laws by which justice is done among the Little Russian People."

Subsequently, the new towns such as Poltava and Lubni also received Magdeburg autonomy from the Ukrainian or Russian governments. The craft and merchant guilds, enjoying considerable freedom, continued at that time to form the basis of the organization of urban economic and social life. The city and town mayors had a limited authority over guild matters. The more enlightened Hetmans, like Khmelnytsky, Polubotok, Samilovich, Mazepa and Apostol, tried to preserve municipal self-government at all costs, and objected to the attempts of the Cossack hierarchy to overpower the cities and to subordinate them to the general regimental administrative system. Hetmans Apostol and Rozumovsky did everything possible to protect the townspeople from the frequent abusive acts of the upper classes, which were directed against urban economic interests.

As far as the social and legal status of the town was concerned, however, there was no uniformity during the Cossacko-Hetmanic era. This had a negative effect on its commercial development. The ancient towns as well as the large towns in the northern and

central provinces had a clear and established legal municipal status as autonomous communities, only partially subject to the jurisdiction of the Cossack courts and administration. Their population constituted a separate social class.

The administrative authorities of the regimental district system exercised merely a legal supervision over the cities and towns, and without any direct governmental authority. The municipal governments of these ancient and large towns were strongly opposed to the Cossacks and their permanent residence in the city, and prohibited any Cossack-owned or operated mercantile establishment—particularly taverns—in their jurisdictions.

The small towns, especially in the eastern and steppe areas, being of later origin, did not have the same clear-cut legal and social status. First of all, they were frequently included in the general administration of the regimental districts, and thus were overpowered by the Cossacks. Sometimes the Cossack aristocrats managed to be elected mayors or other municipal officials of considerable competence; at other times the towns sought an election of the outstanding Cossacks for their officials in order to gain more freedom and to protect themselves against the prevailing interests of the upper classes.<sup>25</sup> In most cases, however, the townspeople enjoyed the freedom of the Magdeburg law, and centralized the trade and mercantile activities in their own hands, although they received considerable competition from the Cossacks, the nobles and the peasants.

On the other hand, the town population, according to the traditional patterns of the medieval class system, was not allowed to own any landed estates or to engage in farming. But municipal governments could acquire and possess such landed estates. This prohibition was not strictly followed by small towns, especially those in the east and south of later colonist origin. There the rural and urban population, as well as the mercantile and agricultural business, were mixed and performed as parallel functions. Being relatively free, the cities and towns of Hetmanic Ukraine developed fairly well economically. The older historians who talked of a general economic decline of the towns during this era were mistaken.<sup>26</sup> Of course, the towns were seriously hampered, along with the countryside, by a great tax and non-tax burden imposed by the government. It included not only monetary payments of direct and indirect taxes but also the city obligation to shelter and feed the army. The burden was sometimes so intolerable that it drove the

towns to despair. Sometimes the townspeople even sought Polish or Russian intervention in an effort to improve their lot. But towns all over Europe were exploited during this period.

Politically, the town and the townspeople fared slightly better in the Hetmanic state than in the Lithuanian-Polish Commonwealth. The representation of the urban population was admitted to the country's General Council, along with the Cossacks and the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church. There the city deputies could speak in the interest of their communities and their class.

Unfortunately, however, there was neither legal nor political equality among the cities and towns. Kiev was the most privileged among the cities, while the city of Chernihiv, for example, did not enjoy all the benefits, and the small towns were simply overrun by the Cossacks. As a matter of fact, the character of the era as prevalently dominated by the Cossack class resulted in the gradual decline of the town in its legal and political position. With the growth of the power of the Cossack aristocracy, the town was subjected to more and more discrimination, and, foregoing its patriotism, it began to look more and more toward the Russian protector for relief. 27

**Foreigners.** There was no discrimination against foreigners in Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine because of their national or racial ancestry. This was in direct contrast to Muscovy where foreigners were mistrusted and denied equality to the native population. 28 However, there was no religious tolerance; the Orthodox faith held an official and dominant position. But religious intolerance was part and parcel of all European society during this period. This attitude could also be explained in the light of Polish domination. The Poles and the Polish government greatly and grossly discriminated against the Orthodox religion and the Orthodox Church. The Cossack wars and the National Revolution of 1648, aiming above all at the liberation of the Ukrainian people from foreign oppression, were in part instigated and waged in defense of the Orthodox Church.

Hence, when independence was achieved, the Orthodox religion was immediately proclaimed the established religion of the Cossacko-Hetmanic state. In particular, Catholics, Mohammedans and Hebrews were subjected to discrimination. The "Uniat" Greek-Catholics, originally Orthodox Ukrainians, who acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the Pope of Rome, were suppressed. The Polish-Ukrainian Treaty of Hadiach of 1658 expressly forbade the

## **Church Union in the "Ukrainian Grand Duchy."<sup>29</sup>**

The Hebrews and Mohammedans had only a right of temporary residence and limited rights to own property and to do business. They could acquire the privilege of permanent residence and status of nobles and townspeople only by accepting Orthodoxy. The Mohammedans, Tartars and Turks were usually slaves having no legal rights. Protestantism was also not favored, but it suffered less discrimination than Catholicism or Mohammedanism.

Other predominantly Orthodox foreigners, such as Armenians, Byeloruthenians, Russians, Serbs, Walachians, Greeks and others enjoyed freedom and government protection. Those living in cities were in many cases exempt from municipal jurisdiction and directly subordinated to the authority of the Cossack regimental administration and Cossack judicial system. This protected them from possible discrimination on the part of jealous municipal officials.

Later Hetmans like Mazepa and Apostol initiated a policy of discrimination against Russian colonists on political grounds. These had begun to form a Fifth Column in Ukrainian towns and countryside. Consequently, edicts were issued to prohibit Russians from acquiring real estate, especially in urban areas, and from participating in mercantile activities. Nevertheless, growing Czarist pressure after Poltava soon overcame the Hetmanic measures. Only the "Old-believers," the refugees from Czarist religious persecution, were welcome in Ukraine.

The northern frontiers of the Hetmanic state, the parts of the Starodub and Chernihiv regimental districts, were almost exclusively populated by Byeloruthenians. These, being Orthodox, enjoyed all the freedoms of the country according to their class associations, preserving their national identity, culture, customs and institutions. For about four years (1655-1659) the Byeloruthenians formed their own Cossack regimental district which remained in a vassalage relationship to the Hetmans. This autonomous unit was liquidated by the Russians in consequence of the Ukrainian-Russian War of 1658-1659.<sup>30</sup>

**Eastern and Southern Frontiers.** Unfortunately, Ukraine did not develop uniformly either politically, culturally, socially or economically. Because of moving frontiers various territories simultaneously existed at different stages of socio-economic evolution. Actually the colonization and conquest of the Black Sea and the Don-Donets steppes by Ukrainians in the 17th century was a re-

capture of ancient Ukrainian lands. The Cuman and Mongol invasion and rule had turned these steppes into a vacuum.

With the decline of power of the Golden Horde, the Muscovites established their nominal supremacy over the Don-Donets basin.<sup>31</sup> In the 15th century, the Muscovites had already begun to make their nominal supremacy over these territories more actual. A series of fortresses was erected on the southern borders of the Don-Donets basin, continuously moving farther toward the south and east, in an attempt to protect the sparsely populated country from Mongol raids. For a long time, however, few dared to settle those dangerous frontier lands. A few fortresses, defended by the Muscovite troops, were the only inhabited places in this vast, empty steppe country until the 16th century. Then a feeble attempt at colonization was initiated. A few villages were established close to the forts.

The real colonization of the Donets steppe country began in 1638, when Jacko Ostrianin, the leader of one of the Cossack wars against the Poles, after being defeated by the Polish army, left Ukraine with nine hundred colonists, Cossacks and their families, and settled in the Donets basin with the permission and under the protection of the Muscovite Czar. Although this venture ended in failure, a beginning was made.<sup>32</sup> From that time on, new waves of Ukrainian emigrants, first Cossacks and later peasants also, steadily settled the Donets steppes in ever growing numbers. These waves of emigration from Hetmanic Ukraine—the largest in the years 1651, 1652, 1654, 1657-67, 1681, 1700-1702, and 1783, were primarily caused by the numerous Ukrainian wars with Poland and Russia, frequent domestic wars among the Cossack leaders and Hetmans, the wars with Turkey, the growing class differentiation and discrimination, and other social and natural disturbances.<sup>33</sup>

The Russian government was very friendly, particularly towards the Cossack immigration into these territories under its domination, since the Cossacks, as experienced soldiers, provided an excellent buffer zone between Moscow and her enemies. Therefore, the Czars left to the Cossacks complete freedom and organizational autonomy, under a supervisory authority of Czarist officials, voyevdes. The Cossack settlers were all the more appreciated because they usually came with all their belongings, tools, cattle and seed, and being self-sustaining, they did not require any financial or material assistance from the Russians.<sup>34</sup>

Soon numerous villages (slobody) and towns were built throughout

the area, giving it the name "Village Ukraine" (Sloboda Ukraine or Slobitshchina). Official Russian records supply abundant data concerning the colonization process, and the organization and economy of this new Ukraine.<sup>35</sup> A very important role was played by the Orthodox religious orders which established cloisters and schools throughout the area.

The country was organized into a number of regimental districts with colonels elected for life as their heads. The organization was similar to that of the Hetmanic state, but these colonels had a much wider authority than their prototypes in the old country, and their office usually remained within the family. Each regimental district operated as an autonomous administrative unit directly subordinated to the Czar and his voyevda official.

Initially, there were only two classes of people in Village Ukraine, the Cossacks and the peasants. With the growth of the towns, however, a third class evolved based on the Magdeburg law system and guild organization of crafts and trades. Also, the urban Church brotherhoods evolved with their religious and philanthropic activities. Class differentials were also brought from the old country. The records of immigrants distinguish Cossacks, peasants and urban colonists, their different statuses, positions and occupations.<sup>36</sup>

The Cossacks, the only class considered really important, were free, endowed with full property rights, and honored with an obligation of military services. They were guardians of the political autonomy of the country. Soon two Cossack segments appeared, the wealthy and important electorals (viboroni) and the poor but influential associates.

In the beginning the peasants were free. They had only to pay a tax to the Czar's treasury. With the growth of Russian penetration, "usual obediences" were introduced, and later serfdom. However, the bondage in Village Ukraine was not as heavy as in the Hetmanic state, Western Europe or Muscovy. The fertility of the soil did not require it.

The emigration to the Don-Donets basin produced continuous conflict between the Hetmanic government and the Russian Czar. The Hetmans wanted to prevent the emigration of their people, preferring to retain their labor power for their own economic growth. The Czars encouraged these mass movements. Hence Hetmanic decrees and edicts prohibiting the emigration had little effect. Finally, Hetman Samoilovich requested the Russian government to give up its domination over Village Ukraine, and to agree to its incorporation into the Cossacko-Hetmanic state. The Czar did not agree.

In 1765 the Russian government began the abolition of the autonomy of the regiments of Village Ukraine, and incorporated the territory into the Russian Empire. This was followed by the introduction of Russian social and legal institutions, including the discriminatory class system.

Immediately after the National Revolution the majority of the Cossacks left the land beyond the Dniepr cataracts for a more civilized life in the Hetmanic state. The land was depopulated. But political upheavals and the growing class differentiation in Ukraine resulted in a gradual colonization of the territory of the Black Sea steppes. Politically, the territory of the Cossack Host, officially called "the Liberties of the Cossacks beyond the Cataracts," was initially in a vassalage relationship to Hetmanic Ukraine, and indirectly also to Czarist Russia. It was described in the official documents of the time as "in obedience to the Hetmans and subordination to the Czars."

Later, after the Treaty of Andrusiv between Poland and Russia in 1667, the Territory of the Cossack Host was considered as a condominium of these two nations. Subsequently, the Cossack Host either severed its political allegiance, or restored its vassalage obedience toward the Ukrainian Hetmanic nation. Doubtlessly, Russian diplomatic intrigues helped to confuse the relations between these two Ukrainian political entities to prevent them from uniting. Of course, there were also some social and economic differences between Hetmanic Ukraine and the Territory of the Cossack Host which worked against unification.<sup>37</sup>

The Territory of the Zaporoge Cossack Host was administered from its center, the fortress Seetch, on the islands of the river Dniepr beyond the cataracts. It was headed by a Chief Commander (Koshovy otaman), an office in existence since the beginning of the Cossack movement in the 15th century. Like Hetmanic Ukraine and Village Ukraine, the country was divided into a number of regimental districts with colonels as the chief local authorities. Only two major classes existed there, the Cossacks and the peasants. The Cossacks were the upper class, living on farms throughout the area. They were divided into senior and junior Cossacks and so-called service men. At a later period insignia Cossacks also appeared, in the pattern of Hetmanic Ukraine.

The political and civil rights, the social prestige and the privileges and obligations of the Cossacks were differentiated according to their status. Traditionally, no women were allowed in the fortress of Seetch.<sup>38</sup> The economy of the Territory was primitive,



based on individual ownership of land and communal ownership of forests, pasture lands and fishing and hunting rights. Nevertheless, the Cossack stratum did not develop an aristocracy as it did in the Hetmanic state.

The peasant had no military status and no part in the country's administration. Neither clergy nor townspeople evolved as separate social strata. Thus, the Territory of the Cossack Host and Village Ukraine were organized as frontier lands.

**West Ukraine** consists of the Ukrainian ethnographic territory west of the Murakhva and Hirin rivers, and includes Galicia, West Volhynia, and the Kholm, Bukovina, Carpatho-Ukraine and Pidlashia districts. These areas were never incorporated into the Hetmanic state, and consequently, they did not participate in the same socio-economic evolution. Except in Carpatho-Ukraine and Bukovina, Polish rule prevailed continually. The Polish class system of nobility, clergy, townspeople and peasantry, with its traditionally enormous power of the nobles and its unjust discrimination against other classes, was unaffected by the National Revolution.

No Cossack class arose in West Ukraine to defend Ukrainian national interests. The national and religious discrimination against Orthodox Ukrainians was so aggressive that it resulted in the complete denationalization of the gentry, and the rapid denationalization of the townspeople as well. The Ukrainian government in the Hetmanic state retaliated by confiscation of Polish landed estates, and discrimination against Roman and Greek Uniate Catholics. In West Ukraine, peasant bondage was made intolerable by giving the nobility the power of life and death over their serfs. Serfs were bought and sold in the open market like cattle by Polish and polonized Ukrainian nobles.

These adverse developments and frequent wars and foreign invasions resulted in the speedy economic decline of West Ukraine. In order to relieve the tragic situation at least in part, the head of the Orthodox Church in Galicia, Bishop Joseph Shumlansky, accomplished a union of his diocese with the Holy See in Rome, hoping in this way to lessen the religious discrimination. He hoped in vain. The Polish government did not wish to recognize Ukrainian Catholics and Polish Roman Catholics as equals.<sup>39</sup>

In the second half of the 18th century, the Polish central government attempted some reforms but with almost no success, because the nobles were unwilling to cooperate. Yet these reforms did take

away from the gentry the right to punish their serfs by death. The peasants became subject to the jurisdiction of the royal courts. The duties of the serfs were more clearly defined. The townspeople received the prerogative of "neminem captivabimus," and the privileges of participating in the country's judicial and administrative system, and of acquiring landed estates. Furthermore, the city tax burden was lowered.<sup>40</sup> The social prestige of the gentry was further reduced by increasing their numbers through liberal ennoblement practices.

The Ukrainian population did not gain much from these reforms; its social and economic position even turned from bad to worse, giving rise to large-scale "robinhoodism." Numerous gangs of "goodhearted" bandits began to operate throughout Galicia and Podolia, robbing the rich and giving to the poor. Naturally, this did not solve the social problems of the lower strata, but it frightened the manorial lords into lessening to some extent the oppression and exploitation of the peasants.<sup>41</sup>

In 1771-72 the right-bank Ukraine also returned to Polish rule, and Polish institutions were speedily reintroduced there. Peasant and Cossack property rights were denied, and the latifundia system with its intolerable serfdom was reinstated. In the southern border lands the nobility offered freedom to peasant settlers in order to speed up the colonization of empty areas. Nevertheless, after this new land was colonized, the gentry immediately moved ahead with the exploitation of peasant labor to the utmost.

The agricultural economy of right-bank Ukraine was soon based on leasing the manors and land to the lesser nobility, foreigners and peasants, in a somewhat feudal manner, with rental payments and services gradually increasing. The serf bore the entire burden. Discrimination and exploitation finally induced a series of peasant uprisings, called "haidamaks." These were frequently led by famous Cossacks.<sup>42</sup> Large-scale "robinhoodism" also flourished in right-bank Ukraine in defense of the oppressed peasantry. Certainly, such things as national and religious discrimination, intolerable serfdom, "robinhoodism" and frequent peasant revolts did not contribute to the economic growth of the country. Moreover, the peasants ran away in droves to the Territory of the Cossack Host, or to Hetmanic or Village Ukraine, looking for better, more peaceful and safer living conditions, leaving the right-bank areas without a steady supply of essential labor.<sup>43</sup>

A few words must be also added here about Carpathian-Ukraine, a small plot of land separated by the Carpathian mountains from the

rest of the Ukrainian ethnographical territory south of Galicia. Since the 13th century, this land was continually under foreign, usually Hungarian, rule. Although subjected to national and religious discrimination by the Hungarian government, and having no cultural connections with the centers of Ukrainian national life, like Lviv and Kiev, the Orthodox Carpatho-Ukrainians remained astonishingly patriotic, faithful to their Church and nationality. The Hungarian class system and peasant serfdom there were even worse than under Polish rule. Consequently, the country, being poorly endowed with natural resources, remained socially and economically backward. Similar unfavorable conditions also prevailed in Bukovina, a small plot of Ukrainian ethnographical area which was under Moldavian domination.<sup>44</sup>

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY, EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

**The national economy of independent Ukraine - The colonization process - Agriculture - Agricultural technology and organization - Hunting, fishing and cattle-raising - Mining.**

**The National Economy of Independent Ukraine.** The National Revolution of 1648 changed the fundamental character of the Ukrainian economy. In the first place, it ceased to be a mere part of the larger economy of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and became a national economy in the modern sense of the term. The development of the nation-state in the 16th and 17th centuries permitted the formation and formulation of this concept of a "Ukrainian national economy."<sup>1</sup>

Naturally, the character of the Cossacko-Hetmanic economy was entirely different from that of the Kievan Empire, which was also a large-scale, imperial, economic complex, however, unlike the situation in the Polish-Lithuanian state, the Ukrainian ethnic element was the most important change brought about by the eventful years of 1648 and 1649.

Another significant economic change was due to the devastation and depopulation of the country by war. This necessitated the rebuilding of the economy under new and basically different circumstances. Prior to the revolution, the so-called "golden peace" prevailed in Ukraine, and the country was economically prosperous, as Ohloblin indicates.<sup>2</sup> After the revolution, the economy was in many instances non-existent and had to be built from the ground up. For the third time in their history the borderlands experienced this tragedy. In some areas it was necessary to colonize completely vacant lands. At first, primitive hunting and fishing was resorted to, followed by cattle and horse breeding, and then agriculture. However, a new atmosphere prevailed. National freedom, essentially Ukrainian individualism, the absence of foreign oppression and many other factors promoted a speedy economic recovery and reconstruction. Nevertheless, the recovery was neither smooth nor miraculous.

The abolition of Polish domination brought an immediate collapse of the Polish economic system based on large-scale latifundium holdings and serf labor and a contempt for other industries. For a short while, at least, the traditionally Ukrainian, small-scale peasant landholding, based on the principle of individual ownership, aggressively took over. This was the third great change produced by the Revolution. Probably the most significant instantaneous effect, since Ukraine was as she was meant to be, an agricultural nation for the next hundred and fifty years. This individualism was true also in other branches of the economy, like commerce, trades, and crafts, which were no longer subjected to discrimination. Nevertheless, in the course of this period a tense conflict among the three social principles prevailed: the "Revolutionary" idea of individual peasant holding, the conservative institution of latifundium land possession, and the concept of a communal or collective peasant land ownership. The struggle between the principles of noble large-scale land possession and of the peasant small-scale landholding went on simultaneously and in connection with the reconstruction of the social composition of the Ukrainian people after the Revolution, while the collectivist trends were prevailing only and on a temporary basis, under the severe, demanding, and dangerous conditions of the steppe frontiers.

The idea of individual land ownership was so strong in Ukraine, that whoever supported collectivism was doomed to fail. The most striking example of that trend was the known political conflict between the left-bank Hetman Brukhovetsky and the right-bank Hetman Doroshenko, as Slabhenko indicated.<sup>3</sup> Brukhovetsky failed, largely because of his collectivistic tendencies. Although Russian historians vigorously insisted on the presence of communes in Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine, there is no objective historical support for this theory.

A communal economy no doubt existed in the territory of the Cossack Host until the end of the 16th century, or perhaps even during the first half of the 17th, being induced by the demands of a pioneer life in the steppes. Land, both fields and pasture, and fisheries and forests were considered collective property by the Cossacks. At that time individual Cossacks received land allotments from the communal area for their own use for one or two years. Capital, cattle, draft animals and equipment were also collective to a great extent. After a year or two, land allotments were returned to the collectives, and reallocated on a temporary basis.

However, the communal principle soon gave way under an in-

crease in the number of agricultural settlers. Capital, cattle, draft animals and, finally, the arable land became subject to individual ownership, and only the use of forests, fisheries and hunting grounds retained a certain collective characteristic. But even there the basic approach changed. The collective use of the forests, fishery rights and hunting grounds was considered as a voluntary and contractual pooling of common interests. Moreover, at the end of the Cossacko-Hetmanic era these remnants of the commune also disappeared.

Early historiography was largely confused, as far as the problem of collectivism in Ukraine was concerned, by the existence at that time of three semi-cooperative, semi-collective institutions, namely, the brotherhood, the spriah and the siabr associations. A brotherhood was an association based on an agreement among male individuals for life, to work together and to share everything, at times even wives and children. Subsequently, it developed into a partnership agreement in order to increase business capital and to reduce risks. Such an agreement was common among Cossacks, peasants and Chumaks.

A spriah was a cooperative association founded on a terminable agreement among a few villages to accomplish jointly certain major projects of mutual interest, such as melioration, digging stumps, establishing settlements or constructing roads. A siabr association was also a contractual institution, concluded for a certain time, to pool the monetary funds, implements, tools and work of the interested people either in a colonization project, or in the acquisition of land, forests, pastures, lakes or mills. The rights and obligations of the members of a siabr association were minutely defined in an agreement, said Slabchenko.<sup>4</sup> Siabr associations often developed as a result of the release of latifundium landholdings, and were instituted to relieve the shortage of funds and labor. Siabr associations could be found in manorial economies, especially in the forest possessions.

Being contractual, and, in most cases, terminable, all three forms progressively disintegrated under the impact of Ukrainian individualism. Of course, some collective flavor remained in the municipal holdings of pastureland for all the urban population.<sup>5</sup> That the concept of a commune faded away in Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine was also evident by the institution of the "par." The "par" was that portion of land in the three-field system which lay fallow. If the commune had been the leading principle, and the peasants had been given the right of a temporary use of land only, the fallow "par"

would have been considered communally owned, and returned to the commune. Instead, all three portions of land, including the par, were regarded as private property.

Although the small-scale, peasant landholdings supplanted collectivism, they were not strong enough to resist the return of the large-scale landed estates of the nobility, the Cossack aristocracy and the Church. In a comparatively short time the restoration of class society in Ukraine brought a sweeping return of large landed estates throughout the nation with a parallel liquidation of peasant land ownership and the reintroduction of serfdom. Numerous nobles, like Nemirich, loyal to the new government, were returned their vast possessions, while the religious orders continued, without any interruption by war, to own and to exploit their latifundia, as explained above.<sup>6</sup>

Soon such Cossack families as Mazepa, Apostol, Skoropadsky, Miklashevsky, Horlenko and Kochubei also acquired enormous landed estates, together with peasant serfs. At the time of Skoropadsky's Hetmanate, Russian nobles also began to acquire land grants at the expense of small-scale peasant farmholdings. It is enough to mention here the names of Prince Menskikov, Vorontsov, Fein and Kornis. Kononenko offers in one of his works some interesting statistics: after 75 years of national independence, in 7 regimental districts out of 56,063 landed estates, the Cossacks, the nobility, the municipalities and the Church owned 55%, while the peasants owned only 32%, the rest being out of rank. In all ten regimental districts the peasants possessed some 29,321 pieces of real estate. During the later years the small peasant landholdings progressively decreased, according to Miakotin and Kononenko. In particular, the Russian grandees enlarged their latifundia by usurpation of peasant land and even tried to seize Cossack small farms and attempted to turn the common Cossacks into serfs, contrary to the wishes of both Hetman and Czar, who wanted to preserve the integrity of this military class.

Discussing the socio-economic processes in the time of Hetman Mazepa, Ohloblin stressed the trend toward a concentration of the ownership of land, by inheritance, usurpation and occupation. Ohloblin said of this period: "The process of concentration of aristocratic land possession developed parallel with a concentration of officeholding and political power in the hands of the upper Cossack hierarchy."<sup>7</sup>

In the Territory of the Cossack Host, small-scale Cossack and peasant land possession was also gradually suppressed by the

growing manorial estates of the Cossack chieftians and the incoming nobles. Vast estates and comparably large fortunes were accumulated by Cossack leaders like Kalnishevsky, the last Commander-in-Chief, and Hloba, Secretary of Office of the Cossack Host. According to contemporary records, Kalnishevsky possessed at the time of the liquidation of Seetch in 1775, about 50,000 rubles, a few hundred red gouldens, 639 horses, over 1,000 head of cattle, and 14,000 sheep and goats; and Hloba owned 30,000 rubles, 336 horses, 889 head of cattle, and 12,000 sheep and goats. The common Cossacks were also wealthy — a fact indicating a well developed agricultural economy in the steppes.<sup>8</sup>

In Village Ukraine, all land belonged to the Czar, theoretically speaking. However, he made land grants to settlers for their lifetime use. The size of the allotment fluctuated during the colonization process. In the Chuhaiiv settlement the allotment was 81 acres, and in Okhtirka, 113.3 acres, per family plus the use of forests and pasture areas. From 1668, the Czarist decrees began to regulate minutely the land possessions of the newly established colonies, where the property rights of the Cossacks, peasants and townspeople were fully secured. The government officials were forbidden to violate these ownership rights. These facts indicate of course, the application of the principle of private property in Village Ukraine. Little of the communal approach could be found there.

Nevertheless, in Village Ukraine, too, the large, manorial landholdings began progressively to replace the small peasant landholding. The upper strata of the Cossacks and the Russian nobles, equipped with capital, implements and draft animals, could easily take care of more land. Hence, they enlarged their possessions by usurpation and abuse, as well as by legal occupation. This led to sharp class differentiations, a manorial economy and serfdom.

In right-bank Ukraine the latifundium land possession abolished the principle of peasant landholding immediately after the reinstatement of Polish domination in this area. Polish noblemen, such as Konieczpolski, Zamojski and Kalinowski, invested large amounts of money in land and in the financing of large-scale colonization projects aimed at increasingly profitable commercial agriculture. Simultaneously they reintroduced bondage of the serf to the soil.<sup>9</sup>

In the over-all picture of the prolonged struggle between peasant landholding and the manorial economy, the concept of individual property rights of the lower strata of society was not completely



abolished. The forms of the newly established class order were less cruel, and the peasants retained a degree of personal freedom until this was crushed by the introduction of the Russian legal system after the annexation of Ukraine by the Russian Empire.

The atmosphere of relative freedom in Ukraine during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period produced an impressive growth of the country's economy in all its segments. Village, manor and city grew in wealth, despite many obstacles to be mentioned later. Farmland increased enormously as a result of continuous and large-scale colonization and the cultivation of increasing areas of steppe land. Commercial activities developed in an atmosphere of private initiative and fading contempt for commerce. "The powerful enterprising skill which dominated everyone, females not excluded, from the Cossack aristocracy, down to a common craftsman, created new workshops, new settlements, and new material wealth," wrote Ohloblin enthusiastically. However, this vital interest of Cossack nobles and Cossack commons in trade and manufacturing developed into dangerous competition for the Hetmanic town and its people.

During Mazepa's time, mercantilist doctrine began to find clear application in Ukrainian economic life. The result was the promotion of modern manufacturing, textile, linen and tobacco industries. The Hetmans, Ivan Mazepa and Daniel Apostol especially, made broad use of mercantilist protectionism in order to sponsor the economic development of their nation in accordance with the prevailing economic theory.<sup>10</sup> At the end of the 18th century this system of early capitalism became dominant.

However, there were a few factors which slowed down considerably the impressive economic growth of the 17th and 18th centuries. The Ukrainian national economy was still agricultural; other industries were merely supplementary. Hence, land ownership and exploitation were the main sources of national income. The peasants and common Cossacks were, therefore, the foundation of the country's productive processes. Their degraded social status, however, had an adverse influence insofar as economic growth was concerned. Secondly, in consequence of many foreign wars, Tartar raids and a few civil wars, the normal evolution of the country's economy was frequently interrupted. Out of the twenty-two years of Mazepa's rule, a little more than one month was really peaceful, as the same Ohloblin notes. These interruptions and destructive wars, as well as epidemics, plagues, droughts and locusts, were the leading causes of the serious economic fluctuations, and in parti-

cular, of the recurring depressions. Those fluctuations were, on the other hand, greatly intensified by the changing character of the economy as a whole, namely its transition from agricultural feudalism to early commercial capitalism. This process was then taking place not only in Ukraine but throughout Western Europe as well.

Recurring depressions and disastrous wars produced strong and numerous waves of migration, flowing out of the right-bank and the left-bank Ukraine, largely reducing the country's population and its labor force, with a consequent increase in serfdom.<sup>11</sup>

The colonial policy of the Czarist government, aggressively pursued in Ukraine since the battle of Poltava, may be considered the third significant factor which greatly retarded Ukrainian economic development. St. Petersburg desired to keep the country as a source of food and raw materials for Russian imperial markets, and consequently, was opposed to any attempt at industrialization on her part. According to Slabchenko, Voluyev, Ohloblin and other students of Ukrainian economic history, after the incorporation of Ukraine into Russia, Ukrainian industries were completely suppressed by the Czars.<sup>12</sup>

**Colonization Process.** Literally throughout the entire Cossacko-Hetmanic period of Ukrainian history until the last quarter of the 18th century, Ukraine continued to be "okraina," a borderland of Europe, the eastern and southern frontiers of which were in perpetual flux. New areas were continually colonized and added to the Ukrainian ethnical territory. With the exception of West Ukraine, colonization was also carried on throughout the ethnographic area and far beyond in the Don-Volga area and the Kuban basin. The Revolution and the subsequent wars had left many villages and towns in ruin, and heavily depopulated some of the provinces. With the pacification of the country and the partial restoration of peaceful conditions, a vigorous colonization process was begun.

In right-bank Ukraine the settlement process was resumed immediately within the framework of the independent Ukrainian state. The West Ukrainians, Poles, Germans, Walachians, Czechs, Lithuanians, Serbs, Bulgarians, Byeloruthenians and others came as colonists to build a better future for themselves. A new impetus was given to the settlement of the right-bank areas by the reestablishment there of Polish rule. History repeated itself. First, the Polish nobility regained possession of their enormous landed estates to resume their own form of commercial agriculture. This

time instead of Polonized names, like Ostrozhsky, Vishnevetsky or Zaslavsky, the names of a new Polish nobility, like Potocki, Branicki, Jablonowski and Zamojski prevailed. At first, in order to obtain more laborers, they offered such advantages to prospective settlers as freedom from bondage and from other obligations to the lords for a number of years. As a result, the population of right-bank Ukraine increased rapidly. But after a few years when the labor force was adequate, these freedoms were progressively suppressed and the peasant colonists eventually turned into serfs.<sup>13</sup>

The Polish form of serfdom was almost intolerable for the Ukrainian peasant, releasing a series of migrations from the right-bank districts in the direction of the Black Sea steppes, or the left-bank Hetmanic Ukraine, or in the same direction farther eastward to Village Ukraine and the Kuban territory, between the Azov Sea and the Caucasian mountains. This adventurous colonization process, known since time immemorial as "ukhodstvo," continued with only short interruptions due to war. Hundreds of new villages and towns were founded or old ones rebuilt during this period, such towns as Hlukhiv, Putivl, Sumy, Krolovets, Lebedin, Kharkiv and Okhtirka, in both left-bank and Village Ukraine. Hundreds of thousands of people of all social classes were involved. The population movement was partially induced by the Ukrainian, Polish and Russian governments, but for the most part it was a spontaneous, voluntary and privately motivated drive of a people in quest for its national destiny.

Naturally, these developments in the Ukrainian national economy were induced by various factors, both internal and national as well as international in character. They were briefly indicated previously. The growing demand for grain in Western and Southern Europe made colonization and commercial agriculture profitable. The growing burden of serfdom and wars motivated people to move to safer and more agreeable places, and the desire of the respective national governments to strengthen their rules by the settlement of vacant territories must be considered. Run-away serfs from Russia and peasants from the left-bank Ukraine looking for freedom in the Donets areas, gave rise to continuous grievances between the Ukrainian and Russian governments. Since both governments wanted to encourage this migration they always supported their own subjects. They were unwilling to return the refugees to their homeland. Naturally, this attitude on both sides was tantamount to raiding the labor force.

The Russian sponsored colonization of the territory of the Cos-

sack Host by Serbians after 1751, undertaken without the consent of the Cossacks, resulted in a serious political conflict. The Cossacks went as far as attempting to destroy these Serbian colonies in the Eizabeth and Bakhmut areas. This antagonized the Russians, caused an assault on Seetch, and the liquidation of the Host in 1775.<sup>14</sup>

Out of the vast reserves of soil in the eastern and southern borderlands individual lots were appropriated according to squatters' rights, *ius primi occupationis*, by the usurpation of unclaimed land by Cossack and peasant settlers, adventurers and social outcasts, as well as by the nobility. At first anyone could occupy as much land as he could till; later colonists began to seek court assistance to assure their property rights. The work and capital invested in land, and in some instances *ius traditionis* were the main criteria for the courts to decide upon ownership rights. Usually during the first stage of colonization, the settlers used several cooperative measures, like "spriah," "siabr," and "brotherhood" associations. Spriah and siabr accomplished their purposes under the leadership of a "captain" (otoman). But as soon as the colonists were economically established, these cooperatives or semi-collective institutions were abandoned.

The quantity of land which could be taken into cultivation in each individual case depended greatly upon the density of population and the increasing scarcity of land. The settlers sought more and more court action and legal documentation for their rights of land ownership.

In Village Ukraine a Czarist grant usually allotted land to the settlers as a group; they divided the arable soil among themselves, keeping forest, hunting, fishery and pasture areas for common use at least for a time. However, land was so abundant in Village Ukraine and in the Black Sea steppes that colonists were actually free to possess much additional land and to establish their ownership by *ius primi occupantionis* or *ius traditionis*.

This abundance contributed to the emergence of large landed estates. The Cossack leaders and the wealthier Cossack settlers, possessing more capital and implements, had an opportunity to occupy more land and in this way to develop vast estates. The same was done later by the Russian noblemen who received Czarist grants in the Don-Donets basin, as mentioned before. Sometimes even non-resident noblemen and Cossack leaders like Ivan Sirko and Michael Vasiliv acquired in Village Ukraine large landholdings which they colonized.<sup>15</sup>

After 1668 the Czars began to issue decrees to assure and to

secure the perpetual property rights of the common and noble settlers, placing them beyond the control of Russian officials. In Hetmanic Ukraine, and later in other territories as well, cultivation of the soil, construction of fences and the employment of markers were the visible signs of occupation and ownership honored by the courts and administrative authorities.

Normally, the more deeply colonization penetrated the "wild fields," the more primitive were the economic beginnings of the settlers. Nevertheless, the economy of the borderlands advanced quickly to the stage of a developed agricultural business, since colonists frequently arrived in the new regions with implements, grain, cattle and draft animals and some capital.

**Agriculture.** At the time of the National Revolution, Ukraine was unquestionably an agricultural nation. Agriculture was the foundation of economic growth. Its progress brought prosperity and wealth. Farming was also the most loved and respected occupation during Hetmanic times. Slabchenko said that the physiocratic philosophy prevailed in Ukraine before it became popular in the West. It embraced more than the intensive cultivation of the soil advocated by Quesnay, Mirabeau and other French agriculturists.<sup>16</sup> Ukrainian farming quickly recovered from the ravages of war. Cultivated areas were enlarged enormously in successive decades, increasing farm output and thus strengthening the nation's economy. The sowing areas expanded when Tartar raids gradually decreased, permitting greater safety in the steppes and in southern and eastern Ukraine. The power of the Turks also diminished in the Black Sea and Azov Sea shore territories. These developments encouraged large-scale colonization which automatically enlarged the arable areas of East Europe. On the other hand, the development of grain production was further encouraged by the continuously expanding needs for food and other agricultural raw materials in the West.

The soil and climatic conditions of Ukraine soon made wheat her leading crop and main export item. The Black Sea was slowly becoming a significant sea route for exportation, mainly because of the decreasing might of the Ottoman Empire. Wheat was widely grown in the southern and central parts of Ukraine because of the ideal climatic conditions and fertile black soil. This was noted by such foreigners as Beauplan, a Frenchman living in this area from 1630 to 1647; Marshall, an English author visiting Ukraine in the years 1768 and 1770; Weihe, a Swedish officer, who was in Ukraine during the Northern War; and many others.<sup>17</sup>

In the northern sections of the country where the climate was harsh and the soil poorer, rye was by far the leading crop. The fact that wheat was the main product of the country, however, can be deduced from the remarks of those foreigners who visited Ukraine in the 17th and 18th centuries. Hildebrandt, a Swedish delegate, found Ukraine "...a beautiful land, rich in all sorts of wheat." Paul of Aleppo, secretary of the Patriarch of Antioch, traveling through Ukraine in the years 1654 and 1656, wrote: "The route through Ukraine led ... through fields of all kinds of wheat which grows as tall as a human being and looks like an ocean without any shores." Weihe, the previously mentioned Swedish officer, said that "Wheat grows here in unlimited quantities."<sup>18</sup>

While wheat was produced by the Ukrainian manors and farms during the Polish rule, it was not such an important crop at that time. All other traditional crops were grown during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period with acreage and output per acre steadily increasing. Among these were barley, buckwheat, oats, millet, hemp, flax, and hops. Marshall mentioned in his recollections various crops seen by him during his journey. He was most impressed by the hemp and flax production. He said: "The quantity of hemp sown in all this country is very considerable ... I observed numerous hemp grounds, though not so much of the country is under that crop as corn (grain)."

Marshall indicated that nine-tenths of English hemp and flax importation from East Europe came from Ukraine, and that these products were better than those received from her American colonies. The subject of Ukrainian hemp and flax seemed to fascinate him as it is repeated again and again in his writings.<sup>19</sup>

These two crops were grown particularly in the northern parts of Hetmanic Ukraine (Chernihiv district) and throughout Village Ukraine.<sup>20</sup> Hops was also widely grown, and in larger quantities than in the previous period, on manorial, monastic and peasant farms, permitting the brewing of beer throughout Ukraine. Large hops plantations were cultivated by the upper classes, while peasants raising hops had to pay their rents in the form of deliveries of hops to the manors.

Mulberry trees were grown in Ukraine to provide for a small-scale silk industry. According to Hueldenstaedt's report, mulberry trees grew in Kiev. Silk production was also attempted in Village Ukraine.

Numerous new plants were introduced into the Ukrainian farm economy. Maize was brought in by Bulgarian and Walachian settlers. Clover and tobacco were introduced by the Tartars. Maize

quickly became popular, and soon a considerable area was planted in it. The cultivation of tobacco grew most rapidly because of government sponsorship. Tobacco plantations were numerous and large in left-bank Ukraine (Lubni, Hadiach, and Nizhin districts) and Village Ukraine (Okhtira and Kharkiv areas).

On the large plantations of the privileged classes tobacco was raised in a system of long belts, and under the supervision of foreign specialists. In 1724 tobacco cultivation was already quite large; some 100,000 bales with an approximate cash value of 70,000 rubles were harvested.<sup>21</sup> Tobacco leaves were packed in bales, and in car-loads delivered to local markets or processing factories. The surplus was exported.

Potatoes were introduced to Ukraine, according to Krypiakovich, in the second half of the 18th century, and on a very limited scale, largely to feed animals. In the 19th century, and in particular during the years of excessively poor crops, potatoes became popular as food for humans. From that time on they were grown throughout the country and frequently were the main item of diet of the lower strata of the population.<sup>22</sup>

Sugar beet plantations also became an important segment of Ukrainian agriculture, beginning in the 19th century. In the borderlands, like Village Ukraine and the Territory of the Cossack Host, hunting, fishing, and cattle raising were soon superseded by agriculture.

Vegetable and fruit raising was also rapidly developing. In the 17th century there were few orchards and but little fruit production in Ukraine according to foreign visitors. Werdum said that fruit trees were grown mostly in cities and that they were almost unknown in the countryside. Paul of Alepo who traveled through Ukraine about this time disagrees: "The route through Ukraine led in most part through orchards, of which there is no end." But Alepo's writings were always so extremely favorable to Ukraine that he might have considered even the wild plum trees of which Werdum spoke as orchards. If, however, there could be any controversy about the extent of fruit growing in Ukraine in the 17th century, such controversy has no place in the 18th century as orchards were developed all over the country. Siltman, another Swedish officer in Ukraine, wrote, under the date of November 5, 1708, about fruit available everywhere for the peasants. Hueldenstaedt, an academician who devoted much time to the study of the Ukrainian economy, reported considerable fruit growing in the towns and cities in the period 1771-1774. He said that in the city of Kiev "fruit

trees could be found near almost every house.”<sup>23</sup> This certainly was not an isolated case, for fruit trees were also grown extensively in other towns and in the countryside.

Eventually special varieties of fruit trees were imported, some times as a hobby of the upper classes. Vice-treasurer Markovich, for example, developed numerous orchards of apple, pear, plum, cherry and walnut trees. In one spring he purchased over a thousand plum trees of various kinds. Famous orchards grew in Galicia, and in left-bank and right-bank Ukraine. Numerous amateurs from among the Cossacks, such as Khanenko, hired foreign specialists to develop and to care for rare species of fruit trees, according to Krypiakevich. These specialists were mostly Germans.<sup>24</sup>

In some instances the orchards of the upper classes were more like gardens. The cultivation of grapes for wine was also continued, particularly in the cloister possessions, but still without much success, since Ukrainian wine was poor and unpopular. Alberto Vimina, the Venetian minister visiting Ukraine in 1650 remarked that “Wine was seldom drunk there, and it was served only for outstanding foreigners.” The growing and processing of grapes was attempted in the newly settled Village Ukraine, according to records, and presumably with the same results.

Among the most popular fruits in the Ukrainian orchards were apples, pears, plums, sweet and sour cherries, and walnuts. The expansion of orchard and fruit tree growing was very rapid later on. Hence, in the following (19th) century, orchards grew all over the country, in every village and town, on every farm and manor. The most outstanding of all the Ukrainian poets, Taras Shevchenko, with delight and love praised the orchards of the Ukrainian village, especially the cherry orchards which made every peasant’s hut charming.

Gardening and vegetable production were not very well developed in the 17th century, according to Slabchenko, but they expanded later.<sup>25</sup> Vegetable growing in the towns and manors was intensified to meet an increased demand, while the villages lagged in this respect. Since gardens require more intensive cultivation, they flourished in West Ukraine (Galicia and Podolia) where living conditions were less stormy, as Werdum points out.<sup>26</sup>

Truck farming was a novelty during the Lithuanian-Polish era, but grew and expanded during the following period. Crops included the traditional beans, lettuce, kohlrabi, cabbage, turnips and onions. In all cases the manorial economy pioneered, and induced imitation by the peasants, as Krypiakevich notes. The variety increased to include carrots, cauliflower, asparagus, beets, cucumbers, peas,



watermelons, radishes, horseradish, parsley, celery and pumpkins. Cabbage, onion, radish and cucumber were among the most popular crops.<sup>27</sup>

**Agricultural technology and organization** progressed rapidly along a recognizable pattern. From western Ukraine it gradually spread over the central, eastern and southern areas. It was at first adopted by the manor and eventually imitated by the peasant. Agricultural technology was initiated in West Ukraine for two reasons. First, because this area suffered less from the devastations of war and conditions were somewhat less turbulent. And, second, because this part of Ukraine was closer to the West, which was at that time the center of civilization. The latter was probably the most important reason.

On the other hand, the manors were better able to adopt advanced techniques because they had more capital and labor at their disposal.<sup>28</sup> Hence, first in West Ukraine, and on its larger estates, the three-field system was replaced by an intensive crop rotation which wasted no arable land. An extensive application of animal manure was adopted. Initially, only small amounts of manure were used. Then experience recommended ever more animal fertilizer until maximum fertility was achieved. However, the natural fertility of the soil in East Ukraine rendered the use of manure less important, therefore delaying the adoption of fertilizer.

Better implements and tools were also gradually introduced. Wooden plow shares, wooden plows and other wooden tools, like rakes, harrows and hoes, which were largely used by the peasants in the second half of the 17th century, were gradually replaced by iron implements. In southern Ukraine, wooden plows were employed, while in the northern parts of the country an even more primitive plowshare was in use.

In the 18th century, however, the so-called Ukrainian plow, a heavy iron implement, came into general use all over the country. Marshall said: "I observed many plows at work, some with six horses of a small weak breed, but in general each was drawn by four stout oxen."<sup>29</sup> In the second half of the 18th century, iron implements were used on all estates while wooden tools were still used by the peasants. Oxen remained the leading type of draft animal throughout the country. Horses were raised extensively, not for farmwork but rather for harnessing to coaches, for riding, hunting, and racing. Weihe remarked that: "The horses have great endurance and are favored more than any other animal because of their racing speed."

In order to obtain more arable land, deforestation and melioration and irrigation works were continuously undertaken, primarily on the large landed estates. But the practices were not entirely unknown among the peasants, particularly rodding the forests. The estates of the religious orders were model farms. Not only was the farmland highly fertilized, but also the pastures as well. The land was deep-plowed and tilled two or three times a year. Meliorations and irrigations were extensive. Field labor and administration were minutely organized according to an elaborate schedule, as, for example, on the Vidubitsi cloister estates, where the schedule was written. Many officials and supervisors were assigned to specific duties. In some noble and Cossack possessions the farm work was extremely well administered by large staffs. On the private estates of Hetman Rozumovsky, for instance, there were some 260 officials, supervisors and foremen, not infrequently foreign specialists. Administration of the noble possessions in West Ukraine was particularly elaborate. Each manorial economy was managed by an administrator, who had to be from the gentry, and directed the work of various officials. A number of the manorial economies in certain areas constituted the so-called "key of estates," administered and managed by a noble official, called the economist, having authority over all manors and administrators, and their farms, mills, distilleries, breweries, sawing mills and other establishments. A number of the key estates were under the management, control and supervision of a "commissioner-general of goods," always a nobleman. Individual establishments of the manorial estates, such as mills, breweries, potash and tar workshops and others, were operated on a rent-lease basis by professional millers, brewers or potash manufacturers, or sometimes directly by the nobles.<sup>30</sup>

Due to advanced techniques, the productivity of the manorial estates, especially the monastic, was two or two and one half times greater than that of the peasant farms. The enlarged sowing area and the improved technology in the land of the Cossack Host produced about 240,000 hundredweights of wheat by 1780.<sup>31</sup> Foreign visitors were greatly impressed. Marshall, who has been quoted so often, wrote that small farms owned and operated by the peasants, prevailed in Ukraine (Little Russia) on a highly efficient basis since serfdom and bondage were unknown there. He also believed that the estates of nobles were not as well cultivated as were the peasants' farms.<sup>32</sup>

Although Marshall's remarks were not entirely accurate, since peasant landholdings were neither more numerous nor more efficient-

ly cultivated than those of the manorial type, he was still correct in saying that peasant farmwork was well done. Furthermore, the over-all impression generally received by foreign visitors of agricultural and industrial prosperity in Ukraine, so soon after the tragic war, may give some idea of the speed at which the economy recovered.<sup>33</sup>

There were in Ukraine at that time, according to Bahalii, four technical forms of farming: the Ukrainian, the German, the Muscovite and the Walachian. The Ukrainian type was relatively primitive, based on raising staple crops. Land was tilled by a heavy iron plow drawn by oxen. Considerable cattle raising and very little gardening and fruit growing took place. This type prevailed on the peasant farms all over Ukraine.

The German type was a most progressive one, brought from Germany either by the German and West Slavic Colonists, or by the German farm specialists frequently employed by the Cossack and noble land owners. It featured an intensive use of manure and fertilizer, the application of advanced tools and implements, scientific cattle and horse breeding and considerable dairy production. The German form of farm economy was found mainly on the manorial possessions.

The Muscovite system was employed mostly on municipal estates. It featured some grain production, but emphasized an intensive vegetable and fruit growing. Walachian dairy farming developed in connection with horse, sheep and cattle raising. It will be discussed briefly in the next section.<sup>34</sup>

As far as the ownership of farmland was concerned, four leading forms and a few subdivisions were differentiated in Hetmanic Ukraine: the state domain, the manorial estates, the municipal estates and the peasant landholdings. Initially, the state domains were vast and numerous. They were the result of revolutionary transitions. Polish possessions were confiscated by the new Ukrainian government. However, since it was physically impossible for the government to manage the cultivation, the land thus acquired was in part distributed among the Cossacks and other privileged classes, on either a permanent or a temporary basis to compensate for services rendered. In part the land was given to settlers, or leased to individuals. Gradually this land came into the permanent possession of individuals, nobles at first, and later townspeople and peasants as well.

There were four major forms of Cossack and noble land tenure in Hetmanic Ukraine: the above-mentioned estates of rank, the perpetual use of land, the possession of land by virtue of military

approval, and the estates in support of homes. The perpetual use of or peaceful enjoyment of land was the most comprehensive and most complete with such rights and privileges as claims on the peasant serfs and patrimonial jurisdiction. The estates of rank were temporary endowments for the duration of office. Legally, therefore, the land and the peasants in bondage thereon were considered subject to state authority, and not the authority of the lords. The estates held at the pleasure of the military were temporary landholdings to be effected by a change in a future time by a government decision. Finally, the landholdings in support of the home were also given on a temporary basis to assist Cossack families for any good reasons, as Kononenko indicated.<sup>35</sup> The possessions of the religious orders were normally in perpetuity.

Estates were administered in the same manner whether they were public or private. Land could be cultivated directly by the manor, or it could be leased for rental payments. Lessees came from all segments of society, and shared their crops according to contractual stipulations with the state or the private lessor. The so-called half-share peasants (Polovinski), for example, rented their land and tilled it themselves, while the Cossack or noble lessors supplied seed and implements. At harvest time, the crops were divided, half for the lessee, and the other half for the lessor. A particular class of peasants existed who possessed no land of their own. They were paid a certain number of shocks of grain in return for cultivating leased land.

Peasant landholding was ordinarily individual and private, contingent upon "usual obediences" toward the master. The concept of a peasant farm always included, according to contemporary criteria, farmland, pastures, forests, stables, barns, implements and servants; while the home dwelling, cattle and horses were not essential components of a farmstead unit—so defined for taxation purposes. Of course, there were numerous poor, landless peasants (Bezzemelni) who were largely hired as day laborers. Their numbers grew proportionately with the turbulent war years and the inflationary trends of the 16th century. Because of inflation their monetary wages were comparatively high, and were usually supplemented by compensation in kind. There was also a group of very poor peasants (called Pidsusidki) who had no living quarters of their own and shared the homes of those who had.

Miakotin and Slabchenko maintained that those landless peasants paved the way for the return of serfdom throughout the country in conjunction with two other factors, the increasing burdens and the

rising indebtedness of both landowning and landless peasants. The burdens imposed upon the peasants by the State, the Church and the lord, along with the annual rental payments, included the traditional tithes, carrol, baptisms, and wedding contributions, excise taxes, tools and other payments. Mazepa and Skoropadsky imposed taxes even on the landless and homeless peasants, where in practice it was impossible to collect.

The indebtedness of the village population was considerable, in the form of both short-term and long-term credit necessary to buy cattle, horses and farm implements. Shortage of capital was general among the peasants, a fact which kept their farms primitive compared to the manors. Insolvency could mean a reduction to slavery or semi-slavery of entire farm families. Together with failure to pay taxes, insolvency resulted in the restoration of serfdom. In general, however, the peasants managed to escape such pitfalls; in time their social status worsened while economically they slowly improved.<sup>36</sup>

The right-bank and West Ukraine were in a less favorable economic position at that time, being under Polish domination and thus exposed to economic exploitation and national discrimination. The reintroduction of Polish rule there in the later 17th century quickly aggravated the burdens of bondage and serfdom. As much as four to six days of compulsory manorial labor each week were required of the peasants compared to about half that much in Hetmanic Ukraine. In addition, compulsory payments, contributions and service, and the unlimited patrimonial power of the Polish gentry over the peasant serfs made the life of the village population intolerable. Hence, hundreds of thousands of them took refuge either in the left-bank provinces or in the Territory of the Cossack Host. The fear of heavy penalties, including capital punishment, failed to halt the emigration. Ohloblin supplies some data on this subject. He said that in certain areas of Volhnia and other parts of right-bank Ukraine, from 1648 to 1690 only from four to twelve per cent of the population remained.<sup>37</sup>

The continuous Tartar raids and military expeditions of the Poles contributed greatly to Ukraine's ruin. The decline of farming was evident from the catastrophic reduction in grain exported from this area through the harbor of Danzig. Thus, the total Polish grain exportation for 1648 was 32,000,000 hundredweights; by 1715 it declined to about 725,000 hundredweights, approximately 3 per cent of the prerevolutionary level.<sup>38</sup> This is, of course, highly significant because Ukrainian grain exports constituted the largest portion

of grain traded by the Polish crown at that time.

In 1704, after the liquidation of a rebellion led by Simon Palii, a Cossack chieftain, Hetman Mazepa gained control over the right-bank Ukraine, and for a short time the country was united. The scanty records of that segment of Mazepa's activity indicate, however, that the Hetman made every effort to improve the economic conditions of the country. Colonization was sponsored, trading supported and industrial production developed. But his rule was too short to produce any lasting improvements.<sup>39</sup>

**Hunting, Fishing and Cattle Raising**, including sheep, hog and poultry production lost much of their importance by this time. With the growth of agriculture they were reduced to a secondary rank. But the farther and deeper that the frontiers penetrated into the steppes, the more important these industries became since they always came as first stages of economic evolution in any territory or society. Therefore, in the territory of the Cossack Host and Village Ukraine they remained highly significant, as the exports at that time indicated.

Horse and cattle breeding was even more important as a way of making a living in the frontier lands. At the liquidation of the Cossack Host in 1775, the possession of large herds of cattle, horses and sheep was still an indication of individual wealth and opulence in these steppe areas. Hence, the economic significance of the extractive industries varied with the sections of the country.

On the banks of large rivers and the shores of the Black and Azov Seas, fishing was always a leading occupation, even in the 19th century, while the significance of hunting was greater in the forest areas. The technologies of hunting, fishing and cattle raising naturally progressed along with other industries.

However, in hunting some traditional techniques, such as the construction and installation of traps for game, the use of nets, and the training of hunting hounds, falcons and hawks still persisted. The most radical innovation was the general use of rifles and shotguns instead of bows and arrows. In those sections of the country where excellent and abundant hunting opportunities existed, there were trained and experienced hunters among the peasants and other manorial personnel, not to mention the Cossacks and the nobles.

According to available records, memoirs, official documents and codes of law, among the animals hunted were bears, wolves, foxes, wild boars, deer, martens, beavers, rabbits and squirrels, and fowl such as wild geese, ducks, blackcocks, moorhens and peahens.

Buffalos, white hares and wildcats were to be found in the northernmost frontiers on the Muscovite borders; bears were found in the mountains and forests, but in decreasing numbers. Beavers were progressively exterminated although they were still available in small numbers in Galicia and Hetmanic Ukraine as late as the early 18th century. According to contemporaries, they were of a nomadic type, up to five feet in length and approaching sixty pounds in weight, living in inaccessible cleavages and clefts along the rivers.<sup>40</sup> Despite legal protection, beavers were soon completely exterminated for their valuable skins. Likewise bulls and ureoxes on the Ukrainian steppes also became extinct.

Hunting grounds and hunting rights were strictly protected and regulated by the Lithuanian Statutes which were still in force, the "Laws by which justice is done among the Little Russian people," the unofficial but popular codification in Hetmanic Ukraine from 1743, and numerous Hetmanic and Czarist decrees. The various regulations were similar. In the newer laws and decrees, however, the monetary value of the game was doubled or tripled to correspond with rising prices, and it was expressed in rubles instead of gulden. Killing a beaver, for example, could result in a fine of from 2.4 to 4.8 rubles, according to its size. In general, killing or stealing of a wounded animal or bird from someone else's hunting ground commanded monetary compensation as follows: for a wild boar, 1.20 rubles; for a marten, 60 kopeyeks; for a large trained hawk, 2 rubles; for a swan, 1 ruble; for a peahen, 1.50 rubles, for a hunting hound, 2.40 to 3.60 rubles according to its breeding

Punishments were also imposed for demolishing traps and nets, for hunting in somebody else's forests and for stealing or destroying beehives. The traditionally great attention paid by law and administration to hunting rights indicated the relatively great economic significance of hunting in the Cossack-Hetmanic era.<sup>41</sup>

Along with the protection of the hunting grounds, legal protection was also extended to other forest rights since the forests were a source of wealth. In particular, with the growth of various forest industries, such as potash and tar production, furniture manufacture and the lumber and timber industries for construction and exportation, this protection became increasingly important. Stealing wood, burning forests, obliterating edges and ownership identification marks, and cutting or uprooting trees without permission or title were punished, and restitution exacted. At first, forest rights, fisheries and hunting grounds were communal property, particularly in Village Ukraine and the territory of the Cossack Host. Neverthe-

less, very soon they became private property. Neither a stranger nor a lessee was allowed to undertake anything that might exceed the framework of the permission granted by the individual proprietor. Monetary compensations also in these cases were now higher than the rates once applied by the Lithuanian Statute. The development of the private property concept with respect to forests and woods was distinctly evident by the granting of servitude to hunt, fish, ride or have bee-hives. One could acquire these servitude rights on somebody else's grounds, for temporary or perpetual enjoyment, and they were protected by law as well.<sup>42</sup>

Apiculture continued to be a very important industry. Bee hives were developed in the fields and forests, where proper plants grew. Nobles, Cossacks and peasants were engaged in bee-raising and honey production. Baranovich said that, for example, in the middle of the 18th century, in the latifundium of Vishnivets (Volhinia) alone, there were 8,967 peasant, and 2,245 manorial bee-hives, producing for the manors some 4,900 guildens revenue. Specialists were hired at an annual wage of 50 guildens.

Fish production and fishing continued to be significant, and even their relative importance increased in some instances, such as the fishing business on the Azov Sea shores. Artificial pools were constructed and maintained, as before, by the nobles and Cossack aristocrats, and in the possessions of the religious orders, while fishing in the rivers and natural lakes was mainly an occupation of the village population. Sturgeons, carps, tenches, roaches and gordons were the principal kinds of fish, the catching of which was done by netting and angling. In the manorial economies, artificial pools were emptied of water to catch the fish in large quantities for trading and exportation. This practice had been known and applied already in Ukraine in the latter part of the previous historical era. The export business of the Cossack Territory and the Village Ukraine exhibited a large fish economy. Fishing and fish exportation sometimes even developed into a political issue. Gordon mentioned in his writings instances of the Russians sending troops to the lower Dniepr area to reduce Cossack fish production and to bar its exportation. Just also mentioned fishing as a considerable industry in Ukraine at the time of his visit. In the manorial estates of the nobles and Cossack grandees artificial lakes and ponds were dug. There they raised all kinds of fish: carp, sturgeon, pike, tench, crucian carp and others. Fishing took place every three years. Manorial income from selling fish was considerable, from 3000 to 3500 guildens.<sup>43</sup>



For the later Hetmanic era, Hueldenstaedt reported a growing fishing industry among the Cossacks and the Ukrainian settlers in the neighborhood city of Tahanrih on the shores of the Azov Sea. Fish factories to haul, process, dry, can and salt fish were in operation in the Cossack Territory and the Tahanrih districts in the 1770's. Apparently, the Ukrainian colonists in the Donets basin were preoccupied by the industry, since Hueldenstaedt thought "...that the Ukrainians were the people engaged in the fish industry. ...that the fish industry contributed to the richness of the area."<sup>44</sup> He gave an example of three Ukrainian settlements on the banks of the Mius river.

At that time, fishing in East Ukraine was no longer merely a way of providing for a meager subsistence at a primitive colonization stage, as in the 17th century, but a progressive and commercialized business conducted for profit, similar to that in West Ukraine in the previous period.

Most certainly, cattle and horse raising was the most important business among these three extractive industries. Raising oxen, cows, sheep, hogs, goats, and then also chickens, capons, pullets, geese, ducks, turkeys and other breeds of animals and birds, must be included in the discussion of this economic sector. Horses were raised partially as draft animals, along with mules, particularly by the peasants. But horses were bred mostly for horseback riding, harnessing, hunting and racing. The nobles and the Cossack aristocrats continued to maintain large horse breeding stations of a thousand or more horses for those purposes, and for commercial speculation as well.

Several breeds of horses were known. Among these were the strong steppe horses, raised mainly in the Cossack Territory; the Walachian breed; and a certain weak breed, noticed by Marshall, probably among the peasants. Beauplan was impressed by the breed owned by the nobles. He said: "The great men of the country have fine horses spotted like leopards, beautiful to behold, which draw their coaches when they go to court." He mentioned also a great number of wild horses living in the steppes.

The peasants raised horses mainly for hard field work, but they could not always afford to keep them. Sometimes one horse was held for every second or third farmstead. Presumably, the village population preferred in some instances weak breeds of horses, cattle and sheep, since these secured them against frequent requisitions by the government and the military, which looked primarily

for outstanding qualities of strength, endurance and fertility in these animals.

Oxen were raised first of all as draft animals for field work in the peasant farmsteads and manorial economies. Marshall and Weihe noticed the strong Ukrainian oxen and were impressed by their breeds. Weihe said that "...oxen ...are of a beautiful breed and size," while Marshall talked about the "stout oxen" all over in the fields.<sup>45</sup>

Cows, goats and certain sheep were reared for milk and milk products. Dairy production was fairly well developed in the manorial economies of the upper classes and of the religious orders, while the peasants and townspeople indulged in that business on a smaller scale, since it was more expensive and required more intensive management. Serfdom certainly did not facilitate the trend. Nevertheless, the output of the peasant dairy production was considerable, as contemporaries related. In both manorial and peasant dairies, production was both for use and for the market. Products included milk, buttermilk, sour milk, sour cream, butter and various kinds of cheese. Naturally, the manorial dairy business was more commercialized. Marshall's statement may be quoted again: "In management of their cattle they were very good farmers ... and they sell immense quantities of butter and cheese."

Dairy production flourished, particularly in the mountainous areas: the Carpathian mountains, Bukovina, and some parts of Galicia and Podolia, where the traditional Walachian type of farming still prevailed. There, whole villages indulged exclusively in the business of cattle, sheep, hog, and horse raising and dairy production. Dairy products were their main output. The population of the Walachian type of villages was made up of professional herdsmen and dairy manufacturers. In most cases, a lack of fertile soil for grain production induced the Walachian type of economy, which although considerable in the 15th and 16th centuries, gradually declined in the 17th under the impact of increasing grain production. Its remnants were to be found only in the Hetmanic period in the above indicated sections of Ukraine.<sup>46</sup>

In the rest of the country, the German manorial and the primitive Ukrainian village farming, however, without stressing cattle raising and dairy business as their primary ends, as Walachian farming did, were progressively engaged in that type of economy. The greater needs of the increasing population necessitated this development. The number of cattle owned was certainly an indication of wealth. The fact that for a good number of years exports of cattle were the

most important sector of Ukrainian foreign trade indicates the extent of cattle breeding in the economy. Dzhedhzora and Doroshenko indicated that the ranchers produced hundreds of thousands of cattle. In 1737 alone Russian armies requisitioned 44,000 and purchased an additional 30,000 oxen while tens of thousands were sold to Poland, Lithuania, Russia and the German cities.

Cattle and horse breeding were especially important in the Territory of the Cossack Host and in Village Ukraine because of their vast stretches of land. Pasture lands there were inexhaustible for years. After the remnants of communal ownership disappeared, considerable individual fortunes accumulated among the Cossacks.

At the end of the political autonomy of the Territory of the Host, Cossack chieftains owned large herds and flocks, hundreds and thousands of horses, oxen, bulls, cows, sheep and goats. The common Cossack also possessed large herds. During the Tartar raid in 1769, for example, the Tartars took from one Cossack 600 horses; from another, 127 horses, 300 oxen and bulls and 1200 sheep; and from a third, 250 horses and 5000 sheep. In the liquidation of Seetch, the Muscovites confiscated the properties of the Cossack leaders like Kalnishevsky and Hloba, amounting to many thousands of rubles, hundreds of horses, thousands of cattle and sheep. These figures are indicative of the extent of cattle raising in those areas.

A similar growth of cattle breeding also prevailed in Village Ukraine, according to the records. This predominantly natural and extensive character of the economy of these two Ukrainian provinces was distinctly manifested by the composition of their export trading, which consisted of such items as wool, cattle, skins, hides, leather, butter and fish, which went to Russia, Turkey, Crimea and Poland. Wheat did not become a leading export commodity of these territories until later, primarily under Russian domination after 1780.

In the latter Hetmanic era, after Samoilovich, sheep raising began to experience a rapid growth, which, however, was followed by an abrupt decline in the 1830's. Its speedy expansion was motivated by the increased demand for wool in Russia. The modern Russian armies required standard uniforms, as Krupnitsky said, and this greatly increased the demand for wool.<sup>47</sup>

Sheep raising was officially encouraged in Russia and also in Ukraine, both by the Hetmanic government and the Russian resident protectors. The economic approach of these two governments to the problem of sheep raising in Ukraine, however, was entirely

different. The Ukrainian Hetmans, Apostol in particular, following the traditional Ukrainian free enterprise system and agricultural preference, wanted to leave sheep raising in the hands of the local population, Cossacks and peasants, and to preserve in this way a balance between the interests of grain production and a normal growth of the sheep raising economy. Technically speaking, these two industries—grain production and sheep raising—are mutually exclusive. Sheep have been a deadly enemy of the plow, and vice versa. Where the plow has marked its success, the sheep must disappear. It was rational, therefore, to leave the issue of grain or sheep up to the population of the countryside and the market to decide. People would raise grain where land was fertile but relatively scarce, and a more intensive farming was required; where pasture lands and good grass were abundant, they would raise sheep.

The Ukrainian Hetmanic government willingly gave its support to a justifiable sheep production. German and German trained Ukrainian specialists were hired to advance the idea of a progressive and scientific sheep raising in the country as a result of which Ukrainian wool exports might have increased greatly.<sup>48</sup> Hence good breeds of long-haired sheep were observed in Ukraine by foreigners. The Russian government, on the other hand, through its representatives and residents in Ukraine, pursued there an aggressive, mercantilistically minded policy, as far as sheep raising was concerned, in order to supply large quantities of wool for its government and semi-private textile and garment shops. Russian experts were sent to carry on large-scale sheep raising in Ukraine, even at the expense of grain production. The Ukrainian people resented foreign compulsion and resisted it by sabotage. These Russian and other foreign experts attempted to establish a kind of sheep "factory," but the experiment soon collapsed, because of its technical and managerial artificiality, the opposition of the local population and the official position of the Ukrainian government. The experiment was very unpopular because these "sheep factories" were run with extensive use of forced labor and excessive government regimentation. Moreover, it was an infraction of Ukrainian political autonomy and detrimental to the economic interest of the country. At the time of Hetman Apostol, Krupnitsky said, the official statistics showed about 339,000 sheep in Ukraine. The figure seems to be grossly inflated. The quantity of 146,000 would be more realistic to accept, he said, for the Hetmanic territory.<sup>49</sup> The extent of sheep holding in other Ukrainian

provinces, in particular for the mountainous areas, cannot be estimated with certainty.

Hog raising developed very successfully throughout the entire Ukraine, because pork was a popular meat. Beauplan and other visitors in Ukraine mentioned hog breeding and pork consumption. It was apparently greater in the forest sections of the country. In the descriptions of the royal economies of the 17th century, references were made to the fact that the peasants kept their hogs in a wild state in the beech and oak woods, where the animals could easily find cheap food. Salt pork, sausage, pork cuts, ham and black pudding were generally known components of the diet of the wealthier classes. Beauplan related that salt pork with peas was an inevitable dish during all banquets and receptions.<sup>50</sup>

All kinds of birds such as chickens, ducks, goslings, geese, capons, pullets, moor-hens and turkeys, were raised for meat, eggs, and feathers. Poultry was widely consumed by all social classes; by the wealthier, of course, more often than by the poor. According to the records, poultry was also indispensable at official receptions and dinners, along with beef, pork, mutton, veal and all kinds of game meats, prepared in various ways.

**Mining.** Iron mining and processing, salt petre exploitation, salt extraction and petroleum production constituted the main branches of the extractive mining industries in Ukraine in the 17th and 19th centuries. Extraction of iron ores from the marshes of northern Ukraine was an ancient industry, originating in pre-historic times. Its growth was very rapid immediately prior to the National Revolution. Ohloblin said that at the end of the 16th century there were scarcely more than ten iron ore pits and iron works in the northern right-bank districts, mainly a small-scale peasant exploitation of the muddy pits. On the eve of the Revolution, there were there already over a hundred, usually large-scale and commercialized enterprises, owned, sponsored and operated by the nobles and monasteries.<sup>51</sup>

Of course, no iron production took place in left-bank Ukraine during the pre-revolutionary era. The war and the revolutionary transitions of 1648-1650 greatly reduced the operation of the iron ore pits and iron workshops, and consequently lowered the iron output for a number of reasons. First of all, those iron works were, as indicated, largely owned and operated by the gentry, and the gentry lost its socially and economically predominant position as a result of the Revolution. Hence, the gentry-owned and operated

iron works either reduced output or ceased operations entirely. Secondly, the peasants were at least temporarily freed from bondage and refused to perform serf labor in the pits and smelting shops. Thirdly, many a peasant joined the Cossacks and the insurgents in the hope of improved social status; these did not care for menial work any more. Finally, many pits and shops, demolished during the military operations, were subsequently abandoned.

Mainly the iron pits and iron shops that were owned and operated by religious orders survived the Revolution and continued to produce, although at a reduced rate. This was possible because the revolutionary government greatly respected the monasteries and from the very beginning protected their property rights, including their right to peasant serf-labor in the ecclesiastical possessions. Therefore, monastic iron works suffered no acute labor shortage as did the others. As a matter of fact, the iron pits and workshops in the ecclesiastical possessions prospered during the Revolution, because the demand for iron increased considerably at that time. At first, the revolutionary and insurgent, and later on, the regular Ukrainian armies, being in a state of constant warfare, needed more and more iron for the production of guns, cannons, wagons and other strategic equipment. The military requisitions of the iron output of the privately operated pits and workshops were quite large, according to the records. Of course, the domestic production of iron could not meet all needs, and imports became necessary. It was estimated that about 28 iron works were in operation in the early 1650's, primarily in right-bank Ukraine, and very rarely in the left-bank districts.<sup>52</sup>

The growing demand for iron and the reduction of iron output caused its price to rise by more than 30 per cent in the course of the first five post-revolutionary years. Consequently, the commercial opportunities of that industry attracted the attention of the enterprising Cossack hierarchy, and they began to become increasingly interested in iron exploitation and processing. In this area too, the Cossack upper classes took over the economic heritage of the gentry, and the output of iron began to rise.

Nevertheless, in the years 1658-1660 a serious shortage of metal (iron in particular) again negatively affected the country's economy and aggravated the problem of defense. Hetman Vyhovsky, for example, on the eve of his war with Russia, attempted to secure iron from Poland in order to relieve a pressing shortage. It seems that at that time the iron mines and workshops in the district of Zhitomir were most productive, as they were frequently referred to in contemporary records. They were apparently all in operation,

said Ohlobin. But the industry in right-bank Ukraine never recovered from wartime dislocations and the social reconstruction of the years 1648-1650. The shortage of iron, therefore, induced an eager search for iron ore deposits in the left-bank and Village Ukraine in the last quarter of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. The Ukrainian government in the Hetmanic state and the Russian government in Village Ukraine supported any initiative in iron mining and processing. The Cossack aristocrats, common Cossacks, religious orders, city patricians, peasants and professional industrialists increasingly engaged in the search for iron ore, its extraction and processing.

At the time of Hetmans Samoilovich and Mazepa, and later Apostol as well, the output of iron ranged up to several hundred thousand pounds a year, fluctuating up and down according to the political and economic situation of the country. It was extracted in Galicia, Volhinia, the Kholm district, Chernihiv, Nizhin, Starodub and Hlukhiv regimental districts, along the rivers Vorskla, Orel and Samara, and in some sections of Village Ukraine—according to Bahalii.<sup>53</sup> However, the industry was concentrated in the northern parts of Hetmanic Ukraine, although attempts were made to develop it in the southern regions of the country, also. This is indicated by the purchasing agreements for the acquisition of landed estates, negotiated by a nobleman, Nemirich, which included the contractual rights to search for and to exploit the iron pits to be found there. A special reference was made to the landed estates on the banks of the rivers Vorskla, Orel and Samara.<sup>54</sup>

Exploitation of iron pits and iron smelting became more and more concentrated in the hands of the government, the Hetmans themselves, the Cossack aristocrats and the religious orders, and to a much less degree by the commoners and townspeople. Since the iron output was not large, and the demand for that product was steadily rising, particularly in the Hetmanic state, the Ukrainian government indulged ever more intensively in protecting and supporting the industry, the extraction, processing and usage of the ore, in order to make the country less dependent upon the import of Russian iron. Hetmans Mazepa and Apostol regulated and supervised iron extraction by their numerous decrees and universals, dealing either broadly with economic matters, or strictly with the iron business. Privileges were granted to the members of various social classes to exploit iron pits and to run smelter shops, and the exercise of the privilege was in all cases supervised and

safeguarded by the Hetmanic courts of law. Of course, this policy was in conformity with the mercantilistic doctrine then in vogue throughout Europe, including Ukraine and Russia.<sup>55</sup>

The Hetmanic mine works and smelting establishments were in Mazepa's time, for instance, in the Sheptakiv, Pohep, Ropsk and Yampil regions. Religious orders owned iron pits and workshops all over Ukraine, in Kiev, Chernihiv, Novhorod Siverskii, Nizhin, Hadiach and other places, wherever monastic landed estates extended. Among the nobles and Cossacks owning and operating iron establishments were Kochubey, Lomikovskiy, Prokopovich, Orlik, Lizohub, Polubotok, Miklashevskiy and many others whose outstanding names have been closely associated with that period of Ukrainian history. The town patricians, such as Yakhimovich and Shevchenko, the Cossack commoners and industrialists were among the owners and operators of the iron pits and works.

The demand for iron was continuously growing due to the growing population, progressing civilization and technology of production, and the modernization of armies. Moreover, the Cossack Host, having no iron ore, desired to purchase ever increasing quantities of iron for the use of its semi-military population. This fact affected the iron market of Hetmanic Ukraine as well. This intensity of demand often induced ruthless practices, primarily on the part of the Cossack hierarchy and the monasteries, to which the iron pits and smelting shops, operated by the commoners, were exposed. Hence, either the Hetmanic courts and administrative agencies, or the Russian resident authorities, had to defend the interests of the Cossacks or city patricians against these abuses of the upper classes. The shortage of iron was aggravated by the Swedish wars. There were even indications that the Swedes were interested in Ukraine as a potential market for their iron and metallurgical products. This might have favorably influenced Swedish-Ukrainian relations which had been friendly since Khmel'nitsky's time.<sup>56</sup>

Of course, there were many well-trained and experienced mine and iron workers in Hetmanic Ukraine. They were greatly sought, and invited as colonists from the West (Poland and Germany), as well as from Muscovy. There were also skilled ironworkers among the local Ukrainian population. With the later growth of Russian pressure, the iron industry also came under a more intense Russian influence, both financial and managerial, although the Ukrainians stubbornly attempted to defend their economic interests in this field. And when in the middle of the 19th century a large-scale



iron industry began to develop in the Krivii Rih, Kerch and Donets areas, Russian and other foreign capital took over completely, supported by the St. Petersburg government. Local Ukrainian interests in modern metallurgy were "either ruined or completely subjected," said Kononenko.<sup>57</sup>

Saltpetre exploitation originated in the late Polish-Lithuanian era and continued to grow in the southern districts of Ukraine. Foreign visitors such as Beauplan and Gmelin—the former at the time of the National Revolution and the latter at the end of the Hetmanic period (1770-1784)—reported the existence of that industry in Ukraine. Unquestionably, the war also increased the demand for saltpetre and gunpowder production, and induced an ever growing output of these two products. The industry was extensively supported by the Ukrainian government, too, since it was very anxious to have its own gunpowder supply for defense purposes, and not be dependent upon foreign importation. Hetmans such as Samoilovich, Mazepa and Apostol, when making land grants to Cossack aristocrats or religious orders, usually either mentioned in the grants or confirmed later by decree the rights of the owners of real estate to make full use of the saltpetre exploitation privilege. At the end of the 17th century, because of the gathering clouds of the Turkish and Northern Wars, a new and very intense interest in saltpetre extraction developed. The opportunities to make large profits by saltpetre production having increased enormously, everybody started to look for saltpetre deposits. Some Cossack grandees became ruthless in their attempts to increase their saltpetre output; they violated the property rights of others and did not hesitate, as Ohloblin indicated, to commit sacrilege by digging and drilling for saltpetre even in old Cossack graves. For example, in 1690 the townspeople of Pereyaslav complained that their Colonel Polubotok committed atrocities in his search for saltpetre. Other Cossack chieftians obviously did the same.

At the beginning of the 18th century, there were numerous saltpetre establishments on the right and left banks of the river Dniepr, on the banks of the river Samara in the Cossack Territory, on the banks of the river Orel and in many other places. The entrepreneurship of the Ukrainian people was evident also in this industry in which monks and townspeople were extremely interested. They not only met domestic needs for that product, but also exported the surplus in considerable quantity to Russia.

In 1700, however, the St. Petersburg government, following its mercantilistic principles, officially lowered the price of saltpetre.

This arbitrary act was a heavy blow to the Ukrainian saltpetre industry. Revenues from this source were greatly reduced. A joint request of the Ukrainian saltpetre manufacturers was delivered to the Russian government asking for the restoration of the original price level. It was unheeded. Somewhat later after the Poltava catastrophe in 1713, Peter the Great ordered the industry to increase its output, an order it was compelled to obey. And in 1720 a Czarist decree was issued which established a strict government monopoly in saltpetre and prohibited its free sale. All saltpetre was to be sold through the artillery stores in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Subsequently, Ukrainian profits from that industry progressively declined.

Hetman Apostol tried to protect these interests to some extent by restricting all saltpetre works in the country to Ukrainian entrepreneurship. Russians and other foreigners were prohibited from engaging in that business in the territory of the Hetmanic state. But growing Russian pressure soon nullified these measures. The Little Russian College and the later Hetman Rozumovsky were unwilling or unable to reverse the trend toward a complete absorption of the Ukrainian economy into the imperial Russian market.<sup>58</sup>

Salt extraction was another traditionally important mining industry in Ukraine in the 17th and 18th centuries. In particular, the sub-Carpathian district of Galicia continued to produce salt in large quantities, and supplied it to the West and East Ukrainian regions. Contemporary records, for example Hueldenstaedt's reports, referred to imports of salt into the Hetmanic state from Poland. Actually, it was the importation of Galician salt, since Galicia was part of the Polish Crown at that time. Since the previous period, the main centers of West Ukrainian salt production were in the districts of Stara Sil, Drohobich, Peremishl, Dolina, Zhidachiv, Kalush, Sianik, Kolomya, Sniatin and Kosiv. In those areas so-called "windows" were drilled, from which salt water was hauled by primitive mechanisms powered by horses. Then, as before and without much technical progress, the water was evaporated in large tin pans to a residue of fine powder and a crude and stony salt. In some places, as in Drohobich, the salt water was considered "thick" (i.e., good) while in other places like Dolina and Kosiv, it was poor.

There were royal, noble, monastic and municipal salt works, the organization and management of which were diversified. Some salt works, like those in the Peremishl region, were really large establishments producing several hundred thousand pounds yearly, while

others, like those in the Kolomya and Dolina districts, were small. The royal salt works either were run by royal administration, or were leased against annual rental payments in salt deliveries to the royal treasury and the fisc. The salt works owned privately by the nobles, religious orders and municipalities were also frequently operated on a lease system.

All salt works had a serious problem of wood supply, indispensable for evaporating the salt water. Hence, the owners of the "windows" preferred to lease them to merchants and specialists in order to avoid such trouble, and to secure for themselves a net delivery of salt each year or each season. Because of the hard labor in the salt works, and the problems connected with wood deliveries, the exploitation of peasant serf labor was much greater in the salt mining districts than in any other sections of the country, or in the farm economies.<sup>59</sup>

In the 19th century, the extraction of salt in West Ukraine lost much of its economic importance, while hauling salt from the salt lakes and the Black and Azov Seas became an increasingly significant sector of the economy of East Ukraine. Hueldstaedt relates of hauling salt from the salt lakes in the last quarter of the 18th century. It was used extensively by the Cossacks for processing fish.<sup>60</sup> On the other hand, salt was one of the leading imports of the Ukrainian national economy in the course of the Hetmanic era.

Already in the 16th century petroleum was mentioned in West Ukrainian (Galician) records. In 1591 the noblemen of the Buchach district negotiated a multilateral contract providing for a combined search for oil, gold and other valuable minerals. Toward the end of the 18th century, some foreign visitors related that the Ukrainian peasants used oil, called "nepht," for greasing their carriages, and as a drug to combat serious diseases. The peasants dug deeper pits from which they withdrew the "nepht" by means of primitive buckets, tied to long wooden poles. Nepht was described as a very odiferous grease, sold in the local markets, and easier to get than tar, although it required some processing.

The Ukrainian Cossacks, while on a military expedition in the Transcaucasia in 1740, also learned some of the qualities of oil, and used it to lubricate their wagons and carriages. Furthermore, Krypiakevich mentioned that in the chambers of the Cossack grandee, Khaneko, there were petroleum (nepht) lamps. Of course, it was an extremely rare and isolated case. The oil lamp was not yet known in Ukraine in the Hetmanic period.<sup>61</sup> Actually, oil

extraction and use did not exist on a large scale in West Ukraine until 1853. In that year two pharmacists from the city of Lviv, Lukasevich and Ceh, invented a successful method of oil refining. About 1850, oil extraction began to expand rapidly in the Caucasian areas. In the late Hetmanic era, coal mining was initiated by Peter the Great in the Donets basin on a very limited scale. The industry did not gain any economic importance until the second half of the 19th century.

Among other minerals, the extraction of clay for the production of bricks and ceramics gained economic importance. It was used in the manufacture of chalices, jars, pots, candlesticks and other utensils. The industry developed all over Ukraine, wherever clay deposits were available. Dishes and household appliances made of clay were generally used by the people, along with wooden appliances, plates, spoons and jars. Only the upper classes could afford such things in china, silver and gold.

Moreover, the demand for clay also increased greatly in connection with the large-scale building construction projects of some Hetmans, such as Mazepa and Rozumovsky, some Cossack grandees and some monasteries. Bricks were needed in increasing numbers for the construction of churches, palaces and public buildings.<sup>62</sup>

Sand was mined for various purposes, primarily for the construction and glass industries. Large lime grounds in the district of Novhorod Siverskii were famous for their output of lime for the building industries. Lime grounds were also available in West and Village Ukraine, and they were intensively exploited in order to meet the growing demands of industry. Outside the construction industry, lime was already used for scientific gardening and orchard care.

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

### TRADES AND INDUSTRIES

**Mercantilism in Ukraine - The city and its economy -  
Trades and crafts - Processing agricultural raw  
material - Textile and leather production**

**Mercantilism in Ukraine.** The creation of the Ukrainian national state advanced the popularity of the mercantilistic doctrine in that country, especially in the areas under Hetmanic domination. The great Hetmans, such as Khmelnitsky, Mazepa and Apostol, understood well that a country's wealth can substantially facilitate its political aspirations. An educated man, Khmelnitsky was greatly interested in the political affairs of Europe. A great statesman and a contemporary of Cromwell, he must have known the mercantilistic doctrine so important in the national affairs of West Europe of his time. Since he was also vitally interested in establishing a strong Ukrainian nation of a monarchistic, perhaps absolutist form, Khmelnitsky could not overlook the values of the mercantilistic policies and practices of the outstanding European rulers. That he had a definite economic policy was evident in his decrees and ordinances. He attempted to coordinate the state finances, to improve collection of customs duties and to enlarge foreign trade. Hetman Doroshenko was also interested in efficient financial administration.

The mercantilist doctrine in the economic and business affairs of Ukraine first became clearly evident during Mazepa's Hetmanate. Mazepa was not only educated along West European patterns, as Vitanovich said, but he also traveled extensively in France, Poland, the Netherlands and Muscovy, where he acquired a direct and comprehensive knowledge of mercantilism. Jean Baluse, a French diplomat who visited the Ukrainian capital city of Baturin in 1704, wrote: "... I myself saw French and Dutch newspapers in his [Mazepa's] study."<sup>1</sup> Mazepa kept himself well informed about cultural, political and economic developments in West Europe. The dominant purpose of his life was a strong and fully independent Ukrainian nation, and he approached the realization of that ideal in a very systematic way, by the application of standard mercantilistic measures of contemporary rulers.

First of all, Mazepa firmly believed in monarchism, and a solemn obligation of the monarch to be vitally and actively interested in all segments of the national life of his country. Hence, he endeavored to strengthen his country politically by skillful diplomacy. He sought economic growth by a policy of preserving a balance of interests among various social classes and stimulating commerce and manufacturing. He also believed in government support to the arts, architecture and education. Baroque architecture was enthusiastically popularized in Ukraine by Mazepa and other Hetmans, increasing the spiritual and cultural ties between West Europe and the Hetmanic state.

Mazepa's interest in the economic affairs of his nation was comprehensive. He sought the harmonious growth of the Ukrainian economy. First of all, he wanted to reduce the social tensions in the Hetmanic state. He endeavored to protect the lower classes, the townspeople and peasants, from discrimination and exploitation by the upper classes. In his numerous decrees and universals he referred to the social and economic problems of the Ukrainian people. The best known are his decrees of 1687, 1688, 1696 and 1698, the intention of which was a protection of the Hetmanic town, and those of 1692, 1701 and 1708, which were designed to defend and protect the village population from the abuses of the privileged social strata.

Mazepa most extensively assisted, protected and supported commerce and manufacturing by legal confirmation of the property and operational rights of the Cossacks, merchants and industrialists, to mine, process, produce and distribute their products. He sponsored colonization of depopulated areas. He also tried by all means available to him to alleviate Russian economic pressure, and to preserve Ukrainian economic autonomy.<sup>2</sup>

The later Hetmans, Ivan Skoropadsky, Daniel Apostol and Ciril Rozumovsky were also mercantilistically minded in their economic policies. Skoropadsky and Apostol had to concentrate all their efforts on the protection of Ukrainian commercial interests against the discriminatory policies of the Russian government, designed to build a great imperial market. Decrees were issued to prohibit the abuses of local administrative authorities. Skoropadsky attempted to regulate commercial credit, which was endangered by Russian trade restrictions. Peter the Great insisted that Ukrainian merchants and manufacturers use Russian ports when trading with the West, to the exclusion of such close neighbors as Poland and Lithuania. This damaged the Ukrainian-Polish-Lithuanian inter-

national credit system, and increased the distribution costs enormously. Only the Hetmanic credit moratorium saved the Ukrainian businessmen and Ukrainian goods.

Hetman Apostol particularly showed a mercantilistic interest in the economic affairs of Ukraine, and by his legislation and administration largely contributed to her economic development. He seriously undertook the job of regulating land ownership to facilitate agricultural efficiency, assisted capitalist circles, reserved certain industries for Ukrainians only and prohibited aliens from engaging in such industrial activities as the exploitation and processing of iron ore and saltpetre. He attempted, furthermore, to discourage Russian colonization of Ukraine, and to neutralize Russian discrimination. Moreover, Apostol assisted the country's financial and credit market, and tried to introduce a state budget for the sum of 144,000 rubles.<sup>3</sup>

Rozumovsky, the last Hetman of old Ukraine, was also familiar with mercantilistic ideas. Like the great rulers of the mercantilist era, he nursed dreams of splendor, of building a magnificent capital city of Ukraine, the city of Hlukhiv, with marvelous palaces, parks, theaters and an opera house, and to reconstruct other Ukrainian towns according to West European patterns. He was only partially successful. Since Russian pressure was already too powerful to resist, Rozumovsky tried in vain to preserve the economic autonomy of Ukraine. Nevertheless, within the limits of his shrinking authority, he reorganized the Ukrainian army according to contemporary European models, protected the armament industry, extensively supported the general education of young Cossack males, and even planned to establish a second institution of higher learning in the city of Baturin.<sup>4</sup>

All these broad interests of the last Hetman in the military, educational and economic problems of his country had mercantilism at their roots. The impressive growth of Russia, accompanied by the aggressive mercantilism of Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, particularly, no doubt influenced the political and economic philosophy and policy of the Ukrainian Hetmans. Of course, the First and Second Little Russian Colleges, which were willing tools in the hands of the St. Petersburg government, were both unable and unwilling to defend Ukrainian economic interests to any great degree.

Mercantilism had actually a twofold influence on Ukrainian economic development. In the first place, it had a favorable impact on the national economy of the Hetmanic state. In the second place, the mercantilistic policies of the Russian Czars affected

Ukrainian national economic interests most unfavorably. Ukrainian society of the 17th and 18th centuries was broadly and intensely interested in all segments of business life, agricultural, mining, manufacturing, commerce and finance, and that interest was common to all social classes. The Hetmanic government vigorously promoted this interest.

On the other hand, Russian policies aimed at opposite objectives. The Czars desired to build an empire and an imperial market, and in the framework of these plans they decided to turn Ukraine into a Russian province, and to make her an agricultural colony of the Russian national economy, where food and raw material could be bought cheaply and Russian finished products sold by Russian businessmen. The plan eventually succeeded.

Since the end of Vyhowsky's rule, and particularly since the tragedy of Poltava, St. Petersburg steadily and consistently proceeded to reduce Ukrainian economic autonomy, to bind her ever more closely to the imperial markets. All possible measures were used: political pressure and extortion, legislative acts, distorted interpretation of these acts, bribery, intrigues, plots, treason and direct physical violence.

First of all, the Russians desired to suppress certain industries as highly competitive to them, such as textile, chemical, armament, saltpetre and tobacco production. This objective was achieved primarily by discriminatory Russian tariffs on some finished articles, by dismantling whole factories in Ukraine and shipping them to Russia, and by establishing Russian state monopolies for certain goods, thus eliminating Ukrainian competition.

Secondly, the Russian government frequently insisted that certain Ukrainian goods be sold only in Russia, or only through Russia by the use of Russian ports. Hence the Czars ordered heavy troop concentrations to close tightly the Ukrainian-Polish-Lithuanian borders, eliminated a direct Ukrainian-Polish-Lithuanian trade, and by so doing, channeled the entire Ukrainian foreign trade with the West through the ports of St. Petersburg, Riga and Arkhangelsk. Similar policies were also applied with respect to the Territory of the Cossack Host when Russian troops took over control of Cossack fish exports, as Gordon reported.<sup>5</sup> The Black and Azov Sea ports suffered from Russian discrimination; Ukrainian exports were not allowed to go there even though they were close and convenient.

Thirdly, Russian merchants and industrialists settled in Ukraine, protected and subsidized by the Czarist government. Fourthly, financial measures were also used by the Russians to damage



Ukrainian economic interests. At that time the Russian ruble circulated widely in Ukraine. Hence, in order to reduce the volume of Ukrainian manufacturing and trade, St. Petersburg tried to withdraw from Ukraine all gold and silver money by means of customs, tariffs and tax policies. Fifthly and finally, the large-scale colonization of Russians and foreigners in Ukraine, wholeheartedly supported by the Russian government, was, no doubt, meant to keep Ukraine a Czarist agricultural colony. Enormous land grants were given to numerous Russian and foreign nobles and merchants, such as Dolgorukiis, Shermietievs, Shafirovs, Weissbachs, Menshikovs, Golovkins, Stroganovs, Felz-Feins, Kornises, Filbers, Vassals, Viazemskii, Potiomkins and Vorontsovs. Russian and other foreign ethnic elements settled in all parts of greater Ukraine for the purpose of strengthening Russian political and economic interests in that country. Strictly Ukrainian economic interests were always and everywhere progressively disregarded by the Czarist mercantilist and nationalistic policy. Village Ukraine, the Territory of the Cossack Host, as well as Hetmanic Ukraine, and later the right-bank provinces at the end of the 18th century after the partition of Poland, shared the same destiny of being exposed to ruthless contiguous colonization. Of course, Hetmans Mazepa, Skoropadsky and Apostol did everything possible to defend the political and economic interests of Ukraine, and they succeeded briefly in many instances, but eventually they failed.<sup>6</sup>

This brief survey of the role of mercantilism in the economic history of Ukraine, and its twofold impact on the economic life of the country in the 17th and 18th centuries, should serve as an introduction to a detailed analysis of the commercial and industrial development of Ukraine in the Hetmanic state, and also outside its political boundaries. Nevertheless, it is very important to keep in mind the fact that mercantilism was only a political tool in the hands of the old Czarate to facilitate the imperial growth of Russia, just as Communism is now a tool in the hands of the 20th-century Russian Bolsheviks who seek to achieve the same end. Mercantilist doctrine therefore cannot be blamed for the viciousness of Russian economic colonization.<sup>7</sup>

**The City and its Economy.** The National Revolution and the decades which followed witnessed the accelerated growth of the Ukrainian city and town. Immediately after the Revolution, as Kripiakevich indicated, numerous new towns were established by spontaneous colonization, particularly in the southern borderlands.

The old cities grew in size and wealth. In 1650, the typical town was still small. Among a hundred leading towns at that time, the population averaged from 600 to 3,000 people living in 200 to 500 houses, compared to a population ten years earlier of 120 to 180 people and 20 to 30 houses.<sup>8</sup>

The Hetmans Khmelnitsky, Samoilovich, Mazepa, Skoropadsky and Apostol understood the role of the city in the economic life of the nation. Consequently, they attempted to protect the townspeople against the abuses of the upper classes by making land grants of soil, pasture and forests to outstanding merchants and municipalities. They either confirmed the municipal autonomy of the Magdeburg order of the older cities, such as Kiev and Chernihiv, or granted the same right to such new towns as Oster and Poltava, in order to enhance their commercial and industrial development. Motivated by economic freedom, her "towns gradually became transformed into sizeable local trading and fair centers," Lyashchenko said. Within half a century they had fully recovered from the economic consequences of Polish oppression and discrimination.

The commercial and financial standing of the cities must have been relatively high, since their appearance favorably impressed centuries, who talked about their beauty, prosperity and cleanliness. Thus Paul Alepo, who visited Ukraine in Khmelnitsky's time, mentioned Kiev, Priluki, Poltava, Putivl and Chernihiv. Everywhere he found beautiful buildings with pleasant balconies, numerous churches and cloisters, public baths and large clocks. Hildebrandt, also of Khmelnitsky's era, mentioned in his diary the city of Chernihiv and was impressed by its fortifications. Marshall called Chernihiv a very well built industrial city, and Kiev, the most considerable city in Ukraine. There, he said, "The streets are wide and straight and well paved; it has a very notable cathedral. ... It has forty thousand inhabitants, and is strongly fortified." Von Keller wrote about the beautiful city of Kiev, which "... now has become like a maiden whose hand is being sought by the Tartars, Turks and the local cavaliers (Muscovites), and on both sides swords are being readied." Ivan Lukianov described Kiev in 1701 as follows: "The city of Kiev is on the banks of the river Dniepr ... beautiful indeed, there is not any equally splendid city in the whole Russian Empire."

In numerous tourist and travel guides various Ukrainian fortresses, like Kamenets Podilsky, Bar, Bilhorod and Ochakiv, were

described with distinction. The author of one such guide exclaimed: "Who fortified Kamenets that it is unconquerable!" Ochakiv was again mentioned by Marshall and Meinstein. Baturin, the capital city of Hetmanic Ukraine at the end of the 17th century, was described or at least mentioned by many authors, such as Voltaire, in his *Histoire de Charles XII*, Gordon, Bell, Beluse and some others. In the 18th century, the city of Hlukhiv became commercially prominent, and began to attract the attention of foreigners such as Meinstein and Bell. John Bell was in Hlukhiv in 1737, and described it as a large and populous place. Lukianov said that there were in Hlukhiv beautiful municipal buildings, and many stone and brick churches, even more spacious than those in Kiev. Jul Just, a Danish envoy to St. Petersburg between 1709 and 1712, cherished such Ukrainian cities as Chernihiv, Kiev, Krolovets and Nizhen. He wrote that "...Korolovets is a big town ... The streets are beautiful, such as I never saw in Russia, the buildings are stately, strong and clean ... Nizhyn is a great commercial city, fortified by a strong wall." He was also impressed by the cities of Yaroslav, Nemiriv and Lviv (Leopolis, Lemberg). Nizhen was called by Lukianov "a big city, too, inhabited by many commercial people."

It seems that the city of Nizhyn was really very prominent, since still another foreign author, Chojecki, a Polish nobleman visiting Ukraine in the years 1768-76, also referred to it as "... a well ordered, densely populated, and well built [city] ... The inhabitants own which conduct trade on large scale." Hueldenstaedt, an academician who paid much attention to the study of the Ukrainian economy, and was mentioned already several times, singled out Nizhyn and Kiev as economically outstanding cities. He said that in Nizhyn one could see merchandise from all countries, and that the merchants were Ukrainians, Russians and Greeks. He was surprised by the beauty of Kiev, and also mentioned industries in the towns of Romni, Oster, Uman, Ivangorod, Korop, Baturin and Starodub. Heuldenstaedt also showed considerable interest in the shipyards, commercial vessels and the Ukrainian settlements in and around the new cities of Tahanrih and Rostov on the Azov Sea littorals. Starodub, which in the late Hetmanic era developed into an important center for Russian-Ukrainian trade, also attracted Hueldenstaedt's attention.

Later writers, like Duran and Zuyev, described the more prominent cities of Village Ukraine, such as Voronezh, Kharkiv, Okhtirka, Yelets, Chuhaiv, Vodolaki and Sumy, which had acquired

commercial and industrial significance in the second half of the 18th century.

Foreign visitors and Ukrainian official records gave a fair conception of commercial progress in the towns of independent Ukraine. These foreigners also described the ruin of the town, its destruction and decline as a result of the Russian invasion of 1709. Voltaire said that the cities were reduced to ashes, and Fridrich Weber related: "Ukraine was flooded with blood, and devastated by looting, and presents a frightful picture of the barbarity of the victors."<sup>9</sup>

During the entire Hetmanic period, Ukrainian towns were still defended by strong stone walls, frequently referred to by foreign travelers. These represented fortresses of strategic importance. The stone city walls began to disappear in the first decades of the 19th century, in the course of which the picture and the nature of the East European city fundamentally changed. The old town of merchants and craftsmen became at that time a modern city of businessmen, capitalists and industrialists.

The Ukrainian cities and towns of the 17th and 18th centuries did not represent heterogeneous structures of equal economic significance. The small towns were still like big villages, where the population was largely mixed; the peasant and merchant classes lived side by side. Agricultural and commercial activities took place concurrently. The townspeople owned horses, oxen, ploughs, and other equipment required for agriculture, but they were also merchants and craftsmen. The commercial and industrial elements progressively grew in the towns throughout the Hetmanic era, and the differentiation between village and town became more and more pronounced. The small towns, particularly in southern Ukraine, were subordinated to the Cossack administration, which discouraged urban economies. In the towns the population universally consisted of merchants, craftsmen, Cossacks and peasants. The proportionate size of those social segments differed in various places. Some cities, such as Cherkasy, Kaniv, Korsun and other southern towns, were populated predominantly by Cossacks. In the large cities, such as Kiev, Pereyaslav, Nizhyn, Chernihiv and Starodub, the most numerous class was the townspeople, and the Cossacks constituted but a small minority. Where Cossacks were in the majority, the townspeople suffered. Municipal autonomy was violated and the traditional rights of the merchants and artisans ruthlessly disregarded.

In every case, however, fluidity was maintained. Some Cossacks

were gradually turned into merchants, and some wealthy merchants became Cossacks. On the other hand, there were cities with a predominantly mercantile and commercial population, such as Baturin and Novi Mliny. Still other towns, like Pereyaslav, Kiev, and Nizhyn, being industrial in character, were populated primarily by craftsmen and artisans. But merchants usually constituted approximately 25-30 per cent of the townspeople and craftsmen and artisans 70-75 percent.<sup>10</sup>

Such large cities as Kiev, Novhorod Siversk, Starodub, Pereyaslav, Poltava, Nizhyn, Baturin and Chernihiv were the real commercial and industrial centers of the country. Some of them—Kiev, Chernihiv, Pochev, Novhorod, Pohor and Starodub—had the municipal autonomy of the Magdeburg law from the Polish-Lithuanian period; other towns, like Oster, Poltava and Kozel, were granted that privilege by the Hetmanic courts, as mentioned above. The Magdeburg municipal constitution greatly enhanced the economies of those cities, since it protected the towns and the townspeople to some extent from commercial competition and outright abuse and discrimination by the Cossacks and the religious orders. The Magdeburg freedoms included in Ukraine the right of municipal self-government, financial autonomy to collect city tolls, weight and measure fees, and other market taxes, the right to use municipal funds for city improvements, freedom in commercial and manufacturing activities, a municipal monopoly for exclusive alcohol distribution, and other legal benefits, which all contributed to the commercial and industrial growth of the city. Unfortunately, only a few cities—no more than a dozen—enjoyed Magdeburg autonomy in all Hetmanic Ukraine. But some non-Magdeburg towns such as Hlukhiv and Korolovets were also extremely fortunate and successful; they were able to gain commercial prominence.

Taking advantage of their Magdeburg constitution, a number of cities occupied an outstanding place in the Ukrainian economy. The city of Kiev, so often referred to by foreign visitors, continued to be the spiritual, cultural, ecclesiastical and political focal point of the Ukrainian nation, and at the same time it was also an important market, the center of the silk, glass and paper industries. It not only possessed a Magdeburg constitution since the Polish era (1625), but it also enjoyed other privileges partially or completely denied to other towns. Among these were exemption from state taxes and tolls at certain times, exemption from compulsory military services, the absolute stapel right, unrestricted and free trading and manufacturing, and the full right of its urban population to acquire and own landed estates.

Although some other cities, such as Nyzhen, Pereyaslav and Chernihiv, had similar privileges, but the abuses of the Cossack grandes and monasteries were more frequent there.<sup>11</sup> The city of Starodub developed into a central market for the northern part of the left-bank Ukraine, and a center of the textile and metallurgical industries. The city of Hlukhiv grew commercially, along with Starodub, as a result of the rapidly expanding Ukrainian-Russian trade. Subsequently, because of its commercial significance, it was made the capital of the country.

The city of Poltava became the center of the southern trade, especially that between Hetmanic Ukraine and the Cossack Territory, and for trade with the Crimean Tartars. Korolovets and Nizhyn were the greatest international markets at that time. The city of Chernihiv was the outstanding center of glass, potash and metallurgical manufacturing. The city of Baturin was for a long time the capital of the Hetmanic state, and by serving in this capacity, it also attained economic prominence.

In the right-bank and West Ukraine, the cities of Zhitomir, Lviv, Lutsk, Uman, Kholm, Brody and a few others succeeded in attaining some commercial and industrial significance despite the discriminatory and oppressive policies of the Polish Crown. Lviv was an important market; Brody housed textile mills, particularly silk mills. In Village Ukraine there were also economically important towns, such as Chuhaiv, famous for furriers, Okhtirka, a textile and glass manufacturing center, and Vodolaki, the producer of rugs and carpets.

There were therefore many different types of cities in Ukraine at that time. Their population differed greatly not only with respect to wealth, but also according to social and legal status. The intense growth of the country's economy and the commercial rise of the town in particular brought about a considerable accumulation of wealth among the city patricians, who were, as a rule, important merchants. In fact, the accumulation of commercial wealth was accomplished in a very short time. The rise of a strong mercantile stratum in the town began, according to Ohloblin, in Samoilovich's Hetmanate. During this era, it gradually took over commerce, crafts and manufacturing. By Mazepa's time, the city patricians were in complete control of the urban economy. Possessing considerable funds, they acquired landed estates and engaged in agriculture and forest activities, and potash and tar production which up to this time had been the domain of the Cossack grandes, religious orders and nobles.

The prestige of the important merchants rapidly increased with their elevated social position, their holding of municipal offices, their accumulation of wealth, their domination of foreign and domestic trade and their possession of large estates. Intermarriage among this class and Cossack grandees and nobles followed as a result. Indeed, the influx of town patricians into the upper strata of 18th century society was considerable. The mercantile families of Dereviankos, Tomaris, Herzigs, Skorupis, Shirais and Maksimoviches were among the most prominent patricians, enjoying prestige, political favoritism and material comfort. The rapidity of their rise is illustrated by two outstanding families, Maksimovich and Shirai. Maksim was still poor in the 1650's. Thirty years later, his family was one of the wealthiest in the country, owning controlling shares in foreign and domestic trade and manufacturing, and possessing vast landed properties throughout the country. Spiridon Shirai, on the other hand, started his mercantile career by trading hemp with Riga and Arkhangelsk. In the course of thirty years, he acquired considerable wealth, established mills and iron works, and other manufacturing enterprises, purchased large landed estates with many villages, and developed large-scale commercial connections with Russia and Poland. During his life time he was regarded as a "prominent member of the Starodub city patriciate." All his children were married to Cossacks, and his grandchildren were among the wealthiest landed grandees and nobles of northern Ukraine.

Many other representatives of the mercantile class became famous Cossacks, such as Ivan Zolotarenko, colonel of Nizhyn. Martin Nebaba, colonel of Chernihiv, and Michael Tisha, colonel of Volhinia.<sup>12</sup> The opportunities for individual social and financial improvement approached the fabulous at that time of rapid economic transitions—a situation somewhat reminiscent of the developments in America between the Civil War and the First World War.

The masses, however, were poor. They were city commoners, small merchants and commercial people, craftsmen, artisans and such professionals as painters, musicians and medical barbers. Normally, craftsmen and artisans were economically and socially lower than merchants. At the bottom of the town's social pyramid were the artisans who either had no formal professional training or, for some reason, were not admitted to the guilds. They were not allowed to practice their trades openly, and if caught doing so, they were severely prosecuted by guild and municipal authorities. Their workshops were demolished and they themselves were beaten and imprisoned.

The intensely growing conflict between guild craftsmen and non-guild artisans developed in a close connection with increasing Cossack pressure upon the town. The Cossacks (grandees and commoners) and the religious orders progressively increased their commercial and industrial activities, producing serious competition for the townspeople, especially in the non-Magdeburg cities. This competition was characterized by unfair trade practices, discrimination and open abuses on the part of the Cossacks and the monasteries, which took full advantage of their privileged social status. The Cossack grandees and the religious orders frequently forced the town population to render special services without any compensation, and to pay exorbitant rents, taxes, tolls and duties, without any legal justification for such actions. Often the upper classes even disregarded the property rights of the townspeople, and illegally confiscated their real estate, mills, distilleries, workshops and commercial establishments.

Records indicate such abuses even in cities which possessed the freedoms of the Magdeburg constitution, like Pereyaslav and Nizhyn. Cossack grandees, such as Mirovich, Miklashevsky and Mokievsky, were among the most notorious offenders.<sup>13</sup> In some instances, the Cossacks usurped municipal offices, but the city population usually did not mind this too much, since in this way they received some protection from abuses. Exposed to unfair competition from the upper classes, the guild merchants and guild craftsmen could at least seek protection from the illegal activities of non-guild merchants and artisans who presumably were unqualified and who did not conform to guild rules.

The mercantilistic minded Hetmans Samoilovich, Mazepa, Skoropadsky and Apostol did everything possible to protect the justified interests of the town by reaffirming the Magdeburg privileges, reserving trade exclusively for the cities, rebuking and punishing guilty Cossack grandees, and giving some additional benefits to the townspeople in order to compensate them for the violations of their interests. Hundreds of Hetmanic decrees and universals dealt with economic—particularly commercial—problems of the town. When the city could not secure adequate protection from the Ukrainian government, it turned to the Russian resident authorities for help. Naturally, this undermined the political position of the Hetmanic government. Needless to say, the Russians were most happy to oblige.<sup>14</sup>

On the whole, the social, political and economic position of the town was not uniform during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period. In the



first years of national independence, the city played a minor role due to the war and to class discrimination. Its growth began during Samoilovich's Hetmanate, and it flourished in Mazepa's time. Immediately after the catastrophe of Poltava, its economic situation worsened because of Russian commercial and industrial discrimination. But under the protective care of Hetmans Skoropadsky and Apostol, it recovered.

In the 1760's, however, the town began to deteriorate socially and economically. The rigid regimentation of trade by the resident Russian authorities, the abuses of military requisitions, discriminatory policies and illegal and exorbitant taxes had become intolerable. Above all, the office of the Hetman was abolished, replaced by the infamous Little Russian College. Hence there was no longer any respected central authority to protect the interests of the town.

The economic position of the town in Polish dominated right-bank and West Ukraine had also deteriorated. Municipal autonomy there was completely suppressed by the Polish nobility, even in the cities where the Magdeburg constitution was theoretically binding. In the process, trade was destroyed by inequitable and discriminatory taxation, economic exploitation and national and religious oppression. If the townspeople tried to oppose this lawlessness, they were beaten, killed and robbed by the hirelings of the nobles. At the beginning of the 18th century, conditions became so desperate that in some instances the entire urban population planned to move to the country or to emigrate. In 1719, the townspeople of the city of Starokonstantiniv, for example, decided to leave.<sup>15</sup> Individual flights of city people were most numerous. The country became impoverished; its economy decayed.

The cities in Village Ukraine were in a slightly more favorable position. There the Magdeburg constitution was freely granted by the Czars, giving the townspeople an opportunity to engage in trade and manufacturing on a large scale. Even there, Cossack pressures retarded these developments, but not nearly so much as in the Hetmanic state. As mentioned above, a few cities such as Kharkiv, Okhtirka, Putivl, Summy, Chuhaiiv and Vodolaki attained economic prominence. Of course, Russian regimentation and regulation of trade and manufacturing, sponsored by the central Czarist government, might have retarded the commercial development of the border towns.

Later, in the second half of the 18th century, another new development began to hurt the city interests. A new class of Russian nobility, growing in strength and influence in Village Ukraine,

began to disregard the rights and interests of the urban communities. The townspeople appealed a few times to Moscow in defense of their free distilleries, salt trade and customs tariffs.<sup>16</sup>

**Trades and Crafts.** In the Lithuanian-Polish period, there was a definite trend in the manufacturing industries. Some of these, such as metal processing, textile manufacturing, arms production and jewelry manufacturing, were largely concentrated in the cities. Others, like forest exploitation, tar and potash production, milling and distilling, were located in the countryside where they complemented the manorial economies. At that time, however, the bulk of manufacturing was still done by city craftsmen and artisans, sponsored and regulated by the guild system.

In the second half of the 17th century, a new development appeared. Industrial entrepreneurship was progressively taken over by the Cossack grandes, capitalistic merchant employers such as Shirai, Maksimovich and Derevianko, and by monastic orders. The economic role of the small-scale handicraft master and his professional guild organization gradually declined.<sup>17</sup> The modern factory system was thus born, although its growth was stunted for many years. At the same time, the new forms of industrial production developed a consistent tendency to move away from the countryside, and to concentrate in cities where labor and market outlets were more readily available. Manufacturing took place in three sectors: in the village, by peasant craftsmen for local consumption; in factories owned by Cossack grandes, merchants and religious orders, for nation-wide consumption and export; and by the townspeople, for urban and rural consumption and for export.

In the city the majority of people were craftsmen and artisans. The census of 1666 supplies the following data.<sup>18</sup>

CITY	ARTISANS	MERCHANTS
Baturin	36	90
Nizhyn	188	40
Kiev	209	30
Konotop	22	26
Kozelets	79	16
Oster	138	15
Pereyaslav	109	73
Sosnitsa	131	10

These figures clearly illustrate the condition of the town. The artisans were the bulk of the city population; the proletarians were

outnumbering the wealthy segment of the merchants. Moreover, there were actually two strata among craftsmen and artisans, guild members and those who were not members of guilds. Consequently, the above statistics must be considerably adjusted in favor of artisans since illegal handicraftsmen were not included in the census. The actual number of urban artisans in the 1660's must have been much higher than these statistics indicate.

The growing conflict between these two groups was one of the social problems of the town. Although the guilds tried ruthlessly to preserve their position in the town's economy, they did not succeed for many reasons. First of all, their organization was antiquated, selfish and rigid, and did not meet the requirements of new developments. Secondly, the National Revolution fostered the spirit of freedom and considerably weakened the restrictive policies of the guilds. Thirdly, the growing population needed more industrial goods, while the guilds insisted on a "numerus clausus" (limited membership) and restricted production in order to secure for their members a maximum volume of business and revenue. Because the market was expanding, informally trained townspeople and Cossack commoners flourished as illegal craftsmen. The influx of the Cossack element in some urban communities was considerable, upsetting traditional social and economic patterns. About 1770 (to quote Nestorenko), there were in the Poltava regimental district about 167 Cossack artisans who, without any compulsion to join guilds, practiced various trades. They were weavers, fishermen, shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths, key makers, saddlers, wheelers and turners. Fourthly, the capitalistic merchant employers and Cossack grandees frequently preferred to hire for their industrial establishments artisans who were not formally trained since they were usually cheaper than guild members. Fifthly, the Hetmanic government, supporting the large-scale manufacturing of the upper classes, showed no particular preference for the guild organizations, although they accepted them as a natural element of the urban economy. Finally, some craftsmen were exempt from the authority of the guilds by law, and were directly subordinated to the Hetmanic court. Therefore, the traditional guild system was unable to survive so many disadvantages and faded away, yielding to new forms of industrial manufacturing.<sup>19</sup>

Nevertheless, craft guilds remained important in the urban economy of the Cossacko-Hetmanic period. Municipal records, the census and other documents listed many trades: butchers, millers, general bakers, bread bakers, roll bakers, grout makers, brewers,

wax processors, candle makers, tanners, furriers, tailors, shoemakers, builders, turners, wheelers, kettlers, metal cutters, cannon and gun makers, sword makers, spinners, weavers, saddlers, rug and carpet makers, barrel makers, blacksmiths, key makers, goldsmiths, fishermen, barbers and many other specialized trades, many more than in the previous era.

In the city of Kiev immediately after the Revolution there were seven butchers, four millers, three grout makers, seven general bakers, seven bread bakers, one rollbaker, eighteen tanners, fifteen furriers, thirty-four shoemakers, two comb makers, three stocking makers, three blacksmiths, one sword maker, one locksmith, one bell smelter, two jelelers, two clay pot makers, five carpenters, two barrel makers and two turners.

About the same time, there were in Pereyaslav 102 artisans; in Bila Tserkva, 277; in Okhtirka, 81; and in Nizhyn, 42 metallurgical craftsmen. Guilds existed in all large cities; the larger the city, the greater was their specialization and the stronger their grip on its economy. In small towns there were one or two unspecialized guilds with but little power and influence. In the Territory of the Cossack Host, guilds were practically nonexistent. In Village Ukraine, guilds were at first rare and loosely organized, but around 1780 there were guilds of shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths, weavers, pot and dish makers, butchers, musicians, cap makers, wheelers and carpenters in Kharkiv, Lebedin, Sumi and Okhtirka. In the Kharkiv region, there were at that time approximately 1843 artisans, some of whom were organized in guilds. At the time of the National Revolution, there were in Lviv about 30 guilds; in Poltava, 12; in Bila Tserkva, 14; in Pereyaslav, 12; in Porchep, 5; and in Hizhen, about the year 1666 there was probably only one guild with a heterogeneous membership of blacksmiths, cannon and sword makers and bell smelters. In the cities of Lviv, Kiev and Pereyaslav, the guild statutes provided for the prosecution and punishment of non-guild artisans. Nevertheless, only about thirty percent of the craftsmen were really included in the guild organizational structure. The provisions of the guilds were poorly enforced, in many instances, and they did not apply to Cossack artisans. 20

Of course, with the growth of population the number of craftsmen increased. Thus, in 1742 in Kiev there were 2,574 artisans, and in 1762 there were 4,338. The number of guilds remained about twelve, namely those of the butchers, tanners, shoemakers, tailors,

blacksmiths, weavers, fishermen, musicians, barrel makers, clay pot makers and painters. In Novhordo Siversk, there were in 1781 thirty-six guilds with a total membership of about 1600. There was no recognizable uniformity or pattern in various towns, as far as the number and type of guilds and their membership were concerned.<sup>21</sup> With the decline of the guild organization, its membership shrank and various trades merged their guilds to form fewer associations. Finally the guild disappeared as an effective form of business regulation in the following period of Ukrainian economic history. In the second half of the 19th century they still existed, but their characteristics were entirely different from those of the traditional guild.

In the 18th century, the guilds still served as economic units to organize production and distribution for the artisans, as charitable and quasi-religious organizations to protect the morals of their members, and to take care of the needy, the orphans, the widows and the sick within their own ranks, according to their ancient traditions. They also existed as military units, obliging their members to participate in defending the city in case of emergency. Nestorenko indicated the close cooperation between the guilds and the Orthodox Church and its sub-organizations. Except for the Polish right-bank and West Ukraine, the membership was primarily Ukrainian, but outstanding foreign craftsmen could be admitted to membership.<sup>22</sup>

In the village and countryside, a petty household craftsmanship developed to meet local needs as it had in the Kievan and Polish-Lithuanian eras. The peasants produced their own wool, linen, leather, boots, clothing, appliances, worktools (from clay, wood or metal), and processed their own food. Aksakov said that the Ukrainian country folk produced literally everything they wore, used or consumed.<sup>23</sup> These petty village artisans did not join any guilds, and they did not have much organization of their own. They were still serfs, subjected to the authority of the nobles, Cossack grandees, the Church and the religious orders. In the middle-sized "kustar" establishments, producing not to order but for a market, and in the large-sized factory-like manufacturing establishments of the upper classes and merchant employers, the artisans occupied the position of hired skilled workers, and no longer fitted into the structure of the antiquated guild associations.

**Processing agricultural raw materials** was unquestionably the leading industrial branch of the predominantly agricultural economy. This industry embraced dairy production, meat and fish processing, flour and grout manufacturing, distilleries and breweries, wine and drinking honey production, textile and leather manufacturing and tobacco processing. In many instances, the composition, organization and methods of production were similar to those of the previous Lithuanian-Polish era. This was true for dairy production, meat and fish processing and wine and drinking honey manufacture, where little progress was made except for the increased volume of business due to the increase in population. In these industries the scale of operation was small or moderate, based on peasant or manorial economies and designed to satisfy local needs.

In leather processing and shoe manufacturing, furriery and tobacco processing, some change was noticeable. There either business was done in the traditional form of craftshops working on order, or it had progressed to the stage of "kustar" enterprises, of production for a free market in anticipation of demand. The kustar manufacturer usually employed a few workers in his petty household "industrial" establishment, produced goods currently and sold them in the market through jobbers and distributors. The kustar enterprise, as a transitional step from handicraft shop to factory, also developed in linen, silk and woolen manufactures and in tobacco, candle and soap production. The real technological and organizational change in the form of an early Industrial Revolution was under way, however, in flour milling, textile manufacturing, and distilling and brewing, where modern, large-scale factory enterprises emerged and initiated a modern industrial growth. The same division among the small-scale, antiquated handicraft shops, the free marketing "kustar" enterprises, and the new large-scale, factory-like forms, prevailed in such other fields as metallurgy, chemicals, construction, glass and other manufacturing, while the factory establishment was progressively developing into the leading productive form, distinctly indicating the beginning of industrialized capitalism.

At this point it is important to indicate briefly the specific rent-lease system of business enterprise, widespread in Ukraine, and broadly applied, in particular, to processing agricultural raw materials, where the original owners reserved certain monopolistic rights such as the exploitation of forest resources (potash and tar manufacturing), alcohol production and distribution, milling and tobacco processing, or renting lakes, ponds and fishing rights.

The nobility, Cossack grandees, religious orders, municipalities or the national government were the owners of the rights and properties, while the members of the gentry, Cossacks, rich merchants and foreigners and skilled craftsmen, like millers, brewers and distillers, were the lessees. As entrepreneurs, the lessees assumed all the risks since they supplied the capital and sponsored economic growth through their ventures.

The system was also very popular in Lithuanian-Polish times, and its economic significance was even greater in Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine. Cossack grandees, such as Lomikovsky, Silenko and Orlik, leased state establishments and monopoly rights. Hetmans like Mazepa and Apostol often leased public property (distilleries and facilities for potash extraction and tobacco processing) to Cossacks, wealthy merchants and craftsmen, in order to secure a better management and a higher revenue for the state. The lessees had to accumulate considerable capital to initiate their commercial ventures since they had to satisfy money-hungry lessors, to finance the acquisition of necessary buildings and equipment, and to provide for risks and possible expansion. Through the system of rent-lease, Yaroshevich said, the early capitalists penetrated the Ukrainian national economy.<sup>24</sup>

The rent-lease agreements, usually signed for long periods of time, imposed upon the lessors and lessees obligations and gave them rights enforceable in the courts of law. Among other things, the lessee had, for example, to take good care of the establishment, be honest, pay annual monetary rent, and supply the lessor with the produce of the business. The millers, brewers and distillers had to feed cattle and hogs with the by-products of their enterprises, to supply a certain number of these animals to the manor, and to give an exact account of their dealings in the framework of the rent-lease contracts.

In connection with the coverage of the extractive industries, dairy production, meat and fish processing, raising tobacco and developing mulberry and silk plantations, were briefly discussed. Now the processing of the raw materials and manufacturing of the finished goods will be the main topics of analysis. Within the peasant, Cossack, manorial and monastic farm economies, butter, buttermilk, sour milk, sour cream and various kinds of cheese were produced. Particularly in the Walachian villages, special kinds of tasty cheeses were made from cow, goat and sheep milk. Much in demand, these cheeses were shipped as far as northern Galicia,

Volhinia, Podolia and even southern Poland. Methods of production were traditional and primitive.

Meat and fish were processed either in the manorial economies or by special craftsmen, such as butchers, sausage makers and fishmongers, or raw meat and fish were purchased by dealers and processed in their kustar establishments. A guild of butchers existed in various cities, indicating a developed meat processing industry. A guild of fishermen existed in Kiev, and did a considerable volume of business.<sup>25</sup> Just and Hueldenstaedt mentioned considerable fishing and fish processing in the Cossack Territory and on the shores of the Azov Sea. Salt was hauled there and used for processing fish and meat, while a considerable portion of the population was employed in the fish industry.

Fish was dried, canned, smoked and exported in great quantities. According to Hueldenstaedt, this was done on a large-scale, assembly-line basis. In other parts of Ukraine, meat was processed in a similar manner, and various meat products, such as sausages, hams, salt pork, fillets, black puddings and other specialties were salted, dried, smoked and sold in the local markets or at the fairs and also exported.<sup>26</sup>

Large-scale manufacturing in flour milling, distilling, brewing and textile production was initiated in the second half of the 17th century. Krupnitsky remarked that the upper levels of Ukrainian society did not show much interest and enthusiasm for manufacturing until that time. Initial social prejudices, regulations, lack of peace, shortage of capital and a poorly developed credit system seriously hampered the growth of industries immediately after the Revolution.

Only when the Cossack grandees were able to acquire considerable capital by skillful and thrifty management of their large landed estates and the sale of their produce, and the merchants accumulated some wealth as a result of their trading activities, could large-scale manufacturing, requiring considerable capital investments and risks, successfully emerge. Of course, the rapidly growing population and the consequent increased demand were the primary reasons for the great industrial change. In the 18th century, Ukraine was already fairly industrialized, more so than such neighbors as Poland, Lithuania and Walachia, and in some respects, Muscovy. The new trend of industrialization was financed, managed and sponsored primarily by the Cossack grandees, merchants, religious orders and the government. And this was true in almost all branches of industry. Some industries involving agricultural



raw materials, such as tobacco and mulberry leaves, saltpetre, sheep breeding and raw wool production, and textile manufacturing, were at all times supported by the Russian government, in direct contradiction to its general economic policy in Ukraine.

Mills were the prototype of big manufacturing since the 16th century. As in pre-revolutionary times, various kinds of mills continued to exist during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period, with a definite trend, however, toward a factory-like establishment. Water, wind, horse and hand mills, small, medium and large mills, with one, two or three wheels, operated throughout the country, while water mills became a large-scale enterprise of predominant economic importance. As indicated above, Cossack grandes, capitalistic merchants and monasteries owned the large water mills, operated by skilled local and foreign millers. The capacity of the mills was measured by the number of wheels, ranging from one to twelve and more. Nestorenko said that the peasants and common Cossacks ran the small, one-, two-, or three-wheel mills, while mills of the upper classes had many wheels. Cossack grandes and merchant employers, frequently owned a number of milling establishments.<sup>27</sup> Large mills did a nation-wide business and exported their product as well. Traditionally, the mills ground not only flour and grouts, but they also operated adjunct saw mills, paper mills, wool fulling mills and gunpowder production. Wind and horse mills were small, run by craftsmen, or sometimes by kustar producers and were designed for local needs only. Hand mills were confined to the petty household needs of the poorest peasant and city families. Hand mills were primarily used to grind all kinds of grain: wheat, buckwheat and millet. Historically, they were replaced, at first, by horse, and then by wind- and water-mills.

Because of their many uses, water mills became larger and more numerous in Hetmanic times, and very profitable, too. Not infrequently, water mills were established in convenient, although not yet settled, areas. New villages soon sprang up around them. The type and volume of business varied from one area to another. According to the census of 1666, the city of Oster represented the greatest concentration of mills with its 21 establishments. In Kiev, there were 17 mills, in Baturin, 12. The Kievan mills were rather small and primitively operated, while those in Oster and Baturin were large, having two, three or more wheels, and more efficient. They were owned primarily by wealthy merchants, for the townspeople were highly interested in the milling business. For instance, of the 21 mills in Oster, 11 were owned by townspeople, 8 by the

Cossacks, and 2, had mixed ownership. Similar ratios of ownership prevailed in other sections of the country. The census of 1666 registered 173 mills in 118 towns.<sup>28</sup> Mills were numerous in Volhinia, Podolia, Poltava and Village Ukraine. Later the Chernihiv region was added to the list. In 1779-1781, there were already 597 mills in this area.

The industry also grew in other sections of the country. By the time of the Revolution, there were thousands of mills. In West Ukraine they were largely owned by the Polish gentry and rented by professional millers. The manorial economies derived considerable revenues from their milling monopolies. In 1755, the Vishnivets latifundium, for instance, received 1200 hundredweights of grain and 3,580 guldens in money as an annual rent. The Starokonstantyniv latifundium obtained in 1778 thirteen thousand guldens in rents from the mills.<sup>29</sup>

Flour was exported to Byeloruthenia, Muscovy, Lithuania and, in particular, the Cossack Host. It was also consumed in great quantities at home, being processed in every household, as well as by numerous general bakers, bread bakers and roll bakers.

The milling business flourished during the entire Cossacko-Hetmanic period because it was a basis for the growth of other industries. Hence, it could be taken as an indicator of the state of industrialization. Hetman Ivan Mazepa worked for the economic growth of the nation. No wonder that the milling business received a new impetus to expand in his time. After the defeat at Poltava (1709) of the Ukrainian and Swedish armies, Peter the Great ordered all mill equipment in Ukraine to be destroyed in order to sabotage a major fraction of her economy, including wool fulling, wood processing, paper production and gunpowder manufacturing. Although this order failed to ruin Ukrainian manufacturing, it heralded a series of attempts to convert the country into an agricultural colony of the new Russian Empire.

Another important sector of the industry, the large-scale processing of agricultural raw material, was the traditional manufacture of alcoholic beverages of all kinds: brandy, rye, whiskey, vodka, beer, wine and drinking honey. As in the Lithuanian-Polish era, all segments of the population were deeply involved in the industry, ranging from household distilling and brewing by almost every family for domestic and local consumption, through the kustar type of wine and drinking-honey production, up to the factory-like processing for nation-wide distribution and export done by the Cossack grandees, capitalistic merchants, municipalities, and

monasteries. At the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries, distilleries and breweries developed into large enterprises, producing mainly for a profitable export business. But the Ukrainians also liked to drink, according to foreign visitors. Vimina said for 1650 that considerable quantities of vodka and beer were drunk there. Hildebrandt reported that "Cossack women were brave, drank well .." And Weihe, for Mazepa's time, said: "Even prominent women do not hesitate to drink whiskey at the market."<sup>30</sup>

Production of strong drinks (whiskey, rye, brandy, vodka and beer) took place prior to the Revolution largely on a monopolistic base: a municipal monopoly in the town and a manorial monopoly in the countryside. Alcohol was distilled by the village and town population, either illegally or by permission for special occasions (holydays, weddings, baptisms, funerals) in return for payment to the lords. The National Revolution broke down the monopolistic principle to a great extent, and made alcohol processing a relatively free business. In the Chernihiv regimental district, for example, a large segment of all social classes made a living from making and selling alcoholic drinks, vodka and beer. Large distilleries and breweries were to be found throughout the country, in the Chernihiv, Kiev, Poltava, Volhinia, Galicia, Podolia and Village Ukraine regions. Particularly in the Poltava, Kiev and Kharkiv districts, large-scale alcohol manufacturing prevailed over household distilling and brewing.

Wine and drinking-honey production was also widespread, but it took place on a small scale within the household or kustar establishment. There were no large enterprises in this field. Manufacturing of drinking honey developed extensively in connection with the widespread occupation of apiculture, which was quite extensive in the Chernihiv and Poltava regimental districts, the Territory of the Cossack Host and Village Ukraine. In general, however, apiculture and drinking-honey production were time-honored occupations in all Ukraine. In the Chernihiv area, about the time of the introduction of the Russian administrative system in 1781-82, there were approximately 1138 bee gardens and plantations, having a total of 43,100 beehives.

Wine was made not only from grapes, but also from all kinds of fruits—apples, cherries, pears and plums—as well as from bread. The wineries were small establishments, often located on rivers to secure water for the processing.

There are some statistics available, especially for the second half of the 18th century, which may serve as a quantitative sampling

of the production volume of alcoholic drinks. In 1722, there were in the Poltava regimental district some 235 distilleries. In 1779-1781, some 392 distilleries operated in the Novhorod Siversk districts; and some 87 breweries and 201 malt-houses in the Chernihiv district. In the Poltava colonelcy, there were in the first half of the 18th century, 24 breweries and 52 large distilleries, Krupnitsky said. In West Ukraine (Volhinia, in particular), the distillery business was widespread. Alcohol was made from rye, barley, buckwheat and other grains. Three types of "vodka" (horilka) were produced: simple, ordinary and double, also called "Danzig brand." In 1773-75, four Volhinian cities alone manufactured some 15,789 gallons of all kinds of alcoholic beverages in their distilleries.

In West Ukraine, primarily the Polish nobles and municipalities owned distilleries and operated them on a profitable rent-lease basis. Some 912 distillery works were in the Kharkiv government district, and its six breweries were much larger than those operated in Chernihiv and Novhorod Siversk areas. Breweries were usually larger establishments than distilleries, employing a great number of workers. They produced two kinds of beer, ordinary and extra-strong. Lease-rent operation was also the customary way of business for breweries. The Berestechko brewery manufactured in 1777-78 about 38,000 gallons of beer, and the Starokonstantiniv brewery in 1772-78, 14,600 gallons. Usually, under the agreement between the lessor and lessee, the lessee had to use the by-products of brewing to feed cattle and hogs, in great part on the lessor's account. Cattle and hog sales from the breweries often yielded thousands of guldens and rubles annually.<sup>31</sup>

Distribution of alcoholic beverages was achieved through fairs, taverns, dealers and market places. As in the previous period, there were taverns that specialized, selling only vodka, whiskey, brandy and rye; others sold wine and drinking-honey; still others, wine and beer, or beer exclusively. Taverns were operated mainly as manufacturers' outlets, and were leased to tavern keepers. There were also dealers who bought beverages from the manufacturers, delivered them to fairs throughout the country, and also shipped them to Russia, Lithuania, Byeloruthenia, Poland and the Cossack Territory. For example, in 1722 there were in the Poltava regimental district approximately 389 taverns: 55 selling drinking-honey and beer, 213 exclusively beer, 78 only vodka, and 43 only home-made country beer. Wine was made for local consumption only, since it was neither good nor popular, according to Vimina's

account. Drinking-honey was exported in quantity to Muscovy and Byeloruthenia. Vodka and whiskey, however, were important items of export.<sup>32</sup>

Since the production and sale of alcoholic drinks was a very profitable business, it was also a frequent cause of conflicts and grievances among the members of various social classes. The municipalities, monasteries, townspeople, common Cossacks and Cossack grandees, and peasants wanted to recover old monopolies, or to acquire them, or to abolish them, or to seize monopoly rights from others. Thus, the townspeople of Village Ukraine made the freedom to distil and distribute alcohol a matter of vital concern in their "desiderata" to the Czar. The townspeople in the Hetmanic state fought desperately against Cossack abuses in this respect, while in West Ukraine, the nobles continued to exploit their privileged position under Polish law, which exposed the lower classes entirely to their mercy. The attempt to improve the situation came much too late.

Along with the business of apiculture and honey production, still other derivative industries developed in the 18th century, namely, manufacturing candles and soap. Wax candles were produced throughout the country, at first as a petty household industry in the manors to supply lighting for their household needs. Then small kustar establishments emerged to produce candles in the cities. Gradually these developed into large-scale enterprises. As supplementary to candle and soap production, two other types of manufacturing entered the market: wax pressing and fat melting, supplying raw materials to the candle and soap industries.

At the end of the 18th century, soap manufacturing took place in all parts of Ukraine. It was limited to small-scale enterprise, and suffered from an inadequate supply of skilled workers. In 1779-81, there were 25 small soap processing establishments in the Novhorod Siversk region, run by capitalistic merchants. It seems that Novhorod was the center of soap manufacturing since but few soap factories operated in other parts of Ukraine. In Tavria, for example, in 1779 there was but one soap factory producing approximately 3,500 pounds of soap worth 600 rubles each year.<sup>33</sup>

Tobacco manufacturing was another important industry processing agricultural raw materials. Growing tobacco, like cultivating mulberry trees, was discussed previously. Raised all over Ukraine, tobacco was processed mainly on a petty household scale. The Czarist government insisted on a semi-fiscal tobacco processing, and did not allow any competitive, large-scale, factory tobacco

manufacturing in the Hetmanic state. Raising tobacco leaves was encouraged there, but the raw material had to be delivered to the monopolistic state tobacco factories for processing. In the Okhtirka factory, skilled foreigners, principally from the Netherlands, students and soldiers were employed. In 1726, new processing machines, brought from the Netherlands, were installed there, and approximately 300,000 pounds of tobacco manufactured. Wages varied considerably: a skilled foreign craftsman received about 170 rubles a year, and an unskilled worker from 3 to 10 rubles annually, plus a quantity of tobacco. About 550 manorial tobacco plantations worked for the Okhtirka state establishment, where labor was performed by peasant serfs without any monetary compensation. Although the costs of raw material were low due to cheap labor, and finished tobacco priced very high, the Okhtiraka factory was notoriously unprofitable, and it was liquidated after 1733, as another example of disastrous Russian regimentation of Ukrainian industry.<sup>34</sup>

Otherwise, peasants, townspeople, Cossacks and religious orders raised and processed their own tobacco, particularly in the Lubni, Hadiach, Nizhen, Romni, Ivanhorod, Oster and Uman regions. It was sold domestically in large quantities at the fairs and market places, and greatly sought because of its good quality.<sup>35</sup> Peter the Great prohibited any Russian importation of Ukrainian finished tobacco in order to preserve the Russian fiscal monopoly. Then, later on, the prohibition was formally repealed, but a 25-30 percent *ad valorem* customs duty was imposed on the selling price, making shipment of Ukrainian tobacco to Russia unprofitable.

**Textile and Leather Production.** Textile manufacturing, including linen, wool, silk and cotton goods, was one of the oldest and most important industries in the national economy of Hetmanic Ukraine. In the Kievan Empire and the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth, various materials, crude and fine, bleached and unbleached, were manufactured for clothing, sails, nets, rugs and carpets.<sup>36</sup> With the progress of civilization and the increasing density of population, the industry naturally had to grow. Hence, a great variety of textiles was produced in the household, craftsman's workshop, kustar establishment and textile factory during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period, and sold domestically and abroad. Paul of Alepo, Werdum, Hildebrandt, Beauplan and others mentioned considerable textile manufacturing. Beauplan and Werdum wrote of an extensive

household textile production, the work of peasants and townspeople, especially of women. Looms were literally in every household and home, said Ohloblin, and Aksakov added that whatever the peasants wore as clothing was exclusively the product of their own hand.<sup>37</sup>

Of course, the extensive hemp and flax raising, indicated by Marshall, and sheep breeding were closely connected with textile manufacturing and processing. Large-scale, factory-like textile enterprises began to develop in Mazepa's time, as a consequence of the clothing requirements of the modernized Ukrainian and Russian armies. In the 17th century, large textile establishments, manufacturing linen and woolen yardgoods existed in various locations, in the cities of Brody and Lviv, Galicia; in the city of Rivne, Volhynia; the city of Zalozci, Podolia; in Hetman-Ukraine, the cities of Kiev, Hlukhiv, Starodub, Baturin, Sheptakiv, Riashkiv and Pochev; in Village Ukraine, the city of Kharkiv, of Putivl and Otkirka in the right-bank Ukraine, the cities of Korsun, Tulchin and Nemiriv.

Immediately after the Poltava defeat, Ukrainian linen and woolen production declined, as did other industries, as a result of the Russian invasion and the Russian politico-economic measures in occupied Ukraine; but in Apostol's and Rozumovsky's time production recovered. Sichinsky noted that in the second half of the 17th and in the 18th centuries, the textile industry experienced continuous fluctuations reflecting the unstable political situation, frequent wars and the contractions and expansions in Ukrainian autonomy resulting from changing policies of St. Petersburg. At first, the woolen industry suffered because of the low breed of sheep and unsatisfactory cleaning methods; thus, wool was dirty and cheap, and woolen materials poor. Later, however, in the second half of the 18th century, wool was cleaned better and consequently, a better and a wider variety of woolen materials was manufactured. Marino sheep were introduced, and the techniques of breeding were improved. Production of cotton goods was negligible. Woolen materials were used to manufacture clothing, rugs, carpets, covers, blankets, bed covers and so forth.<sup>38</sup>

Concurrently, the linen industry also expanded, to supply shirts, underwear, sails, nets, ropes, cordage and other appliances demanded in connection with the development of the Russian navy on the Black and Azov Seas, the growth of armed forces and the emergence of commercialized fishing. Large scale linen manufacturing took place particularly in the Chernihiv and Starodub districts, Kiev, Volhynia and the Village Ukraine. The city of

Izium supplied linen; Reshetiliv, ribbons; Krolovets, table cloths and towels; Ostriv, fishing nets; and Novozybkiv, sails for the commercialized fishing industry on the Azov shores. In Apostol's time, the Starodub area became the center of linen manufacturing, while Kiev and Hlukhiv developed into centers of the garment industry.

The volume of output of the woolen and linen factories can be estimated on the basis of the fractional statistical data, so far available. Probably the oldest textile factory, a woolen mill, was erected in Putivl, Village Ukraine, in 1719. In 1722, it already had 455 workers, Russians, Ukrainians and foreigners. In the 1880's, Pultivl textiles enjoyed the reputation of being the best in all Ukraine. Colonel Horlenko established a factory in the village of Riashkiv, Chernihiv regimental district, which in 1737 was acquired by Russian field-marshal Munnich. In this factory in 1779-81 over 720 workers labored daily at 60 machines bringing in over 3,000 rubles of pure profit. Pay scales differed according to the type of work and skill. A skilled material worker received 24 rubles per year; an apprentice, 10 rubles; a carpenter, 8 rubles; a wool-master, 36 rubles. There were also some specialized jobs, differently paid on a basis of either piece-work or time.

Hetman Cyril Rozumovsky erected a textile factory in the city of Baturin in 1756, at first operating only 12 machines. In 1800, it had 76 machines and over 100 workers, manufacturing over 633,000 feet of woolen materials of various kinds. The largest linen manufacturing establishment was in Pochep. Established in 1726, it employed 221 workers at 63 benches. From 1726 to 1736, it produced over 40 million feet of linen. In 1731, another linen factory manufactured over 2,000 bales of linen material. Those enterprises were relatively large for their time, but they were considerably smaller than government-sponsored Russian textile establishments, working primarily for the army, and employing sometimes from 1,000 to 1,500 workers, producing thousands of bales of woolen or linen material yearly.<sup>39</sup>

Production of rugs, carpets and embroidery materials, also one of the ancient Ukrainian industries, developed as a separate branch of textile manufacturing during the Cossacko-Hetmanic era. The old chronicles mentioned rugs and carpets under the years 997, 1015, 1097, 1100, and others. The art probably originated in the Orient since Ukrainian rugs always showed Oriental influence in coloring, patterns, and artistic compositions.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, rugs and carpets were manufactured in individual households by all segments of the population. How-



ever, there were also establishments of skilled craftsmen and kustar enterprisers who produced them on order or for the market. Cossack grandees, merchant employers and monasteries penetrated the field in an attempt to mass produce rugs, carpets and embroideries. Such factories were established in Nemiriv, Tulchin, Yampol, Zalozci, Horodlo, Baturin, Kharkiv and Kiev. These carpets and rugs were distinguished for good quality, artistic design and the use of excellent dyestuffs. Embroidery became a cherished hobby of women as well as an important industry. Woolen, linen and silk materials were artistically embroidered in various colors, including gold and silver threads. Each region of the country began to develop its own style of the art.<sup>40</sup>

Production of silk was a growing industry in Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine. Paul of Alepo and Hueldenstaedt reported seeing mulberry trees there and signs of a great interest in silk, which was generally used for garments of the upper classes, Church vestments and decoration of chambers. Thus mulberry trees were raised in gardens and plantations in Pereyaslav, Nizhen, and Kharkiv and Okhtirka in Village Ukraine. In the city of Brody in Galicia, a silk mill existed since 1641, and trained operators were brought there from Flanders, the Netherlands, Danzig and Greece. This factory produced silk materials, well dyed and with golden and silver embroideries in clearly oriental patterns, as Sichinsky said.

Later on, a Greek merchant, Manuil of Korfu, established another silk factory in the city of Lviv. In general, the Greeks were very active in Ukrainian silk manufacture in its early stage. In 1724, a similar silk establishment was founded in Kiev, followed by others in Korsun, Sokal, Nemiriv, Krementchuk, Kharkiv and Okhtirka. Ohktika was especially famous for its silk shawls. Hetman Mazepa was interested in the production of raw silk and silk processing.

The Poltava event unfavorably affected also this industry, and it wasn't until the 1720's that silk manufacturing really recovered. At the end of that century there was in Krementchuk a factory that produced silk stockings.

It must be stressed again, that the development, growth and decline of the Ukrainian textile industries were conditioned by the economic policies of the Czarist government. The Russian policy of keeping Ukraine as a source of raw material and an outlet for Russian finished goods prevailed. Hence, the Russians opposed in every way possible the industrialization of textile manufacturing. But this policy was not consistent. Urgent needs sometimes forced the Russian government to favor manufacturing in Ukraine, particularly, that of textiles including garments, sales, nets, tents and similar items of military importance.

For the same reasons, Peter the Great and other Czars, established

state factories, or sponsored, supported and subsidized private manufacturing of textile and other strategic materials in Muscovite territory. Sheep breeding, hemp and flax growing and mulberry tree cultivation were warmly supported in Ukraine by St. Petersburg. In 1779-1781, at the very end of the Ukrainian political autonomy, there were in Podolia, Poltava, Novhorod Siversk and the Village Ukraine, over 730 sheep breeding stations. That this growth was achieved with the help of Russian intervention cannot be denied. But at the same time, export of Ukrainian wool and linen abroad was either prohibited or directed through the ports of Riga, Arkhangelsk and St. Petersburg. Russian aristocrats and capitalistic merchant employers, such as Menshikov, Munnich, Potiomkin and Stroganov, acquired the existing establishments or founded new ones, brought in Russian artisans and skilled workers, and cheated the Ukrainian producer of raw materials.

Ukrainian manufacturers were discriminated against by means of tolls, tariffs, exorbitant taxes and down-right chicanes. The most prosperous linen establishment in Pochep was dismantled in 1754 and shipped to Russia.

Nestorenko stressed a great interest on the part of the Russian government in developing raw silk production in Ukraine. For 75 years the experiment was continued. Peasants and Cossacks, raising the mulberry trees, were offered various benefits, like exemption from military service and from certain taxes and tolls, and guaranteed the purchase of all raw silk by the state. In 1753, a Russian inspector visited Ukraine to learn the state of raw silk production. His report was very optimistic. The Ukrainian Hetmans were urged by the Czars to cooperate. Subsequently, Czarist ordinances advised raising mulberry trees and producing raw silk throughout Hetmanic and Village Ukraine, and those peasants, Cossacks and foreigners who complied were offered financial subsidies from the fisc.

At first, large-scale silk plantations were encouraged, but the project failed. Then, small-scale individual operations were recommended.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, both Russian and Hetmanic sponsorship proved disastrous. Regimentation, regulation and control were always more formal than essential, and their rigidity actually killed the industry, according to Krupnitsky.<sup>42</sup> Local population despised compulsion and was unwilling to cooperate. Silk factories existed in various places, but they were very early taken over by Russians, who were granted monopolistic rights, so that Ukrainians were not admitted to ownership and management. The Russian monopolistic

position was used to exploit the Ukrainian producer of raw silk. Thus, the project was doomed to complete failure in the next decade. Russian protection was of no avail to the industry.

Leather manufacturing evolved along with large-scale cattle raising. It remained, however, confined to small-scale craftshops or *kustar* establishments, although the extent and volume of its production were tremendous; for only leather shoes and boots were worn in Ukraine, according to foreign travelers. The artisans who processed leather and manufactured leather goods, the tanners, shoemakers, boot makers, and saddlemakers, the belt, glove and leather cap manufacturers—were generally poor, and their shops were usually located in their homes. Each province had its center for the leather industry: the towns of Korop and Olishivka in the Chernihiv region; Oster, Oposhnia, Zinkiv, and Sanzhari in Poltava; Okhtirka, Sumi, Valki and Nova Vodolaka in the Village Ukraine; the cities of Zhitomir, Berdichiv and Poritsk in Volhinia. The annual income of the small leather *kustar* establishments did not generally exceed 100-300 rubles. By the end of the 18th century, some large-scale leather establishments had been established in the regions of Novhorod Siversk, Volhinia and Tavria.

Furriery was another segment of the animal skin processing business, fairly developed, but for a lower economic significance than it had in the earlier periods of Ukrainian history. As before, furs were processed for winter clothing, for decorating the living chambers, and for export. Hueldenstaedt said, for example, "In Reshetilivka there was a tannery producing a fine quality of furs used for men's hats throughout Ukraine." He also indicated considerable Ukrainian fur exports to Germany, Poland, Moldavia, Turkey, Crimea and other lands, which unmistakably point out a large fur manufacturing.<sup>43</sup>

In Hetmanic Ukraine, the city of Oster was an important center of fur and fur garment production. Russian nobles and merchants were very interested in acquiring controlling interest in Ukrainian leather and fur manufacturing, and were supported by St. Petersburg in this respect, upsetting the normal development of the country's economy.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

### TRADES AND INDUSTRIES (CONTINUED)

**Metallurgy and arms - Chemical industries: potash and tar - Glass and ceramics - Paper and printing industries - Construction industry and wooden manufacturing**

**Metallurgy and Arms.** Metallurgical, chemical, wood and construction industries developed under less favorable conditions than the processing of agricultural raw materials. As long as Ukraine preserved its sovereignty or at least an extensive autonomy, they prospered; but when in the 18th century Russian pressure was intensified, St. Petersburg while still tolerant of the processing of agricultural produce, because of their strategic importance, ruthlessly tried to liquidate other industries. Of course, this was a violation of Ukrainian autonomy and of the original articles of the Pereyaslav Treaty (1654), but the Russians thought it essential to eliminate the the competition of Ukrainian manufacturers from the East and Central European markets.<sup>1</sup> Thus, metallurgy, the armament industry in particular, chemical industries, paper manufacturing and printing were reduced or eliminated by the end of the 18th century. These industries, however, grew impressively during the first decades of Ukrainian statehood, at least, until the defeat at Poltava.

Metallurgical industries, the production of arms, manufacturing tools and appliances, and the jewelry industry had developed since Kievan times. Iron ore was mined, and iron, copper, zinc, aluminum, gold and silver also were imported for processing and manufacture.<sup>2</sup>

It is interesting that the Ukrainian Hetmans, Daniel Apostol particularly, by not importing Russian iron and other metals, avoided dependence upon Russian supplies. This is a good example of Ukrainian mercantilistic thinking.

In the Hetmanic times, specialized metallurgical trades existed, such as smelters, smiths, sword makers, kettlers, gun and cannon makers, key and lock smiths, bell founders, zinc processors, watch makers, goldsmiths and many others. Metallurgical manufacturing was done extensively throughout the country, usually in workshops or kustar establishments. Metal processing in large factories was

rare, except in armament and bell production, which was usually sponsored by the government, or by the Hetmans, Cossack grandees and monasteries.

Production of arms and weapons was certainly the most important sector of metallurgy. Paul Aleop related that "In every apartment of these dignitaries, and even in the cells of the priests and monks, there are valuable arms in great number."<sup>3</sup> Collections of arms, produced domestically and abroad, were gathered by the nobles and grandees not only for military reasons but also as an expensive hobby. In these years of frequent wars, there was a great demand for all kinds of weapons. In all cities and manorial possessions, skilled and famous craftsmen manufactured arms in the 17th and 18th centuries. Some of these were Ukrainian, of whom three were outstanding: Andrew, Luke, and Matthew; some were German, like Weisse, Froehlich, Wolff and Herle; and some were Czech, e.g., Krahl. They came from Augsburg, Nuerenberg, Krakow and other foreign towns. Their craftsmanship was excellent, known at home and abroad, and frequently associated with artistry.<sup>4</sup> Shields, swords, cannons and guns were ornamented with artistic metal carvings and engravings.

Various traditional weapons, like armor, shields, helmets, swords, spears and axes were still produced, along with modern arms like shotguns, cannons and pistols. Old pieces of arms, such as armor, shields, swords and helmets, were always ornately engraved and covered with leather. They were no longer used in battles, but were worn by the Hetmans, nobles and Cossack grandees on outstanding occasions as symbols of their high offices. Cannons and artillery pieces were manufactured and used since the 16th century; all major cities were defended by artillery. Shotguns and rifles came into use in the 17th century. Prior to the Revolution of 1648, the production of canons and guns was concentrated in the cities of Belz, Lviv, Rohatin and Kamianets, and in the Cossack fortress of Seetch beyond the Dniepr cataracts, as Beauplan related. The Cossacks used as their main weapons shotguns of various kinds and, since the 18th century, pistols. Lances were used by the Cossack cavalry. The Cossack artillery in Seetch had a hundred cannons. Most of their arms were produced on the premises.<sup>5</sup>

During the Revolution, the demand for arms increased greatly. In the Hetmanic state, armament establishments—craftshops, kustar enterprises and small factories—developed throughout the nation, with a concentration in the city of Starodub, followed by the cities of Nizhen, Pochep, Novhorod Siversk, Hlukhiv, Pereyaslav and

Kiev. According to eyewitnesses, Ukrainian cannons and guns were of an excellent quality. In an emergency, churchbells were melted down and converted into cannons. This was done, for example, in 1663 by Colonels Zolotarenko and Somko.

Cannons were made from iron and copper. Hetman Mazepa established a state arms factory, managed by Friedrich Koenigseck, a German born Commander-in-Chief of Hetmanic artillery. Mazepa himself studied intensively the problems of artillery. He was very much interested in the production of arms and weapons, and supported the industry in every way possible, in view of his long-range plans for a war against Russia. Hence, he gave protection to the producers of cannons and guns, in particular to two outstanding masters of the trade, Joseph and Karp Balashevich.<sup>6</sup> After the Poltava defeat, however, Czar Peter the Great ordered the liquidation of all Ukrainian arms and weapon manufacturing. All supplies of firearms and cannons were confiscated and taken to Russia. Later on, Hetman Apostol tried to reestablish the manufacture of cannons, guns and other weapons in Ukraine, but he was not very successful. The base of Hetmanic artillery formations was located first in the city of Lohvitsa, and then it was transferred to the cities of Romni and Korop. The artillery was stationed in Korop until the demise of the Hetmanic state.

The same fate overtook the production of saltpetre and gunpowder. Saltpetre mining and processing and gunpowder manufacturing developed in Ukraine for many decades, as testified by Beauplan, Gmelin and others, to such an extent that they were considered traditional industries. The Cossacks were very proficient at producing gunpowder in their own territory. Nobles also made their own gunpowder, by mining saltpetre and making gunpowder production a supplement to their flourmills and sawmills. Even peasants manufactured gunpowder for their own limited use.

During the Revolution, Hetman Khmelnitsky temporarily made saltpetre extraction and gunpowder manufacturing a state monopoly. But immediately after the Revolution, individual initiative and free enterprise took over in the Hetmanic state. Cossack grandees, nobles, monasteries and capitalistic merchants indulged in the business extensively.

In 1713-1720, however, Peter the Great made the distribution of saltpetre an imperial monopoly. He ordered all saltpetre extracted in Ukraine to be sold through the state artillery stores in Moscow and St. Petersburg only. In 1764, a Czarist decree prohibited gunpowder manufacturing in the Hetmanic state on the flimsy

grounds that Ukrainian gunpowder was of inferior quality. In fact, however, St. Petersburg wanted to eliminate any future attempts of the Ukrainians to separate themselves from the Empire by force of arms.<sup>7</sup>

Equally important as the manufacture of weapons was the manufacture of all kinds of tools and appliances for household, agriculture, trades and transportation. These tools were produced wholly or partially from metals such as iron, copper, tin and so forth. Axes, hammers, saws, plows, plowshares, rakes, hoes, forks, knives, spoons, iron parts and bindings for carriages, wagons, and sleds; such articles as horseshoes, nails, wire, kettles, pots, pans, plates, chalices, jars and flatirons; ornaments such as figures of saints, crosses, metallic monuments and candlesticks; fences, gates, doors, locks and keys; and various primitive machines—all these were manufactured by petty but highly skilled artisans.

Copper, aluminum, tin and other metals were imported in ever increasing quantities to fill domestic needs. Iron was imported too, but it was also produced more and more at home in the iron pits and iron works in Polisia, Volhinia, Chernihiv and Village Ukraine. In Novhorod Siversk, iron processing was done in connection with milling establishments. The cities of Starodub, Hlukhiv, Poltava, Kharkiv, Okhtirka, Chernihiv, Yanpil and Lviv were the centers of the metallurgical trades. The territory of the Cossack Host had its own iron-processing centers. The great demand for metal goods at home and abroad made the industry a highly profitable one. Nevertheless, Ukrainian exports of metal articles were insignificant, and importers profited considerably by the heavy demand for foreign-made metal objects.

Because of the deep religious devotion of the Ukrainian people, the manufacture of church bells continued to be an important and growing branch of metallurgy in Cossacko-Hetmanic times. The city of Lviv was a traditional center of bell manufacturing since the 14th century. In Hetmanic Ukraine, bells were produced in left and right-bank cities, such as Nizhen, Starodub, Pochep, Novhorod Siversk, Kiev, Hlukhiv, Pereyaslav and elsewhere. Iron, copper, bronze and brass were used in their manufacture. The bell-producing industry enjoyed particular protection from Hetman Mazepa, the great protector of the Church, culture, the arts and the economy. The industrialist, Karp Balashevich, engaged extensively in the manufacture of bells along with the large-scale production of huge pots and kettles for the distillery and brewery industries. He manufactured the famous "Pigeon" bell, with

Mazepa's portrait and coat of arms, and rich ornamentation.<sup>8</sup>

Jewelry manufacturing, with artistic ornaments and engravings, flourished in Hetmanic Ukraine. Goldsmiths' establishments, working with gold, silver and other valuable metals, manufactured watches and clocks in all major cities, in Lviv, Yaroslav, Pere-mishl, Kiev, Chernihiv, Lutsk, Kremianets, Rohatin, Sianik, Potilich, Sambor, Pereyasla, Kharkiv, and many other places, as the old records report. The city of Lviv was the center of the jewelry industry for centuries. Goldsmith and jewelry establishments, craft and kustar shops, manufactured not only jewelry but also gold and silver tableware, like plates, bowls, knives, forks, spoons, candlesticks, crosses, figures, picture frames, chalices, cups, jars, and many other articles, which were widely exported to Muscovy and Walachia.<sup>9</sup> Craftsmen were largely of Ukrainian descent, and the ornamentations and engravings on the jewelry bore predominantly Ukrainian artistic motifs and patterns.

In West Ukraine, the Polish government continued to suppress jewelry manufacturing in Lviv, Zhovkva, Sianik and other cities, where it bore a strictly Ukrainian national character, and particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries when it began seriously to compete with Polish and German jewelry in all East European markets.

In the second half of the 18th century, all branches of the metallurgical industry, including bell manufacturing, began to decline due to the rigidity of their guild organization, on the one hand, and Russian suppression on the other. In Galicia, metallurgy still existed to some extent, but the industry was largely taken over by foreign businessmen.

**Chemical Industries: Potash and Tar.** Gmelin, a German doctor and scientist, gave in his four-volume book, *Travels Through Russia*, a favorable picture of Ukraine, and expressed amazement at finding well developed chemical industries, saltpetre manufacturing, chemical and pharmaceutical plants, inoculation against smallpox, and other progressive manifestations of the country's economy and culture.<sup>10</sup> The saltpetre industry and lime processing have been discussed already. Both were considerable. Lime extraction took place in various parts of Ukraine, in Podolia, Chernihiv, Novhorod Siversk and Village Ukraine. Lime was used extensively in construction, and for painting dwellings, as Nestorenko indicated.<sup>11</sup> Lime was largely made in the household economy. Potash and tar production was doubtlessly leading among the chemical industries, although its extent and output probably declined in proportion to the Polish times. It was pointed out before that forests were greatly devastated and



their reserves depleted as a result of ruthless exploitation. The government had to intervene in order to prevent a catastrophe. Hence, the extent of the wood processing industries, potash and tar manufacturing, particularly in the Hetmanic state but also in the provinces still under Polish domination, was somewhat reduced. In numerous decrees, granting or reserving rights of tar and potash manufacturing to the Cossack grandees, monasteries, merchants and professional potash and tar producers (budniks), the Hetmans attempted to regulate that business in which all classes of people were so greatly interested. It was profitable, since potash was needed for glass, soap and dyestuff production, and was eagerly sought by export firms to supply foreign markets.

Some Hetmans owned and operated potash works. Among these was Mazepa whose works were in Pochep, Ropsk, Sheptakiv and Yanpil. These plants were centrally administered by a Custodian of the Hetmanic Potash Establishments, and locally managed by special officials. The scale and volume of the Hetmanic potash business may be visualized by the revenues it produced. Thus, Sava Vladislavovich paid for potash from the Hetmanic works in the course of three years 100,000 guildens.<sup>12</sup> Cossack grandees manufactured potash and tar in connection with their enormous forest economies and hereditary property rights. Merchants, on the other hand, frequently organized companies and partnerships for the purpose of potash and tar manufacturing and forest exploitation. Thus, Spiridon Shirai, mayor of the city of Starodub, and Kost Prihora, mayor of Novhorod Siversk, were mentioned in historical records as important potash producers. Among the Cossack grandees, Colonel Miklashevsky and Envoy-General Hamaliia were big potash and tar producers.

In many instances, Ohloblin said, tar and potash manufacturing was a family prerogative, frequently affirmed by the Hetmanic office. However, official Hetmanic decrees were not absolutely necessary for the establishment of those usually hereditary family rights. They were only helpful when new settlements were organized and the founder desired for himself and his family the economic advantage of forest exploitation and tar and potash production.<sup>13</sup> Main tar and potash works were located in the districts of Starodub, northern Chernihiv, Novhorod Siversk and in right-bank Ukraine, in Polesia and Volhinia. At least ten villages today are called "Buda," which means in Ukrainian "potash and tar works," thus indicating their historical significance as locations of that particular industry.

St. Petersburg wanted to suppress and to destroy this branch of the Ukrainian economy. Therefore, in 1718 Czar Peter the Great issued an ordinance prohibiting the establishment of any new potash works in Ukraine. One year later, the Russians began to ship their potash extensively to Ukraine, trying to stifle the Ukrainian production by fair and unfair competition.<sup>14</sup> In 1781, however, the industry still continued to manufacture potash on a limited scale. In that year there were about 14 large potash works in Novhorod Siversk, 6 in Podolia, 4 in Galicia and 12 in the Starodub and Bila Tserkva districts. The potash works in Piriatin, for example, produced in the course of the summer of 1781 over three tons of potash and sold it for 289 guldens.<sup>15</sup> Of course, the industry, by contributing to the depletion of forest resources at a time when Ukraine had no positive reforestation program, exerted a negative impact upon the economy as a whole.

**Glass and Ceramics.** Glass manufacturing, another large-scale industry, was a very significant branch of the economy in Hetmanic times. In the Lithuanian-Polish era, glass manufacturing was insignificant. In the 14th and 15th centuries, it was rapidly declining, but it again prospered in West Ukraine in the 16th century.

In right-bank Ukraine, glass works began to operate first in the 17th century, at first in the towns on a guild and craft basis. Artisans were of foreign, primarily German, as well as Ukrainian descent. However, in the late 18th century, glass manufacturing moved to the suburbs and countryside, and was sponsored by the grandees and merchant employers, and concentrated in the northern areas, northern Kiev, Chernihiv, Polesia, Volhinia and northern Galicia, where valuable raw materials (such as quartz sand, chalk, potash and wood) were available. The records for 1666 describe glass works in Kiev, Nonotop and Sosnitsa counties. At the end of the Hetmanic era, there were 7 glass works in Volhinia, 15 in the Novhorod Siversk, and 8 in the Kievan areas. In the Chernihiv district there were 21 glass works in 1767, and 28 in 1781. The statistics indicate a growth of glass manufacturing throughout the 18th century, reaching its peak, as far as the quantity, quality and variety of glass were concerned, at the end of that century, Krupnitsky said. On the other hand, Slabchenko believed that the decline of glass production in Ukraine came in the middle of the century.<sup>16</sup> It seems that Krupnitsky's view is correct.

Glass was widely used in Ukraine, according to eyewitnesses

such as Paul Alepo and Weihe. Alepo saw richly decorated glass windows in the towns, churches, private homes and monasteries. Weihe related that "they have .. glass-making plants, wherein they manufacture great quantities of glass for windows and all sorts of drinking glasses."<sup>17</sup> Slabchenko indicated that even peasants produced glass for their household use.<sup>18</sup> In the second half of the 18th century, glass was manufactured also in Village Ukraine, in the village of Huta, Okhtirka county.<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, the term "huta" means "glass work" in Ukrainian, and it was generally used to identify the villages and towns where glass was produced. There are many villages today in Ukraine called "Huta," the name being reminiscent of the days of glass manufacturing in those places, just as with the names of villages called "Ruda" (iron pit) and "Buda" (potash work). Sichinsky said that in Podolia there were 13 villages called Huta, in Volhinia 9, and in the Kiev area 8.<sup>20</sup>

In Hetmanic times, glass manufacturing occurred on a large scale, in factory-like establishments owned by Hetmans, Cossack grandes, capitalistic merchants and monasteries. These glass works were operated on a rent-lease basis by professional masters of the trade. Their volume of production was large, from 200,000 to 300,000 pieces of assorted glassware annually in one plant, bringing from 500 to 1,500 rubles of net revenue.<sup>21</sup> Production technology was on a high level with a well developed terminology and highly skillful and specialized craftsmen. Some works manufactured even crystal glass in a limited quantity.

Artisans were primarily of Ukrainian descent, coming largely from Galicia and Volhinia, where the glass industry was traditional. Skabichevsky, Bohinsky, Bilozersky, Sidoriv, Kononiv, Los, Ivanitsky and Baran were the most famous artisans. There were also some foreign master artisans such as Schot. Some of these craftsmen were very rich, for example, V. Baran, the manager of the Rozumovsky glass works.

The wages of the craftsmen and workers in the glass industry were flexible and depended upon the profitability of the business. The incentive system prevailed. At first they fluctuated from 20 to 30 kopeiek for 60 bottles or 60 pieces of glass, and then, from 50 to 60 kopeiek for 100 pieces. In monastic establishments the artisans were paid better, about 10 rubles per year plus meals and board, while in the Cossack glass works they received about 6 rubles. In small establishments the wages were lower than in the large, factory-like mills.<sup>22</sup>

Window glass, special drinking vessels for wine, beer, whiskey

and honey, cups, pots, bowls, plates, jars and vases were manufactured in these establishments. Window glass was at first only slightly transparent, but later beautiful glass, including stained glass mosaics, was produced. Other glass articles were usually ornamented with all kinds of patterns and figures, and with the identification marks of the manufacturing glass works. Glass and glassware were sold at market places, fairs and special glass stores and warehouses throughout Ukraine. In 1781, for instance, there were specialty glass stores in Starodub and Novhorod Siversk.<sup>23</sup> Glass was also exported in large quantities to Muscovy, Lithuania and Byeloruthenia, in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries. In particular, a first quality glass, including that for pharmaceutical purposes, was shipped to Russia, to the cities of Moscow, Orel and Viazma, as well as to Smolensk in Byeloruthenia, and Riga in Latvia, where a poorer quality of glass was produced.

Among the owners of the large glass works were Hetmans Mazepa and Rozumovsky, the Cossack grandes and capitalistic merchants, known already because of their extensive business activities, such as Kochubey, Lomikovsky, Orlik, Miklashevsky, Lizohub, Polubotok, Markovsky and Prokopovich. Furthermore, from among the common Cossacks and wealthy townspeople, Matvievich, Yakimovich and Shevchenko were important glass manufacturers.

Along with glass production, the ceramics and pottery industries developed steadily because a good raw material, caoline clay, was available in such parts of Ukraine as Kiev, Chernihiv, Poltava, and Volhinia provinces; they exhibited strong Greek and Roman influences in the Kievan era. After a decline during the Mongol invasion in the 13th and 15th centuries, when output decreased and quality declined, a recovery followed at the end of the 15th century. This time the industry showed strong West European influences.

In Hetmanic Ukraine, the ceramic and pottery industries grew impressively, especially in the right-bank areas. Craftsmen were loosely organized into guilds, quite different from those of Lithuanian-Polish times, when a strict guild system existed. They manufactured a variety of appliances, bowls, plates, chalices, cups, jars, pots, tiles, bricks and other things in Chernihiv, Poltava, Starodub, Kozel, Nizhyn, Pohor, Novhorod, Komishin, Opishnia, Baturin and almost in all towns and most of the countryside of the left-bank, as mentioned, as well as in Kamianets, Zinkiv, Bar, Smotrich and Derezhnia of right-bank Ukraine. In Galicia and Volhinia, pottery and ceramics continued as important industries in Lithuanian-Polish times.

Production of tile was especially well developed; manufacturing technology was advanced; the produce was of good quality and beautifully ornamented. It was used for building stoves, hearths, and for beautifying walls. Until the first half of the 18th century, the ornamental patterns showed German and Dutch influences, and after that French Rococo patterns.

The skill of the Ukrainian pottery artisans was so great that the Russians frequently bribed them by offering very high wages, bringing them to Muscovy. Production of ceramics and pottery articles was frequently done, especially in the countryside, on a family basis, and the trade was passed on from father to son, resulting in a steady improvement of the potters' skill. The daily production of the pottery craftsman was relatively high; 100 bowls or 200 cups or chalices, 130 pots or 100 tiles, or 500 bricks per artisan was the average output.

China production was started in Ukraine in the 1760's in the village of Poloshki, Chernihiv colonelcy, where an excellent domestic clay was available for that purpose. The Russians, for example, imported hundreds of tons of Poloshik clay for their own domestic china manufacturing.<sup>24</sup> Actually, Cossack grandees initiated and sponsored china manufacturing in the Hetmanic state, although it was limited to a small scale.

In connection with clay processing, brick manufacturing must be mentioned as growing in importance with the brick and stone construction industries. Initially, bricks were produced by traveling artisans who moved from one place to another, utilizing temporary brick works to meet existing demands. Later on, the Cossack grandees and religious orders began to establish permanent brick works on their landed possessions, to supply bricks for building walls, towers, churches, palaces, chimneys, stoves and hearths. Thus, in the 18th century, there were brick works in Kiev, Poltava, Kharkiv and other places in Ukraine, and their size and efficiency may be illustrated by the works operating in the cities of Baturin and Hlukhiv, supplying bricks since 1748 for the large building construction projects of Hetman Cyril Rozumovsky. The Baturin work employed over 400 workers between 1751 and 1753 and in 1753 alone manufactured more than 2,500,000 bricks. The Hlukhiv works were smaller, employing some 70 workers and producing some 600,000 bricks a year. <sup>25</sup>

The paper and printing industries are not only economically significant, but serve as indicators of a society's intellectual life.

As Sichinsky said, the larger the production and consumption of paper and the more extensive the use of the printed word, the higher is the level of a nation's culture.

The paper and printing industries were very well developed in Hetmanic Ukraine. In the first half of the 17th century, paper production was still a small-scale operation in the cities, and in the framework of the guild organization. In the second half of that century, the paper works were usually in the countryside, in noble, Cossack and Church possessions, where labor was cheap and raw materials readily available.

In early Hetmanic times, paper mills operated in Kiev, Chernihiv, and Podolia, producing several kinds of paper. Hetman Mazepa, who had a great understanding of the cultural needs of his country, directly established or indirectly sponsored several paper mills in the left-bank areas, mentioned in the records later under the years 1748, 1779, and 1781. Paper from these establishments was always furnished with elaborate water marks, not infrequently bearing the image of Mazepa himself. Each individual paper mill used its own special marks to identify the origin of the product.

Northern Ukraine was the site of the paper industry. Many mills existed in the Chernihiv regimental district and several in the Kievan area. The records mentioned 12 paper works in Chernihiv, 8 in Galicia and a number in Kiev. Large religious orders and the bishops of diocese operated paper mills and printshops; some of these manufactured as much as 300,000 to 400,000 feet of various kinds and qualities of paper annually.

The artisans in those works were initially of foreign (primarily German) descent, but in the 18th century they were predominantly Ukrainian. Ukrainian youth were especially trained, as Sichinsky relates, for performance of those jobs in the paper industry. The Ukrainian character of the industry was also indicated by the well developed Ukrainian technical terminology used in the paper mills.<sup>26</sup>

The paper mills were, as a rule, erected on river banks, and primarily in the forest sections of the country in view of their need for water as a source of power and wood as raw material. Needless to say, the industry's heavy consumption of wood contributed considerably to the depletion of forest reserves.

Consumption of paper grew rapidly in Hetmanic times. Paper was used primarily for printing ecclesiastical books and textbooks, for keeping records of the central and provincial governments, for the records of large private estates, and for school. As a matter of fact, paper consumption in Ukraine during that era was greater than

that of the whole Russian Empire. Because of the increased output, paper prices declined steadily in the course of the 18th century.

The book printing industry proceeded on a large scale. Paul Alepo reported as follows: "In Kiev, near the Cathedral of St. Sophia, is an excellent printing press serving for all this country. It publishes all the church books with a surprising print of various forms and colors ... Here we printed, as other patriarchs had done before us, a complete set of Indulgences." He said, furthermore, that the population of Ukraine was literate, and that its upper strata were highly educated.

Jul Just, a Danish envoy, was greatly surprised to see the Ukrainian peasants in many villages going to church with prayer books, indicating that they were literate.<sup>27</sup> Book printing took place in Kiev, Lviv, Ostroh, Chernihiv, Pochaiv and other cities. Printing was artistic, of an advanced technique and in various colors. Books were richly ornamented and bound in animal skins; their engravings exhibited both Ukrainian and foreign, particularly Italian, artistic motifs and patterns.

The Church and its religious orders were actively engaged in book printing, especially because of the religious discussions between the Orthodox and the Uniat clergy and intellectuals. Thus, the Uniat Catholic monastery of Basilian Fathers in the town of Pochaiv, West Ukraine, initiated a large publishing activity in the 18th century. The books were sold at the fairs and in the market places by their publishers and by special dealers and also in the stores.<sup>28</sup>

At the end of the 18th century, however, paper manufacturing and bookprinting began to decline rapidly because of Russian economic, religious and cultural pressure. Peter the Great had already introduced a heavy censorship of books and pamphlets printed and published in Ukraine. This move reduced considerably the exportation of Ukrainian paper and books to Russia. This time even the Russian Orthodox Church actively engaged in the anti-Ukrainian practices of the Czarist regime. Between 1681 and 1693, the Patriarch of Moscow, arbitrarily assuming authority over the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, forbade the printing of religious books in Ukraine, or even using Ukrainian-made paper for that purpose. This was done, presumably, to forestall the spread of heresy in the Empire. In 1720, Peter the Great prohibited printing in Kiev of any other than ecclesiastical books. Thus, between the regulations of the Patriarch and those of the Czar, the printing business in Ukraine was crippled. In 1766, 1786 and 1790, the Russians forced the Ukrainians to import Russian-made paper.

As a result of all these repressive measures, paper production and book manufacturing declined, hampering the culture and education of a once highly educated and cultured society. Slabchenko said that under the impact of St. Petersburg's policy Ukrainian paper manufacturing fell at the end of the 18th century far below domestic requirements, necessitating imports from Russia. Thus Russian economic policy for Ukraine attained its objective.<sup>29</sup> At the same time, however, large-scale printing and publishing activities continued in West Ukraine as long as Russian influences did not reach that far.

**The Construction Industry and Wooden Manufacturing.** Wooden, stone and brick construction industries and derivative trades, such as carpentry, wood cutting, masonry, bricklaying, building and architecture, constituted an ever growing field in the Ukrainian economy, due to the freedom and accumulation of wealth and capital. Doubtlessly, the state of the construction industry is indicative of a country's cultural level. And that industry in Ukraine in the late 17th and early 18th centuries was better developed than in contemporary Poland and Russia, according to Sichinsky.<sup>30</sup> Once again, foreign visitors in Ukraine at the time afford an objective and reliable testimony in this respect. Beauplan supplied descriptions of of buildings and city constructions. Alepo, Just and Hildebrandt tell about strong buildings and fortifications. Chojecki noticed wooden and stone buildings in the country, while Zhuiev said that the houses in Village Ukraine were "extremely spacious, made of wood, and painted with white lime."<sup>31</sup>

The creation of an independent Ukraine spurred the development of the country's construction industries. First of all, the Hetmans such as Khmelnitsky, Samoilovich, Mazepa, Apostol and Rozumovsky, the Cossack grandees already mentioned several times, Miklashevsky, Mokievsky and Mirovich, and the Church dignitaries, spent money lavishly for the construction of churches, palaces, convents and public buildings. Ohloblin remarked that even those regarded as notorious misers, such as Somoilovich and Borkovsky, spent generously for new churches. Hetman Ivan Mazepa was, of course, the greatest protector and benefactor of the Church. A monk from Chernihiv wrote: "There was nobody before, there is not anybody, and there will not be anybody like him in the future." Czar Peter I brought testimony in this respect, too, when he called Mazepa "...a great constructor of holy churches."<sup>32</sup> It is almost impossible to give an account of Mazepa's zeal for building. He



built 22 new churches and renovated or reconstructed many older ones. In every major city, he erected or rebuilt magnificent buildings. Buildings were also erected in Village Ukraine, as in the cities of Kharkiv, Sumi, Iziium, Okhtirka and Valki, where also a vast number of churches was built as either wooden or brick construction.<sup>33</sup>

Military construction developed speedily, although less impressively. Mazepa secretly attempted to fortify the Azov Sea ports and the Russian-Ukrainian border in preparation for a war of liberation against Russia. There is not much information about these fortifications because they were constructed secretly, but Paul Alepo, Hildebrandt, Meyerberg and other foreigners referred briefly to that fact, praising the excellence of the job from a strategic point of view and the qualifications of the engineers and builders. Seetch, the capital of the Cossack Territory, seemed to be the most outstanding example of Ukrainian construction and fortification work of the time. Because of the introduction of firearms and artillery into military operations, a new system of fortifications had to be devised in the 17th century based more on earth works. Deep ditches and high earth walls were built, rather than wood and stone constructions, as in the past. Peasant labor was used extensively for this construction.<sup>34</sup>

The construction of palaces, castles and public buildings was impressive. Hetman Khmelnitsky built his palaces in Cheherin and Subotiv; Mazepa, in Baturin, Chernihiv and other places; and Rozumovsky, in Hlukhiv. From among the Cossack aristocracy, many grandees also constructed palaces: Lizohub in Sednev, Mirovich in Pereyaslav, and Polubotok in Lubech. Church dignataries also built splendid palaces.

The Kievan Academy, an institution of higher learning, was erected in 1632, and then reconstructed and renovated by Mazepa in 1703-1704. The Kievan City Hall was built in 1697. Many of these buildings were built in the Baroque style so popular at that time. However, they avoided a slavish imitation of Western patterns in favor of a synthesis of West European and Ukrainian architecture and ornamentation called "Cossack Baroque." Churches and private buildings were constructed in that style.

The Baroque era was represented in Ukraine by such outstanding architects as Ivan Baptist from Lithuania, Adam Sernikau from East Prussia, Joseph and Fedir Startsv, both Ukrainian, S. Kovnir, also Ukrainian, J. Schedel from Germany, and many others. Among the numerous examples of outstanding Baroque constructions in Ukraine,

there are: Mharsky Monastery in Lubni, erected by Samoilovich and Mazepa, the Church of Holy Ascension in Pereyaslav, erected by Mazepa; St. Michael's Goldroofed Monastery in Kiev, financed and built by M. Vuyakovich, Judge General and Hetman Mazepa; the Main Church of the Kievan Lavra, reconstructed and enlarged by Metropolitan Peter Mohila, Samoilovich and Mazepa; Mazepa's House in Chernihiv; Lizohub's Building in Sednev; Kochubey's Building in Baturin; and the building of the College of Chernihiv, sponsored and financed by Hetman Mazepa and L. Baranovich.<sup>35</sup>

By mid-18th century, however, the Cossack Baroque was already declining in favor of the new classical style of architecture which was speedily spreading throughout the nation. Classicism was brought to Ukraine mostly by foreign born architects, such as Schedel and Mereder from Germany, Rastrelli, Quarenghi and Rinaldi from Italy, and J. De Witte from Flanders. Ukrainian architects, such as I. Barsky, P. Yaroslavsky and I. Zarudny, also added considerably to the splendor of the Ukrainian Classical, as well as Baroque, construction.

Classicism was evident in such constructions as the Cathedral in the city of Volodimir, in Volhina; the palace of the Zavadovsky family in Laliche, in the Chernihiv district; Rozmovsky's Hetmanic palaces in Baturin and Pochep; and Miklashevsky's buildings in the Starodub district. Both foreign and Ukrainian native architects were highly respected and very well paid. The compensation received by Ivan Baptist from Lithuania may serve as an example. During the building season he received 8 guldens weekly, plus a certain quantity of wheat and rye flour, millet, buckwheat, peas and salt, 65 pounds of lard, 65 pounds of salt pork, two barrels of butter, 6 lambs, two barrels of cheese, three barrels of beer, 100 quarts of whiskey, 30 quarts of oil, one cow and one hog.<sup>36</sup>

Buildings were of stone, brick and wood. In the countryside, construction was primarily wooden, as Zhuiev noticed in Village Ukraine, too. Bricks and stones were extensively used in the cities for building palaces, churches, forts, public buildings, factories, and in general, for the construction of stoves, herds and chimneys to reduce the fire hazard. Modern industrialization of Ukraine increased considerably the demand for bricks and lime, the production of which took place in various parts of the country. At the end of the 18th century, however, the construction business also declined with the evaporation of the country's political autonomy.

The wood industries, the construction of buildings, the furnishing

of Ukrainian homes and the manufacture of all kinds of tools and appliances continued to be economically important although their relative significance declined somewhat in comparison to the manufacture of metal appliances, glass and china household utensils, and bricks for construction. In old Ukraine wood was used literally for making all things, but on the eve of the emergence of modern Ukraine, technological progress brought some changes in this respect. The demand for wood did not decrease, however, because new uses were found for it and because the population was growing rapidly. Sawmills of various sizes and kinds operated in the forest belts of the country to prepare boards and lumber for further processing. Sawmills were numerous in Volhynia, Chernihiv, Kiev, Novhorod Siversk, Galicia and other northern districts of Ukraine. In Village Ukraine, sawmills were small-scale establishments. Forests were ravished in the face of extensive cuttings to manufacture potash and tar, to supply fuel for glass, brewery, distillery, paper and other industries, to warm homes, to build roads, bridges, shipyards, boats and other things, and finally for export. Hence the lumberjack was an important person, as were those who engaged in other building and wood-processing trades. Hueldenstaedt, Beauplan and other writers referred to extensive boat building on the Azov Sea and on the main rivers, such as the Dniepr. Shipyards were constructed on the shores of the Azov Sea. Bridges, plankroads, and plank sidewalks were built throughout the country in the 17th and 18th centuries by skilled artisans and engineers, among whom Ukrainian names predominated.

Of course, wood was still processed as it had been in the Kievan Empire and the Lithuanian-Rus Commonwealth in order to make tools, appliances, household utensils, carriages, wagons, stagecoaches, furniture and similar items. Craftsmen, such as wood cutters, carpenters, wheelers, turners, barrel makers, and furniture makers either were organized into separate guilds for each trade (as they were in large cities, such as Kiev) or joined a common guild of the wooden trades, which was the prevailing practice of all small towns. Trades were also extensively developing in the countryside, in the manors and villages, although without guild organization. The craftsmen were exclusively of Ukrainian descent, and in some cities, such as Starodub and Lviv, they reached a very high level of craftsmanship famous in all Ukraine.

Around the first half of the 17th century, the efficiency of these trades declined, particularly in West Ukraine, along with the progressive weakening of the guild system. But, at the end of the

same century, Sichinsky said, the wood processing industries recovered throughout the country. Nevertheless, the industry was still limited to the small-scale craft shop or kustar establishment. At the end of the 18th century, some factory-like enterprises emerged in the field. Carriage factories were organized in some places, such as Tulchin, Zalishchiki, Korets and Makhnivka, where various kinds of coaches, wagons, carriages and sleds, with iron parts, were manufactured. Furniture production occurred in small shops in Ukraine since the 16th century, and throughout the Hetmanic period. The product was not outstanding. A better quality of furniture for the use of the upper classes was imported from England, France, and Switzerland, through Silesia and the port of Danzig.<sup>37</sup>

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

### COMMERCE

**Transportation and communication - Domestic commerce - Chumaki, traveling traders - Foreign trade, its development and composition - Foreign trade policies**

**Transportation and Communication.** With the overall growth of the Ukrainian economy and particularly with the growth of regional specialization, the need for more efficient transportation and communication became more pronounced. On the other hand, traveling was an integral and important part of the social life of that time. People traveled a great deal, as Kripiakevich said. Travel was also a demanding venture, because of such inconveniences as great distances and poor roads.

Most travel was by land rather than by water. Such trips were made along the "hostinets" (highways)—broad, dusty roads with no marks of identification. Traditional routes connected various regions of the country. In West Ukraine this network of highways was better developed, enabling more efficient commerce with Western Europe. As a matter of fact, all commercial interests of the country were closely associated with Western markets. Only under the pressure of Russian economic policies was this traditional mercantilism distorted and Ukrainian commerce artificially channeled toward Russian markets.<sup>1</sup>

Only the city streets were paved, and probably only those of large cities. For example, Marshall said that "the streets in Kiev were wide and straight and well paved."<sup>2</sup> That foreign visitors did not complain about poor transportation facilities can be explained by the fact that similar conditions existed throughout Europe at that time. People were used to poor roads and the hardships of travel. In summer the highways were dusty and dirty; in spring and fall, they were sometimes incredibly muddy. In winter they were often snowbound. In spring and autumn traffic could be delayed for many miles and for many hours by carriages and wagons stuck in deep mud. Since the distances were great, and the roads were unmarked, and because of scanty population in some areas, travelers could easily become lost for days, especially in winter when highways were covered with snow. Snow removal was a local matter and proceeded very slowly.

Nonetheless, a great deal of commercial and social travel took place on those poorly maintained highways. Only in their worst parts, where swamps and incredible mud made transportation literally impossible, either plank roads were built, or stones, wood, sand or bricks were used to fill in the holes. Merchandise was so skillfully packed that even glass and china could be shipped hundreds of miles along rough roads and still arrive safely at distant markets.

Dependent upon need and purpose, different kinds of carriages were used. Among them were palubi, karyti, kolasi, polukarytki, berlini, two-wheeled polubtsi, taradiaki and budki. The Cossack grandees and nobles used sleeping coaches for long, demanding and difficult journeys.

Since the Lithuanian-Polish era, main highways were traditional. They ran westward from the city of Lviv to the cities of Yaroslav, Peremishl, Krakow and Breslau; northward to the cities of Rava Ruska, Zamost, Lublin, Warsaw, Thorn and Danzig; southward to the city of Kolomya and the Walachian country; and eastward to the cities of Lutsk, Zhitomir and Kiev; from the city of Kiev northwards, one highway ran up the left bank of the Dniepr river to Byeloruthenia, and another to the cities of Nizhyn and Putivl, and up to Moscow and other Russian cities. Southwards from Kiev a highway ran down along the left bank of the Dniepr toward the Cossack Territory and to the Crimean peninsula.

Of course, there were other highways of lesser commercial importance, like that through the city of Berest in Lithuania, and that in rightbank Ukraine to the Black Sea.

Different from the highways were the "trails," broad thoroughfares running through the steppes and deserted areas, detouring around all rivers, lakes and streams. These were used for purposes of commerce and strategy. The Black trail ran between the rivers Dniepr and Boh, far into the "wild fields" of the Black Sea area. The Kuchman trail ran between the rivers Dniester and Prut. Since the Tartars liked to use these trails for their raids, castles and forts were erected along them to protect Ukrainian interests.<sup>3</sup>

Main water routes, although of less importance than highways, and never used to their full capacity, were the rivers Sian and Buh in West Ukraine, and Dniepr in East Ukraine, and their larger tributaries. Water transportation employed various kinds of boats for fishing, commercial shipments, passenger transportation, military use and pleasure, on either long or short trips. These were called komishi, dubasi, shkuti, and in the 17th and 18th centuries the

popular baidaki, lipi and dubi. Most famous were the baidaki, used by the Zaporozhe Cossacks for their military excursions against the Tartars and the Turks. Beuplan and others referred to Ukrainian water transportation. The Kievan fisherman's guild developed their own boats to fish and to ship their catch.

In 1700, Hetman Mazepa attempted to regulate the usage of land and water routes for commercial purposes. One route was supposed to run from Starodub, through Bikhiv, Borisiv, Minsk, Rakov and Werzbolow, to Koenigsberg in East Prussia. Another route, also to Koenigsberg, went from Chernihiv, through Lviv, Slutsk, Grodno and Augustow. A combination land-water route to Koenigsberg led from Starodub to Stolptsi on the Memel river, and thence along the river, bypassing Grodno, Kaunas and Jurburg. The route to the port of Riga ran initially by land to the place called Bishenkowice, and thence by the river Duna.<sup>4</sup>

With the growth of trade the need for better communication became more apparent. At first letters and other communications were sent through "occasion," such as traveling merchants, chumaks or friends. In 1629, however, a mail service was organized by Roberto Bandinelli, an Italian, in the city of Lviv connecting Galicia and the western parts of the Polish Kingdom. Mail was carried every Saturday in both directions: northwards to the cities of Zamost, Lublin and Warsaw, and westwards to the cities of Yaroslav and Krakow. But the postmaster undertook to forward mail to other more distant cities and on days other than Saturday for an additional fee. Postage was determined by the size of the letter and the distance it was carried. Thus a half-page letter was transmitted for one grosh, when mailed to Yaroslav; 2 groshes when mailed to Lublin; 3, to Krakow and Warsaw; and 6, to Danzig. Mail service was provided by special and bonded "cursores" riding on horseback. It usually took two weeks to send a letter from Lviv to Warsaw.

In the Hetmanic state, Hetman Khmelnitsky organized special mail services for the military and the government. His advisor in this matter was Ostap Astamatenko, the Treasurer-General. In 1669 Hetman Damian Mnohohrishny organized regular mail service for left-bank Ukraine, connecting the cities Kiev, Nizhyn and Baturin and carrying the mail to Moscow<sup>5</sup> as well. Other hetmans later extended the service to other towns.

Hetman Vyhovsky's printed ordinances, which were sent to the entire Cossack hierarchy and included not only orders and regulations but current news and information as well, are regarded as the beginning of the Ukrainian press. These ordinances had considerable

circulation. Under Russian pressure, however, this service which had operated for two years, 1657-69, was discontinued. Ukraine's first real newspaper was published in 1776 in Lviv. It was called "Gazatte de Leopold." It was followed by "Kharkivskii Yezhenie-dielnik," in 1812.<sup>6</sup> In Hetmanic Ukraine, however, commercial communication was still primarily oral.

**Domestic Commerce.** The basic organizational structure of Ukrainian domestic commerce during Hetmanic times continued much the same as in the latter part of the Polish-Lithuanian era. Local markets, periodic fairs, a specialized merchant class, the gradual growth of specialty stores, the traveling traders (chumaks), commercial class discrimination, and governmental attempts to preserve the social balance of the domestic market, were as previously the chief characteristics of the country's distribution process. However, the composition of the merchant class changed, for, as the volume of domestic trade increased, wider social circles indulged in commercial activities. Russian economic policies began to hurt the Ukrainian market. Practically speaking, every social class was involved in commercial operations to a great extent, while the cities and the townspeople continued to be the center of those operations. The merchants constituted some 25 to 30 per cent of the urban population.<sup>7</sup>

There was a considerable trend toward specialization among the merchants, primarily according to the merchandise they handled. For example, there were sellers of bread, tobacco, cattle, textiles, glass, grain, leather, furs, Oriental spices and Oriental materials, etc. At that time the distinction was already developing between the retailers, dealing with the final consumer and in small quantities, and the wholesalers maintaining large warehouses of costly merchandise.

Considerable trading was done by traveling merchants, residing in various cities and called "Korobiiniki." Substantial salt, grain and leather trade was carried on by a distinctly different group of Chumaks, a kind of Cossak-like traveling traders, recruited largely from the population of villages and small towns. There was also a differentiation between the "merchants" and the "commercial people," according to the volume of capital invested in commercial ventures and the kind of merchandise they sold. The merchants were wealthier, invested more capital in their businesses and traded domestically as well as internationally, going to Danzig, Breslau and other foreign commercial centers, where they handled primarily



oxen, leather and wax. The commercial people covered local markets and nearby areas. Their establishments were smaller and they dealt mainly in tobacco, wood and alcohol.

Some merchants were very rich, such as Ivan Teterivsky, Peter Kotovich and Vasil Mezensky, from Khmelnitsky's time, or Spiridon Shirai, Isak Derevianko, and Maksimovich, from Samoilovich's and Mazepa's era, who practically dominated financial and marketing matters in their towns and regions, and also enjoyed special consideration from and protection by the Hetmans.<sup>8</sup>

The majority of the merchant class had neither the economic importance nor the social prestige of these city aristocrats. This was reminiscent of the meaningful distinction between "wealthy" and "common" merchants during the Polish-Lithuanian times when the wealthy merchants occupied main streets and handled costly merchandise and the common merchants had their stores on side-streets and traded in cheap goods.

Similarly, urban commerce suffered greatly because of the discriminatory practices of the upper classes or of privileged foreigners as they had prior to the National Revolution. But whereas the gentry and the Armenian and German merchants had created unfair competition for the local townspeople during the Polish rule, in the Hetmanic state the Cossack grandees and the Orthodox religious orders, on the one hand, and the Greek and Russian merchants, on the other, were responsible for the abuses and unfair competition. The Czarist government through its protectionist policy in the interest of the imperial market, also caused the Ukrainian townspeople to suffer great losses. With the help of their government, the Russian merchants residing in Kiev and other cities of northern Ukraine dominated the Russian-Ukrainian trade. They enjoyed all kinds of favors from the Czar, and claimed an exemption from Ukrainian laws when doing business in Ukrainian territory.

This was the case particularly in Skoropadsky's and Apostol's time. Hetman Apostol attempted to put an end to such unfair competition which constituted a violation of the original articles of the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654. Hetman Apostol therefore forbade foreign merchants, especially Russians, to engage in certain industries, such as saltpetre extraction, and local trading. Furthermore, he subjected them without exception to Ukrainian laws and courts. But the effectiveness of these measures was only temporary.<sup>9</sup>

Urban commercial interests suffered equally from the abusive practices of the Cossack grandees and the Orthodox religious orders. Various cities complained of the discriminatory and illegal

levies imposed on them arbitrarily by the Cossack grandees and the monasteries, such as additional and unjustified road and bridge tolls and sales taxes and competitive production and distribution of whiskey and beer in the cities, where actually the municipalities and townspeople had an alcohol monopoly. Innocent Monastirsky, Superior of the Cyrilian Monastery in Kiev, established, for example, toll stations in four places around that city and raised additional tolls from all merchants entering them, including those residing in Kiev. This was repeated with variations in all towns, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, Starodub, Nizhyn and others.

The Cossack grandees also greatly exploited the urban artisans, forcing them to work without compensation. The Cossack colonels and other high officers frequently usurped landed estates, forests, potash and tar works and other properties of the municipalities or townspeople, raised unjustified rental payments from the towns and merchants, usurped the municipal levies, such as weight and measure fees, sales and marketing taxes, and violated the autonomous Magdeburg rights of some cities. Although the Hetmanic government tried hard to prevent those abuses by the Cossack hierarchy and the monasteries through numerous ordinances and administrative measures of such Hetmans as Samoilovich, Mazepa, Skoropadsky and Apostol, and in particular, by Mazepa's edicts of 1687, 1688, 1691, 1696 and 1698, and Apostol's regulations, not much was achieved. The commercial interests of the town in Hetmanic Ukraine were actually overrun by the predominance of the Cossack class which thought that the state existed chiefly for their benefit.<sup>10</sup>

In some cases, the Hetmans gave privileged treatment to cities, such as Khmel'nitsky's preferential protection of the trading activities of Lviv and Mazepa's over those of Kiev, Starodub, Chdrnihiv and Nizhen. This unequal treatment and legal status for various cities, some having Magdeburg autonomy and others not, served only to worsen the country's economic situation. Enjoying preferential treatment from the Hetmanic government, the cities of the Magdeburg system were in unfair competition with the vast majority of other smaller towns and townships of Ukraine. A large volume of competitive trading done by the grandees, Cossacks and monasteries completed the unfavorable picture.

Local markets and local, provincial and nation-wide fairs and stores were the centers of mercantile exchange. Markets and fairs continued to be important in the distribution process, just as in the previous period. In every city and town regular market days were held, attended by the peasants from the vicinity, local merchants and outside traders, Cossacks, Chumaks, artisans, monks who sold

for account of their monasteries, and many other people, both men and women. All kinds of produce and merchandise were traded in direct exchange between producer and consumer, and by indirect exchange between merchant and consumer. Such market days were held, for instance, on Mondays and Fridays in Pereyaslav, and on other days in other towns. Oxen, cattle, hogs, wool, textiles, honey, alcohol, wax, food, glass, books, potash, tar, leather, footwear, metal utensils, poultry, salt, spices, luxury goods and a great variety of other things were exchanged, bought and sold in these markets. These were also important social events. Imported articles were also available.<sup>11</sup> Hueldenstaedt related that "On the Nizhyn market the most common Ukrainian products were rough linen (from Starodub), good leather from Dobrayansky on the Dniepr, fine tobacco from Romani, Ivanhrod, Ostriv, and Uman, and good whiskey from Korop. ... In Nizhyn one could see merchandise from all countries: European, Turkish, Crimean, Muscovite, Siberian ..."<sup>12</sup>

Traditionally, fairs were held annually and seasonally in various towns and cities, such as Kiev, Baturin, Krolovets, Nizhyn, Kharkiv, Sumi, Brozonia, Pereyaslav, and Lviv. They also started on specific days, and continued for several weeks. In Kiev and Kharkiv, they were held in the late spring after the roads cleared.

These fairs were witnessed by various foreigners, such as Paul Alepo, Heuldenstaedt and Zhuiev, who saw there Greek, Russian, Polish, German and Moldavian merchants. Zhuiev said that in the fairs in Village Ukraine, Poles and Germans were seen. These foreign merchants had to travel great distances, and these fairs must have been very attractive to make such long trips worthwhile. Paul Alepo received an impression that fairs were held in Ukraine the whole year round, and that the greatest took place on the Kievan Lavra grounds. Fairs in Kiev, Krolovets, Lviv, Chernihiv and Nizhyn had really a nationwide and international character.

Nestorenko pointed out that during Hetmanic times the Ukrainian fairs were bigger and more numerous than those of Russia. A few figures may substantiate this statement. In 1648, for example, the merchants from Norinsk sold in the local markets and fairs grain for 5,470 guildens. In Putivl, 20 to 30 carloads of whiskey were traded. The merchants from Starodub sold in the city of Briansk alone, hundreds of carloads of potash annually. Aksakov related that annually 100,000 carloads of merchandise were sold by Russian merchants in the Ukrainian fairs. The Chumaks sold 50 to 60 carloads of salt, fish, leather and grain.<sup>13</sup>

Merchants, commercial people, Chumaks and Korobiiniks (traveling

merchants) moved constantly from one fair to another, despite bad roads. Inadequate supplies of textiles and metal articles (knives, axes, saws, clocks) and luxury items (coffee, tea, spices), as well as salt, resulted in continuous imports, Nestorenko further added. Since the 17th century, fairs in the city of Lviv on St. George's day, under the protection of the Ukrainian Catholic Metropolitan, became especially famous. They were held until the first quarter of the 20th century.

Although trading in the markets and fairs was relatively free of all kinds of guild and monopoly restrictions, it was still burdened with various levies, duties, road and bridge tolls, weight and measure charges, sales tax, and a general levy to provide market protection, all of which tended to reduce the volume of trade and to raise prices. Most painful were those arbitrary and abusive charges imposed upon the merchants by the Cossack grandes and monasteries, and by the Polish nobles in West Ukraine. Added to expensive transportation costs, these increased prices and resulted in a decline in profits.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, trading in the stores acquired an ever growing importance in Ukraine. New kinds of specialty stores developed for a number of articles, including textiles, footwear, glass and ceramics, weapons, hardware, jewelry and clocks. In addition, there were stores adjunct to the craft and kustar establishments, like bakeries, butcher and meat stores, fish stores, taverns selling various kinds of alcoholic drinks, stores trading costly Oriental merchandise, and the so-called Nuereberg stores—selling all kinds of cheap and small items, somewhat like the modern five-and-ten-cent stores. There were also large wholesale warehouses for such goods as woolen materials, Oriental textiles, furs, wines, drugs and arms. In 1781, there were four glass stores in Starodub, and four in Novhorod Siversk; in 1722, in the Poltava regimental district alone, there were 55 honey and beer taverns, 213 beer, 78 whiskey, and 46 other alcohol distributing stores.<sup>14</sup>

**Chumaki, Traveling Traders.** The traveling merchant caravans were known to exist in Ukraine in the early Middle Ages. Later on, in 1352, Rubricus (Rubrik) told about those caravans having brought to the city of Theodosia, in Crimea, martens, sables and other furs, in large, strongly built wagons, covered by a roof and drawn by oxen. In the early 15th century, a specifically Ukrainian phenomenon of itinerant merchant, half-peasant and half-Cossack, called Chumaks, developed from that very old tradition of merchant

caravans. In the next century, and until the second half of the 19th century, in every village in Ukraine, there were a few Chumak families, the members of which traveled and traded over a large territory all their life. In 1499, Chumaks were mentioned in the city ordinance of Kiev. They evolved into a special caste of people with very rigid customs and traditions of behavior. As Lypa said, everything in their lives was strictly regulated by that unwritten code, the route to travel, when and how to leave home for a mercantile journey, in what manner to travel, where to make stops for rest, how to share the risks and the income.

The Chumaks were organized into half-commercial, half-military associations, based on a traditionally Ukrainian close cooperation of free individual enterprises. Their mercantile caravans, ruled by strict regulations, were led by chiefs called "otamans," and their assistants called "osuals." The caravans were heavily armed, and the Chumaks were skilled warriors who could face all dangers of travel in those times.

The Chumaks had their own commercial routes. In the 17th and 18th centuries, there were two highly important Chumak trails. The first, the Shpak trail, named after a famous Chumak chief, ran from Volhynia, through the city of Uman, and to the river Dniepr at its Siniukha tributary. It was a part of the ancient Iron Route. The second one, the Muravsky trail, the ancient Salt Route from Kievan times, ran in leftbank Ukraine, bypassing the springs of the rivers Vorskla and Samara, then, through the Territory of the Cossack Host and by the Dniepr cataracts, and down to Perekop and the Crimean cities. The Chumak caravans also traveled westward to Poland and Prussia, and eastward to Astrakhan and Asia Minor.

A considerable portion of the rural population, and later, also the urban population, were Chumaks, doing a great deal of mercantile and shipping business, mainly with salt, leather, textiles and grain. In almost every village there were at least a few Chumak families. At the time of the National Revolution, for example, there were 39 Chumak families in the Pereyslav area, 34 in Berizna, 24 in Nizhyn, 20 in Kiev, and 10 in the Oster area, according to Kripiakevich.<sup>15</sup> This essentially Ukrainian class of "commercial Cossacks" constituted the wealthy members of the village communities, usually being the creditors of the poor peasant population, lending them money, grain and food. Their economic role embraced both foreign and domestic trade.<sup>16</sup>

**Foreign Trade, Its Development and Composition.** The National Revolution of 1648 and subsequent wars had an unfavorable impact on Ukrainian foreign trade, which, at the end of the Lithuanian-Polish period, had been favorable. Now its extent was reduced and its composition changed. Grain, the leading export commodity prior to 1648 and amounting to 100,000 guildens annually, declined for years. It was replaced by alcohol, oxen, potash, tar, wood and later tobacco. Imports were also limited. Mostly necessities were imported: textiles, metal goods, needles, thread, furs and a few other articles. The directions of import-export trade also changed since the Revolution had blocked the traditional channels to the Polish and Western markets. Hetman Khmelnitsky, for example, for a short time retaliated against Poland. However, commercial relations were soon resumed with this Western neighbor as well as with the German cities. Actually, foreign merchants, particularly those from Danzig, were largely responsible for the revival of Ukrainian-Western trade.

During the Revolution the exploitation of forest resources was temporarily abandoned, resulting in a painful shortage of potash in Central European markets, according to Kripiakevich. The merchants and commercial agents from Danzig and perhaps Breslau were the first among Western businessmen to restore commercial connections with the Ukrainian cities of Novhorod, Starodub, Pochep, Hlukhiv, Romni and Pereyaslav, where they reactivated potash and tar exportation to the West. Khmelnitsky realized some 200,000 guildens for the country's treasury from the sale of potash to Western businessmen. As early as 1649, Russian merchants also became interested in Ukrainian potash, which they bought in the cities on the Ukrainian-Muscovite border. The river Desna was for a long time the main northern water route for potash exportation.<sup>17</sup>

Following the Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654, the volume of Ukrainian-Russian trade began to rise slowly. The Russians purchased Ukrainian cattle, horses, hemp, flax, tobacco, alcohol, wax, saltpetre, textiles and potash, and these items were delivered to markets in Moscow, Kaluga, Briansk, Bielgorod and other places in the Muscovite Grand Duchy. The main imports from Russia were furs, such as sables, beavers, martens, white foxes and others, some textiles and linen, and leather. Khmelnitsky himself sent his agents to Muscovy in 1652, ordering them to purchase a large quantity of furs. On the whole, however, the volume of Ukrainian-Russian trade was very small for the next two or three decades. At times, when salt from West Ukraine (under Polish domination) and

from the shores of the Black and Azov Seas (under Turkish domination) was not available for leftbank Ukraine, Ukrainian merchants and chumaks traveled to the Don region and bought it there. Russian officials even let them do their own salt boiling. This, of course, occasionally increased Ukrainian imports from the territories under the rule of the Russian Czar.<sup>18</sup>

Salt was also imported from Walachia in considerable quantities when Galician deposits were not available to the eastern provinces of the country. This happened in 1652 when hundreds of carloads of salt arrived from Walachia. Trade with Bohemia and Hungary continued at a reduced rate. Most significant was Khmelnitsky's interest in commercial relations with Turkey. More and more numerous caravans rolled to and from the Ottoman Empire through the cities of Bendery and Chechelnik, shipping great varieties of goods. Oriental merchandise came from Turkey either for direct Ukrainian consumption or as transit goods for Russia, Byeloruthenia and Lithuania. These imports included silk, Oriental rugs and carpets, velvet, belts, headkerchiefs, Persian textiles, cotton materials and such Oriental fruits as figs, almonds and citrus fruits, and rice and tobacco. Among Ukrainian exports to Turkish markets were meat, furs, grain, wax and a few articles of minor importance. Turkish, Armenian, Jewish, Greek and Ukrainian merchants carried out the growing Oriental-Ukrainian trade which had been during and before the Kievan period the most important sector of Ukrainian foreign commerce. In the 17th century its revival in the newly independent Ukrainian state was due to a turn of geo-political events favorable to Oriental-Occidental trade. Trading with the Tartars, like earlier trade with the Cumans, was a subsidiary of that large-scale commercial project. Tartars sold in the Ukrainian markets horses, cattle and sheep, and for the most part bought grain.

The new prospects for large-scale Ukrainian-Turkish trade were closely connected to political developments. Khmelnitsky sought to strengthen his political position by intensive and free economic cooperation with all neighboring lands. On this basis he planned to make Ukraine the very center of East European politics. In 1650, he started to work on a commercial treaty with the Ottoman Empire, substantiated by preceding developments in the field of commerce. The treaty was intended to enrich the Ukrainian national economy. It was supposed to include several important provisions, which, practically speaking, reserved the Black Sea and Azov Sea areas exclusively for Ukrainian and Turkish economic interests. It provided, among other things, abolition of all tariffs, favorable

credit terms for the merchants of both nations, establishment of an official Ukrainian mercantile agency for protection of the interests of Ukrainian merchants and tradesmen on Turkish soil, guarantee of full safety and freedom for Ukrainian warehouses within the borders of the Ottoman Empire, an official guarantee given by the Ukrainian government of full respect of Turkish navigational rights in the Black and Azov Seas, and of safety for Turkish commercial caravans when on Ukrainian soil. The treaty also provided for a safe credit system for Ukrainian and Turkish merchants to facilitate their business.

The treaty did not materialize, however, because of subsequent political developments. The Pereyaslav Treaty of alliance with Muscovy dampened the hope for a close Ukrainian-Turkish commercial relationship. Moscow attempted to draw the economic interest of the Ukrainians more closely into dependence upon Russian markets, and it insisted on severing the friendship with the Ottoman Empire. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian-Turkish commercial exchange continued to be considerable, and Dubrovsky came to a conviction that even as late as the first half of the 18th century the commercial ties of Ukraine with Turkey were economically more important than those with Russia.<sup>19</sup>

The later decades of the 17th century brought a splendid recovery and further expansion of Ukrainian foreign trade. The direct and indirect (via Polish markets) mercantile connections with West European countries were restored, and this time the Ukrainian Cossack grandees and nobles and the Ukrainian national economy reaped all the gains from the business, and not the Polish or polonized gentry and the Polish national economy as before the Revolution. Commercial connections were reintroduced and developed between the Ukrainian cities and Danzig, Koenigsberg, Breslau, Nurenburg and Riga, and those cities became largely middlemen for Ukrainian trade with Germany, Prussia, Silesia, Austria, Holland, France and Scandinavia. Through these places a great variety of produce and merchandise came and went to Ukraine in the form of exports, imports and transit business.

Actually, Ukrainian foreign trade was primarily west-bound and west-oriented. As long as the Russians did not have the deciding influence on the political destiny of Ukraine, it always gravitated towards the West culturally, politically and economically.<sup>20</sup> During Samoilovich's Hetmanate, Ukrainian international commerce was already large-scale and multilateral, and carried out fully automatically in the interest of the Ukrainian people. It continued on



this basis during Mazepa's time and until the fateful Poltava battle of 1709.

Commercial relations with the West were supplemented by extensive trading with the Crimean Tartars, the Balkan countries, Ottoman Empire, the Caucasian lands and Iran-Persia. Mercantile ties with the Don-Volga basin were constantly growing. The events of 1709 altered the traditional and well developed pattern of Ukrainian foreign trade. Employing increasing political pressure, St. Petersburg forced Ukrainian trade into other channels and other directions, serving the purpose of a gradual transformation of the Ukrainian economy into a Russian colony. The issue of foreign trade policies, however, will be discussed later. Now it is proper to analyze briefly the composition of the well developed Ukrainian international commerce of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Hueldenstaedt gave a brief account of Ukrainian mercantile activities for the years 1771-74, which may serve as a brief description of their foreign trade activities at the end of the Cossacko-Hetmanic era. He related that "...one could see merchandise from all countries: European, Turkish, Crimean, Muscovite, Siberian ... From there they [the Ukrainians] export to Danzig, Leipzig and Silesia all sorts of furs, wax, leather, paste, bristles; and they import from there a thin Dutch and English cloth, Silesian linen, French and German silk and woolen apparel, scythes and dry goods. To Poland they export furs, tobacco, leather, and from there they import salt and finished tobacco. Also they export to Moldavia and Turkey such products as rough linen, furs and leather, and import from Moldavia and Wallachia wine and rock salt; from Turkey they import silk and colonial products, sheep, cheese, rice, coffee, almonds, Greek nuts, figs, raisins, spices, lemons, tropical fruits (fresh and preserved) and the juice from them. The Ukrainians exported to Crimea such products as rough linen and furs, while importing salt, fine leather, hat furs, nuts, rice and wine."<sup>21</sup> Although Hueldenstaedt's report is not a complete enumeration of exports and imports, it clearly indicates the extent and variety of the Ukrainian foreign trade of those days.

As far as the export business was concerned, it included mainly the following produce and merchandise, raised or manufactured in Ukraine: oxen, flax and hemp, wool and rough linen, lumber, potash and tar, fish, salt pork, vegetable oil, fur, saltpetre, alcohol, wax, and tobacco. For a few post-revolutionary decades, oxen were the major Ukrainian export. The Hetmans, Cossack grandees, nobles and townspeople were very busy selling oxen and cattle abroad.

It was a very profitable business in Polish-Lithuanian times as well. For example, Hetman Daniel Apostol himself was vitally interested in cattle export and derived considerable revenue from it. The export of oxen was a brisk and well organized business. Cattle trails were traditionally established, safety measures were relatively good, cattle drives were handled by experienced herdsmen and sales were made by experienced merchants. Financial aspects of the trade in oxen was based on numerous commercial agreements between the Polish and Ukrainian governments. It was definitely west-bound. The cities of Breslau and Leipzig and the ports of Danzig and Koenigsberg were the leading markets for these oxen and cattle, raised mainly in southern Hetmanic Ukraine and in the Territory of the Cossack Host. Records indicate hundreds of thousands of rubles in revenue from the oxen trade. This aroused the envy of the Russians who attempted to take it over for themselves. At first they discriminated against Ukrainian cattle traders and created difficulties for them; then they resorted to governmental regimentation. As a result of these measures the volume of business and its attractive profits declined about the middle of the 18th century.<sup>22</sup>

The export of flax and hemp was considerable. It attracted the attention of Marshall who considered it important to the English economy. Supposedly, as Marshall said, Ukrainian flax and hemp were better than that brought to Great Britain from its American colonies. The port of Riga on the Baltic shores was the main route for Ukrainian flax and hemp destined for Western markets. Being shipped through Russian territory, it was early subject to Russian mercantilistic protection and regimentation, along with other articles like potash and tar, saltpetre, skins and wax, directed through the Baltic ports. Tobacco was shipped mainly to Koenigsberg, Poland and Byeloruthenia, bringing again hundreds of thousands of rubles of income for the Ukrainian exporter before this trade was suppressed by the Russians. At one time the Ukrainian government considered an export tax on tobacco as a possible source of public revenue.

Grain exportation, ranking first in importance prior to the National Revolution, never reached pre-revolutionary levels during the Cossacko-Hetmanic period. Grain was sold cheaply, and exported to Byeloruthenia, Poland, Lithuania and Muscovy. Very little went to Western markets. The Russians were essentially interested in Ukrainian grain imports, since that produce was scarce in the North,

and they left that part of Ukrainian foreign trade relatively free from regimentation and protectionistic restrictions, except one or two minor attempts to establish a Russian controlling interest. With the gradual increase in the volume of grain exportation toward the end of Hetmanic times, the major portion of it went first of all to Russia, although some percentage of it might have been reexported to Western markets. Among the other exports, potash and tar, lumber and alcohol were more important.

The chief import articles were manufactured goods, such as Silesian, Dutch and English materials; woolen materials; fine linen and silks; German tools and appliances, such as Nuerenberg saws, scythes, sickles, knives, axes and hammers, Steirmark metal, silver and crystal articles, mainly dishes, needles, and again, knives. From the West European markets, via Danzig and Koenigsberg, came copper and iron, mainly for the production of church bells, cannons and other arms, and kettles for the brewery and distillery industries. Hetman Paul Polubotok, for example, was involved in the copper trade, as Dzhedzhora pointed out.

Fine furniture and fine garments were brought from England.<sup>23</sup> Books in foreign languages and all kinds of paper were brought from the cities of Breslau (Wroclaw), in Silesia, and Liepzig, in Prussia, and also from other places in West Europe, via the ports of Danzig and Koenigsberg.<sup>24</sup> From West Europe luxury goods were also imported, such as fine garments, musical instruments, jewelry, fine wines, watches and spices, which were handled through those important markets and then traveled across Polish and Lithuanian territories until they reached the centers of Ukrainian foreign trade: the cities of Starodub, Chernihiv, Nizhyn, Poltava, Kiev, Lviv and Kharkiv.

Imports from the Ottoman Empire, such as velvet, silk and silk materials, rugs, carpets, incense, raisins, almonds, coffee, tea, rice, tobacco and lemons, continued to arrive at Ukrainian markets at a steadily decreasing rate, while imports from Russia, such as furs of all kinds, including sables, martens and white foxes, linen, sugar, paper and books, flooded Ukraine at an ever increasing rate. Imports from other neighboring lands, such as glass and crystal from Bohemia, salt and tobacco from Poland, were less important.

Tens of thousands of rubles or guldens were involved in individual import-export transactions. Thus, in 1710, Dzhedzhora said, two merchants, Karpika and Lavrik, brought from Breslau products worth up to 8,000 rubles. Another merchant was deprived of 6,000 rubles value of merchandise on his way home, but this constituted only a portion of his shipment from Breslau. Hetman Polubotok

owed to Potii, another commercial grandee, 40,000 guildens for his trade operations, while the townspeople of the city of Mohilev owed tens of thousands of rubles to Ukrainian merchants for their purchases in Ukrainian markets.

Dubrovsky attempted to give an approximate quantitative description of the over-all extent of Ukrainian foreign trade in those times on the basis of official Russian registers and documents for the years 1715 to 1729, compiled by Russian commercial agents in the cities of Nizhen, Kiev, Pereyaslav, Romni, Starodub and Chernihiv, the most important mercantile centers in Hetmanic Ukraine. He said that in these years Ukraine imported over a hundred thousand yards of various textiles from Germany and Turkey, some very costly, all destined for domestic consumption. Millions of furs were imported but millions were also exported. For the years 1715-1720, when 7,488,000 squirrel skins were exported, fur exports exceeded imports. According to Dubrovsky, during that time Ukraine exported 3,776 oxen, 6,047 sheep, 18,049 head of cattle, 554 carloads of wool, 2,368 carloads of hemp, 8,528 hundredweights of leather, 160 barrels of potash, 150 hundredweights of wax, 351 carloads of tobacco, and about 520 gallons of vegetable oil. The figures are not exact, since they cover the foreign trade of only a few larger cities at a time when that business was on a nationwide decline due to Russian protectionistic pressures.<sup>25</sup>

The economic value of the Ukrainian transit trade, that passing through her territory and on the account of her merchants, should not be underestimated. Oriental goods were sent to West Europe. Muscovite furs and leather went to Poland and Germany; German metal goods, to Russia and Asia Minor. Since prehistoric times Ukraine had been an important middleman between the East and the West, and between the North and the South. In the 18th century, Ukrainian merchants went as far as France and the Netherlands in the West, Persia and Caucasia in the East, Archangelsk in the North, and the Mediterranean in the South.

In order to complete the analysis of the composition of the Ukrainian export-import business in those times, a few words must be added about the role of the Territory of the Cossack Host and Village Ukraine. Agriculture was the predominant occupation in these two areas, hence they exported agricultural products. The Cossack Host traded with Hetmanic Ukraine, Russia, Crimea, Turkey, Poland and Walachia, and exported mainly furs, leather, wool, horses, cattle, butter, vegetable oil, fish, meat and grain. Its imports consisted mainly of manufactured goods, including beer and

whiskey, bread, lumber, incense and spices, arms, gunpowder, linen, woolen, cotton and silk textiles, boots and garments.

Doroshenko said that salt exports had great significance for the Cossack economy. From that area to Poland over a thousand car-loads of salt were exported yearly. About 5,000 families made their living by extracting and trading salt. The fisc of the Cossack Host collected in 1688 over 12,000 rubles from customs tariffs. Slabchenko estimates that in the 18th century the volume of foreign trade of this area amounted to something like 800,000 to 835,000 rubles in total value.<sup>26</sup>

The foreign trade of Village Ukraine was initially much like that of the Cossack Host from beyond the cataracts, including even the importance of salt exports. At a later date, however, Village Ukraine also began to export some manufactured goods. Its agricultural and manufactured products reached not only the Hetmanic state and Muscovy, but also West Ukraine, Silesia, Prussia and Crimea. Because of a splendid economic growth in this area, foreign merchants, Polish, German, Armenian, Turkish and Russian, began to visit the cities of Kharkiv, Izium, Okhtirka and others. The major export articles of Village Ukraine were cattle, silk, furs from Chuhaiiv, tobacco, rugs from Vodolaki, female apparel from Okhtirka and many items of minor importance. Of course, the scope, extent, composition and growth of the Ukrainian trade, in general, were decisively influenced by the policies of the Ukrainian government, at first sovereign, then autonomous, and finally foreign dominated. These influences were growing steadily.

**Foreign Trade Policies.** Two opposite political trends prevailed in Ukrainian foreign trade. The Hetmanic government tried in every way possible to facilitate Ukrainian commercial interests, and to protect them against foreign discrimination and injustice. The Czarist government, however, pursued a quite different end, that of turning Ukraine into an economic service area for the Empire. In order to understand properly the trends in the development of Ukrainian foreign trade, it is necessary to examine the commercial policies of both the Ukrainian and the Russian governments.

All Ukrainian Hetmans understood the importance of international trade, and assisted the merchants, the Cossack grandees and even the nobles who were engaged in that business. Of course, some Hetmans had a greater appreciation for foreign trade issues than others. It was pointed out that Khmel'nitsky was greatly interested in the status of Ukraine in the international market. He urged the

merchants to trade internationally. He himself sent merchants abroad to purchase necessary products (furs, salt) and to sell potash on the account of the fisc. He vigorously attempted to regulate tariffs on the Russian and Turkish borders, and planned the commercial agreement with the Ottoman Empire in order to facilitate a large-scale exchange with the Oriental markets. In 1654, Khmelnitsky advised Ostap Astametenko, Treasurer-General, to develop a system of import duties, the so-called "induction," to assure a steady fiscal revenue for his government. Otherwise, he accepted the principle of free trade without reservations.

Hetman Doroshenko was also interested in tariffs as a source of government revenue and undertook certain measures to assure that income.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, Hetmans Samoilovich and Mazepa paid much attention to the problems of foreign trade as an important segment of the still sovereign Ukrainian national economy. Their edicts and ordinances aimed to secure the interests of Ukrainian import-export merchants, and to bring order into the fiscal projection of international commerce. Not infrequently they had to intervene in individual cases involving merchants whose commercial interests were violated by foreign governments, particularly by the Polish and Russian governments, which discriminated against these merchants by excessive tariffs, by customs officials who robbed and beat them, or confiscated their merchandise.

At that time Ukrainian trade with the West had already begun to suffer greatly because of the growing chaos in Poland and the bad will of the Polish government. Thus, when shipping their merchandise across Polish territory, Ukrainian merchants were exposed not only to such chicanes of the Polish officials as unjustified quarantines, arbitrary imposition of duties and illegal confiscation, but also to the increasing anarchy that affected all Poland. Ukrainian merchants were robbed not only by "professional" bandits but by reputable Polish merchants and businessmen as well. It was one way of eliminating Ukrainian competition in Polish markets and of reestablishing the Poles as market middlemen between Ukraine and the West. The Polish officials were corruptible because the decaying Polish government did not assure them their salaries.

Later on, in Skoropadsky's and Apostol's time, these conditions became intolerable. Although Ukrainian merchants still had the opportunity to seek protection and compensation for damages in the usual court and legal procedures, practically speaking, they were ineffective because of the costs and the long delays involved. Consequently, the Ukrainian merchants decided that the best way to

protect themselves and to even the score was to rob Polish merchants and merchant caravans. As a consequence, the Ukrainian trade with the West began to decline. The Polish government was unwilling to do anything about it in spite of repeated protests.

After the Poltava battle, Ukrainian foreign policy became primarily a defense of Ukrainian economic autonomy against the increasing encroachment of Russia. Skoropadsky complained several times to St. Petersburg of the discriminatory and criminal actions of Russian residents, officials and merchants in Ukraine and Russia, committed against Ukrainian merchants and businessmen and their commercial interests. He also attempted to regulate credit conditions in foreign trade for two reasons. First, the banditry and procrastinating court procedures in Poland necessitated ever larger quantities of capital for the Ukrainian merchants to compete. Extensive credit was essential to fill the gap. Secondly, the Russians forced Ukrainian trade with the West to give up its traditional and direct commercial routes to Danzig, Koenigsberg and Breslau, and to go through Riga, St. Petersburg and Arkhangelsk, the unknown, uncomfortable and unusually long routes. It was an exasperating change which could be financed only by an efficient credit system. And Skoropadsky attempted to provide one.<sup>28</sup>

As Dzhedzhora said, Hetman Daniel Apostol fully understood the importance of economic development and its needs and difficulties. In his letters to St. Petersburg he always referred to the "old rights and privileges" of his people, demanding the abolition of unjust and abusive tariffs, discriminatory policies, and abusive actions of Russian officials and military commanders. He asked for equal treatment of Ukrainian and Russian merchants, freedom of trade and a reduction of Russian protectionistic measures. He furthermore improved credit stability for Ukrainian merchants in foreign commerce by agreements with the Polish and Prussian governments. These measures prevented many business insolvencies and bankruptcies which might have been caused by the new terms of trade imposed by Russian pressure.

Apostol had a special concern for the merchants trading with Danzig and Breslau. He also prohibited the Ukrainian administration from discriminating against, abusing or making difficulties for those merchants who engaged in foreign commerce. As a result of his frequent complaints, accusations and demands, St. Petersburg was forced to liberalize slightly its policies towards Ukrainian merchants engaged in international trade. Later, however, the Second Little Russian College abandoned its fight to protect the rights and interests of the Ukrainian economy in general and its large-scale mercantile operations in particular.

Krupnitsky emphasized the economically enlightened views of Hetman Daniel Apostol, a successful producer, merchant and exporter, who resisted energetically the Czarist endeavors to liquidate Ukrainian economic autonomy and to reduce the volume of Ukrainian foreign commerce. Apostol strove for a greater autonomy for his country by every available means, including petitions to and bargaining with St. Petersburg, briberies given to Russian officials, favoritism shown to Ukrainian businessmen and discrimination against Russian merchants and commercial interests. He provided credit moratoriums for the Ukrainian import-export businesses, prosecuted abuses, and excluded foreigners, particularly Russians, from engaging in such business activities as retail trade, acquiring land, saltpetre and iron extraction and potash processing.

His policies were primarily directed to protect the merchants and the commercialized Cossack hierarchy, whereas Samoilovich and Mazepa, for example, favored the nobles and Cossack grandees primarily interested in industrial projects. Of course, Apostol could not reverse or repeal Czarist measures and aims since his political position was rather weak. Yet his attempts to protect Ukrainian economic interests were surprisingly successful in view of the ruthlessness of the Russian pressure at that time. Thus Apostol succeeded in suppressing abuses injurious to the commercial interests of the country, reducing the illegal collections of additional tariffs on the Polish and Russian borders, reducing the threat of robbery and increasing the safety of commercial travel. By means of negotiation, he induced the Poles to drop their urban "stapel rights," and by so doing, he brought about a temporary revival of Ukrainian-Western trade.<sup>29</sup>

Russian political and economic influences in Ukraine increased in strength and intensity by the end of the 17th century. However, prior to the Poltava battle the Russian government used indirect methods to channel the Ukrainian foreign trade according to Moscow's designs. In 1701, Peter the Great initiated the first open regulations designed to weaken Ukrainian economic autonomy in international commerce. St. Petersburg ordered the Ukrainian merchants to export hemp, flax, potash, leather, wax and salt pork solely through the port of Archangelsk, and to give up the traditional routes through Danzig, Koenigsberg and Breslau.

The new route was an unusually long way to the West European markets and extremely costly. The promise that all exports via Archangelsk would be duty free did not help. The damaging effect of the order was much greater since it referred to the most essential



Ukrainian export articles. A temporary lifting of the regulation in 1711 did not bring any relief because it was followed in 1714 by an absolute prohibition of any Ukrainian export to Western markets of these and such other products as vegetable oil and bristles.

Such policies were part of a master plan designed to liquidate gradually the autonomous Ukrainian state. St. Petersburg sought to tighten the commercial ties between Russia and Ukraine and in particular to crush the Ukrainian-Western trade in order to consolidate its hold on Ukraine, a prerequisite to its eventual absorption by the Russian Empire.<sup>30</sup>

The policy of Peter the Great toward Ukrainian foreign trade was inconsistent. At first he wanted to develop the Azov Sea ports as bases for launching an attack on the Ottoman Empire. Therefore he directed Ukrainian merchants to export and import through these ports. Later he changed his mind and gave preference to the Baltic Sea ports, according to his master plan to bring Russia closer to West Europe and its culture and economy. Immediately afterwards, Peter issued the above mentioned ordinance directing the Ukrainian-Western trade through the ports of Riga, St. Petersburg and Archangelsk, and ordering the abandonment of the traditional routes through Danzig, Koenigsberg, Breslau and Poland.

As a result, the volume of Ukrainian trade with the West was drastically reduced; the financial and commercial interests of the Ukrainian merchants were seriously impaired. Subsequently, the Russians established over forty additional toll and customs stations along the western Ukrainian border, and plagued Ukrainian merchants with excessive and discriminatory duties on goods which were not headed for the north-bound route via Russian territory.

The Russians then proceeded with other restrictions. In 1714, Ukrainian merchants were prohibited from importing Russian money. Additional measures were undertaken to withdraw from Ukraine gold and silver coins, allowing only copper and nickle money to circulate. Between 1718 and 1721, St. Petersburg prohibited the importation into Ukraine from Western markets such merchandise as stockings, gold and silver thread, fine textiles, silk materials, woolen materials, linen, table cloths, sugar, dyestuffs and tobacco. The Russians had begun to develop industries which produced these goods, hence this policy was designed to shut off competition of Western countries in Ukraine.

In 1719, St. Petersburg even tried to regiment Ukrainian grain exportation, but without any apparent success because Russia was not an important grain producer or grain exporter at that time. Hence

Ukraine was not competitive in this respect. Furthermore, grain was not Ukraine's leading export. In many instances the Czarist government attempted to establish a fiscal monopoly in such items as potash, wax, skins and leather, salt pork, saltpetre, oil and flax seeds. This hurt the private interests of the Russian merchants as well, but it was really a deadly blow against the commercial interests of the Ukrainian merchants since St. Petersburg, following the mercantilistic doctrine, still favored and protected the Russian mercantile class and their businesses at the expense of the Ukrainian economy.

St. Petersburg was especially anxious to suppress trade with Breslau. In 1714 it was prohibited outright. The Silesian merchants were horrified. The imperial government of Austria officially complained on their behalf, but initially to no avail. In 1720 St. Petersburg promised a liberalization of its policy, and in 1722 under continuous pressure from abroad and numerous petitions from Hetman Skoropadsky, the promise was kept. In 1723, the prohibition on Western exports from Ukraine of cattle, salt pork, bristles, wax and glue was lifted. But Russian maneuvers continued. Austrian agents conferred many times with Apostol and the Polish royal government in order to coordinate their actions, aimed at inducing Russia to give up its extreme protectionism, which hurt Austrian, Polish and Ukrainian commercial interests.<sup>31</sup>

Along with the regimentation of Ukrainian trade, the Russians changed their tariff policies. In 1719, the tariff rates were revised to shift from the principle of revenue to that of protectionism. Instead of a 2 per cent ad valorem, indiscriminate export and import duty, new differential rates were introduced with a discriminatory feature, ranging from 4 to 37 per cent on exports, and from 10 to 37 per cent on imports.

A year later, new customs stations were established in all important mercantile places in Ukraine: Kiev, Poltava, Sorochinsk, Lubech, Starodub, Pereyaslav and others. Additional toll stations were also established along the western and southern borders to discourage trade with Crimea and Poland.<sup>32</sup>

Even so, these measures constituted only one form of the Russian assault on Ukrainian economic autonomy. Abuses increased. For example, in 1715 a regulation was issued requiring mercantile caravans to go first to the city of Hlukhiv to register there all merchandise in the Hetmanic office. After 1722, all caravans had to go to Kiev to the Russian commander for a license, and then to the city of Briansk for a merchandise inspection. It was a lengthy,

cumbersome and, of course, unnecessary detour, aimed at discouraging trade.

The Chumak caravans were plagued with quarantines and inspections. Although the Czar promised the Ukrainian merchants an exemption from tariffs and safety and protection when traveling through Russian territories, the promise had practically no value. Dzhedzhora minutely described the Russian techniques of abuse, extortion and confiscations without compensation, although an Act from 1719 provided for compensation when imported goods were expropriated. Other abuses were excessive tariffs, sabotage of merchandise, imprisonment, prolonged inspections and controls, and extortion.

These abuses were frequent, and the Russian government appeared to approve of them. As long as the office of the Hetman was preserved in Ukraine, at least the Ukrainian merchant had someone to appeal to. Rozumovsky was the last Hetman with any power. After 1764, there was nobody to defend the commercial rights of the Ukrainian people. The second Little Russian College failed to champion the Ukrainian cause. The complete subjugation of Ukraine was now an accomplished fact.

# CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

## FINANCE

### Money and credit - Public finance

**Money and Credit.** In the early capitalistic economy of Ukraine of the 17th and 18th centuries, characterized by the specialization of production, growing manufacturing industries and the rise of big business and extensive commerce, money and capital were vitally involved. Throughout that period Ukraine suffered more or less acutely from a shortage of money which hampered economic growth. Russian mercantilistic policies aggravated this condition.

Immediately after the Revolution of 1648 the Ukrainian economy began to suffer an acute currency shortage. Polish guildens became scarce and the circulation of foreign currencies declined sharply because of a drastic and rapid reduction in foreign trade. Consequently, their value increased substantially.

As a matter of fact, foreign coins did not circulate in Ukraine at their face value, either prior to or after the Revolution. They had a highly elastic exchange rate dependent upon the pattern and balance of international trade. This, in turn, had an adverse effect on the Ukrainian national economy in the first decade of national independence.<sup>1</sup> With the gradual recovery of foreign trade more and more foreign coins of gold and silver flowed into the country. Lithuanian, Polish, German, Russian and other coins circulated freely, relieving somewhat the pressing currency shortage. Their exchange ratio was determined by the issuing country's economic status. German currency fluctuated considerably, since trade with Danzig, Breslau, Nuremberg and Koenigsberg was extremely important, but its flow was irregular due to Polish and Russian intrigues. Polish currency was relatively stable in value, in particular the Polish red gulden. For example, from 1712 to 1725, the rate of exchange of red guildens increased only from 2 rubles and 10 kopeieks to 2 rubles and 20 kopeieks.

The Russian ruble also fluctuated in value although Moscow was anxious to maintain its stability of value as an incentive to a growing Russian-Ukrainian trade. A stable ruble would facilitate this

growth substantially. However, in the long run the ruble appreciated in value in the Ukrainian market in direct proportion to the increase of Russian political and economic influence in Ukraine. Hence the ruble dropped from 64 kopeieks to 36 kopeieks in 1651; later it rose gradually from 45 kopeieks to the ruble in 1657 to 60-67 in 1663. In 1687 it dropped to 50, and it rose to 52 kopeieks in 1702. However, the ruble did not appreciate in terms of the red gulden or the common gulden. Thus in 1733 one ruble and 10 kopeieks were paid for a gulden, and in 1759, one ruble and 60, and up to 75 kopeieks. Later a change in the price of the gulden brought considerable fluctuations in the value of various currencies, and naturally, permitted opportunities for arbitrage. These fluctuations originated, however, in West Europe due to currency problems there. They were extended into Ukraine through the channels of international commerce. Conversely, monetary stabilization in Western Europe also brought temporary stability to Ukraine. Thus Slabchenko is of the opinion that the 17th century fluctuations were not produced primarily by the monetary policies of the Russian government, as some economists believe, but by fluctuations in the European money markets.<sup>2</sup>

To relieve the serious money problem in Ukraine some Hetmans, such as Doroshenko and Samoilovich, initiated their own coinage. Doroshenko began to coin money in 1672 in the form of "chechs" valued at one and a half grosh. When in 1674 the mint was captured by Hetman Samoilovich, he continued for some time with the consent of Moscow to coin the same "chechs." Soon, however he was forced to abandon coinage under pressure from Moscow.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps it was Bukhovetsky who coined the "karbovanets," but this is unlikely. Various authors, such as Kunov and Pototsky, expressed the view that Hetman Khmelnitsky coined his own money, but this too is uncertain. Doubtlessly, he planned to do so, but the Russians interfered. Veselaho indicates that in 1654, at the time of the Pereyaslav Treaty the Muscovites coined new rubles designed for circulation in the Hetmanic state and the territory of the Cossack Host. These bore the Czar's image and the inscription "Great and Little Russia." The old ruble, he said, carried only the inscription "All-Russia," with no reference to "Little Russia," namely Ukraine. Veselaho concludes that the Czar insisted on preserving his exclusive coinage privilege in spite of promises of financial autonomy made to Ukraine by treaty.<sup>4</sup> A relative shortage of gold and silver at that time probably forced Khmelnitsky to postpone his own coinage. Following the mercantilistic principle, however, he attempted ardently to increase the fiscal reserves of precious metals

of his country, and to bar their outflow in order to build up a financial base for his state. Coinage of his own money would have followed as a natural consequence of the war and the break with Russia which he planned at the end of his life. In times of critical shortage of currency, the idea of issuing Ukrainian paper money was raised and discussed, always to be suppressed by Russian intrigues.

In spite of Russian pressures, however, the Russian ruble did not have wide circulation in Ukraine. The people preferred West European and Polish money, red guldens, guldens, half and quarter guldens, florins, ducats and other gold and silver coins, and Ukrainian checks. According to Bidnov, they used the Russian ruble reluctantly.<sup>5</sup> This situation continued until the end of the 17th century. In 1709, however, after the Poltava catastrophe, the Russian government enforced the exclusive circulation of the ruble in Ukraine. All foreign and Ukrainian coins were to be replaced by Russian silver rubles and ruble notes.

In 1719 a money crisis took place in Ukraine because of the discriminatory money policy of the Czarist regime. St. Petersburg, following the idea of accumulating its own gold and silver reserves, prohibited exportation of gold and silver rubles to Ukraine, and attempted to withdraw those already in the hands of the Ukrainian population. Cheaper moneys were designated for use in Russian-Ukrainian trade. This crisis provided an opportunity for large-scale currency speculations which enriched the few and impoverished the masses. It eventually resulted in a reversion to barter with only unfavorable balances settled in currency.<sup>6</sup>

This shortage of money also increased the use of credit. Leading sources of credit were Cossack grandees, monasteries, nobles, rich merchants, municipalities, merchant and craft guilds and the treasuries of local administrative units, colonelcies and sotnias (counties). Relatively speaking, the interest rates were not excessive. In 1651, 7 per cent interest on loans was common. Later the rate rose to 10 and 20 per cent. In periods of acute shortages of loanable funds, the rate sometimes rose to the level of 50 per cent per annum.

It was pointed out in connection with the topic of foreign trade that Hetman Skoropadsky and Hetman Apostol had tried very hard, and with considerable effect, to regulate credit. Apostol, in particular, provided a base for sound credit in foreign commercial relations. He arranged for a one to three years' credit moratorium in financial hardships developing out of the Ukrainian-Western

trade and threatening serious losses and bankruptcies. A debt moratorium had to be handled through the Hetmanic office. Preference was given to merchants dealing with Danzig and Breslau, since they were exposed to Polish and Russian discriminatory practices.

The Hetman tried to put the credit system on a sound basis by direct negotiations with Poland, Prussia and Austria. In addition, Apostol placed a legal ceiling of 11 per cent on interest rates. His government constantly tried to lower interest rates, while money lenders fought to increase them.<sup>7</sup>

In the growing economy of Hetmanic Ukraine, the need for capital was also increasing rapidly. Immediately after the Revolution, there was an acute shortage of capital, a factor retarding the economic development of the nation. Soon afterwards, however, capital began to accumulate gradually, first in the hands of the landed gentry, the Cossacks and the monasteries. These, to an increasing degree, speculated in mercantile and industrial projects.

Foreign capital also began to reach Ukraine, primarily for forest exploitation and potash and tar production. It was supplied by merchants from Danzig and Koenigsberg. During Samoilovich's and Mazepa's time a class of wealthy merchants entered the economy, accumulating capital through profitable commercial operations in a free enterprise and golden opportunities. Soon hundreds of thousands of guildens or rubles were available to finance new projects, new ideas, new and larger industrial and commercial operations, pyramiding the accumulated capital. Paralleling these developments were the ruthless tactics of some grandees, nobles and merchants who usurped peasant farmsteads, forced peasants to perform excessive serf labor, turned peasants into serfs for defaulted debts, forced city craftsmen to produce without due compensation, usurped monopolies, charged unlawful and excessive tolls and other fees, arbitrarily confiscated merchandise shipments, and cheated the government.

All these abuses facilitated the accumulation of individual fortunes which, in turn, were reinvested in various business projects, to expand the farm economies, to establish industrial enterprises, and to engage in trade, particularly foreign trade. These excesses were overemphasized by Marxist economists, such as Nestorenko, Virnik and Lyashechenko, who maintained that all private capital accumulated in Hetmanic Ukraine had come from ill gotten wealth. This is not even a half-truth. Hard work, honest enterprise and saving were the fundamental and primary sources of capital creation in Ukraine.<sup>8</sup>

**Public finance** experienced fundamental changes in the Hetmanic state. It evolved literally from a vacuum to a fairly well developed system based on a budget and a thorough accounting of receipts and disbursements. The Revolution had abolished the old and very imperfect Polish system of public finance in Ukraine. The new Ukrainian financial system of public economy had to be organized from the beginning. In the first days of national independence, there was no separation of the private funds of the Hetman and the state treasury, the fisc. Khmelnitsky freely disposed of all funds, through a bursar who took care of the routine administrative work.

In 1654 the office of the Treasurer-General of Hetmanic Finances already existed. The treasurer was in charge of the collection of public revenues and managing public expenditures. Under his authority special officials called "executors" collected taxes, duties, rents, tolls and other levies. Then this office simply disappeared.

In 1663, during the reign of Hetman Brukhovetsky, it was reactivated, and a very able man, Roman Rakushka, was appointed to it. The office continued to operate during Mnohohrshny's Hetmanate. Rakushka himself remained in office until 1669. He succeeded in reorganizing Ukraine's fiscal policies, considerably increasing the revenues collected.

The office was again abolished in 1669, and it was not reestablished until 1728. Mazepa did not have a Treasurer-General; he either administered state finances himself or he appointed able men to do so on a temporary basis. Among these were Hetmanic Commander-in-Chief I. Lomikovsky and the successful businessmen, D. Maksimovich and I. Lisitsa.

In 1728 the office of the Treasurer-General was reinstated as a cabinet post. First of all, a separation of the private treasury of the Hetman and the state fisc was accomplished. Two treasurers were appointed to manage finances, one of whom had to be a Russian. The Russian treasurer assured the Czarist government of taxes from Ukraine. Apostol was greatly disturbed by this new violation of Ukrainian autonomy, but could do little about it.

In 1729 the role of the Treasurers was spelled out. They had to collect taxes and non-tax receipts, in money and in kind. They were in charge of all expenditures of the central government. They had to supervise local financial matters of individual colonelcies, sotnias and municipalities; they were in charge of a new agency called the "State Accounts Commission." Regional offices for financial matters were also established during Apostol's Hetmanate.<sup>9</sup>

Apostol improved financial administration considerably. What was formerly chaotic, incidental and sporadic, he organized into



a state budget called "the military treasury" for ordinary collections and disbursements. The budget was estimated at 144,000 rubles; it was collected from regular revenues in the form of "induction" (import) and "eviction" (export) duties. Ordinary expenditures were foreseen for central administration, such as the hiring of foreign troops, the maintenance of the state artillery, and diplomatic relations. Extraordinary expenditures for court physicians, painters, poets, libraries and the like were left to the discretion of the Hetman. They would be paid from extraordinary revenues.

Regular account books were introduced, and monthly reports were required. Other top dignitaries of the Hetman's cabinet were forbidden to interfere with the Treasurer-General, whose job soon developed into the third-ranking office in the central administration, being outranked only by the Chancellor and the Chief Justice. Of course, frequent conflicts developed between the Hetmanic treasurer and the fiscal treasurer, since the latter looked more for the protection of Russian rather than Ukrainian interests.

On the lower, local level, fiscal matters were also well organized. Individual colonelcies had their own treasurers and treasuries, well staffed with collectors and clerks. A similar pattern was followed by the municipalities which collected various levies and paid the costs of city government.<sup>10</sup>

Public revenues in Hetmanic Ukraine were derived principally from government ownership of productive property, and only secondarily from indirect taxes. Direct taxation was new and relatively unimportant. Public property consisted of the pre-revolutionary "royalties" and "economies" of the Polish king and government, which at the time of the creation of the sovereign Ukrainian state automatically became the property of the new Hetmanic government as estates of rank. The estates of the Roman Catholic Church and the Polish nobles who left Ukraine with no intention of returning also became state domains.

The war retarded the effective operation of manorial economies of rank. After a few years, however, they began again to produce considerable public revenues. Kripiakevich estimated that the State derived up to 100,000 guildens annually from the previous "royalties" and "economies" alone. An additional 50,000 guildens could come from the confiscated Church and noble properties.

Manorial farm economies, mills, sawmills, breweries, distilleries, potash and tar works, glass works, iron mines and iron works were examples of state-owned businesses managed on a rental-lease basis by Cossack grandes, common Cossacks, colonists, nobles,

foreigners, merchants, craftsmen, monasteries, municipalities, colonelcy local governments, and specialists-manufacturers, who channeled to the state treasury rental payments in honey, flour, wax, fish, whiskey, potash and even money. There was no serious Russian interference with these collections prior to 1656, while the rent-lease system of the management of government-owned productive property was increasing in importance. Frequently partnerships, corporations and other forms of business were organized by private individuals in order to raise enough capital to lease state-owned establishments.

In many cases the state insisted on monopoly rights, in which case the business was very profitable both for the government and for the private lessees. In 1699, during Mnohohrshny's Hetmanate, as a result of the recommendations of the Supreme Cossack Council, monopolies were generally established in industries producing whiskey, tobacco, potash and tar, both in manufacturing and in sale. Whiskey, for example, could be sold wholesale only with a monopoly and in minimum quantities of a hundred quarts. On the other hand, drinking honey and beer could be sold freely in any quantities.

As a result of reforms which took place in 1678, ten colonelcies were expected to produce 77,000 guildens in revenue, but only 44,565 guildens were realized. The Lubetch colonelcy alone accounted for about 17,000 guildens.<sup>11</sup> One reason for the decrease in public revenues was the awarding of public lands to private individuals on a temporary or permanent basis in return for services. In some cases these estates were simply usurped by grandees, nobles or monasteries. In 1729 Apostol made a feeble attempt to recover these lands, but only 6,173 manors were returned to the fisc. Hetman Rozumovsky, however, continued to make heavy grants, and reduced the public ownership of manorial economies to 2,661 estates.<sup>12</sup>

The rent-lease system proving unpopular, Mazepa abolished it in 1693. He planned to replace it with an excise tax on whiskey, tobacco, potash and several other items. The reform failed. Public revenues declined excessively, necessitating a return to the rent-lease system a year later.

Indirect taxes were many and varied. Among them were customs collections, excise taxes, consumption taxes and sales taxes, and tolls. Customs were of the two major types previously mentioned. They amounted to about 2 per cent *ad valorem*. Already in Khmel-nitsky's time Ostaph Astamatenko was advised to reorganize the collection of duties in order to increase efficiency. Special atten-

tion was paid to the Russian and Turkish borders. Paul Alepo related that for 1654-1655 the indirect taxes brought in 100,000 red guildens. Later Hetman Doroshenko also attempted to improve collections of duties, which seemed to have been the second most important source of public revenue.

The bad feature of tariffs and tolls was their abuse by assessors and collectors, who sometimes charged arbitrary and unlawful rates, cheated the taxpayer or collected twice on the same bill, keeping part of the collection for themselves. Hetmans such as Samoilovich, Mazepa, Skoropadsky and Apostol made every possible effort to stop these criminal practices, but matters grew even worse after Russian officials began to interfere in Ukraine's collection of internal revenue.

Internal commodity taxes, on such items as whiskey, beer, wax, honey, tobacco and tar were important sources of revenue. They were usually associated with the business and sales taxes, levied against the right to run a business, to manufacture or to sell such goods or to purchase and consume them. In 1663-69, under Rakushka's administration, iron mining and smelting were also taxed.

Immediately after the Revolution of 1648, the Cossacks were exempted from whiskey taxes, in line with an old Polish tradition of a privileged class. Later, however, distilling and selling whiskey or any other alcoholic beverages was generally taxed. Hetman Mnohorishny attempted to abolish the spirits monopoly of the Cossacks and the municipalities, and extended the right of distillation to all, including the peasants and townspeople, while at the same time he established a "kettle tax" on the equipment used. The tax rate was regressive: 50 kopeieks for a kettle owned by the upper classes, and 1 ruble for one owned by the peasants and town people.

Tolls were also levied on goods crossing bridges, or using ferries or public roads. Tolls were charged not only by the Cossack and local governments, but also by private individuals who transformed these public revenues into a racket.

The municipalities collected tolls, along with such taxes as those on "all breads," drinks, market places, counters, selling shelves, weights and measures, and transportation. Similar levies were also raised by the colonelcy and sotnia governments. Later the Russian authorities established additional toll stations, and introduced new taxes and tolls which soon became almost unbearable.

Direct taxation was poorly developed at this time. Khmelnitsky planned in 1654 a general levy, a "capitation" or head tax on

peasants and townspeople, four rubles on each chimney (hut). The Cossacks, nobles and clergy were supposed to be exempted from this levy according to the tradition of the Polish crown. In accordance with the provisions of the Pereyaslav Agreement of 1654, the capitation was planned in conjunction with a general levy for the Russian Czars, as evidence of Ukraine's subordinate status. The plan failed and a direct general levy was not effectively established although sporadically a direct tax was imposed, especially during Mazepa's time and later. It was paid in currency by the city population and in kind by the peasants. Mazepa attempted to impose this surrogate of direct tax, and some indirect taxes (on whiskey and drinking honey) on the landless, poor segment of the peasantry who did not even own huts, the "pidsusidki." The act remained ineffective. Then Skoropadsky passed a similar resolution with similar results.<sup>13</sup>

Among other direct fiscal burdens were service obligations of the peasants and townspeople to work on roads, bridges, toll stations, shoveling snow and constructing forts and castles and other defense projects, and to fulfill the station obligation of maintaining and transporting the Hetmanic court *en route*. This obligation, originating in the days of the Kievan Empire, also fell upon the nobles and the monasteries. It eventually disappeared.<sup>14</sup>

Because of the limited scope of government activities in those times, public expenditures were few but relatively costly. Defense, administration, the administration of justice and the maintenance of diplomatic relations constituted the ordinary expenditures of the Hetmanic government. Of course, defense and administration were the largest expenditure items, followed by the costs of foreign relations. At that time foreign diplomats were housed, fed and maintained by their hosts. The procurement and maintenance of artillery was the largest single defense item.

Extraordinary expenditures included donations to the Church and its monasteries, paying the court physicians, hiring writers and poets to glorify certain court or national events, and the like. These were covered by the Hetmanic treasury more often than by the fisc. By 1678, ordinary expenditures of the fisc amounted to 40,181 gulden, while during Apostol's time they rose to exceed the sum of 140,000 rubles or about 120,000 gulden.

Meanwhile, the burden of Russian taxes increased, retarding Ukrainian economic development, particularly in the 18th century. According to the original Pereyaslav agreement of 1654, the Czar solemnly promised not to invade the financial sovereignty of Ukraine.

This promise was repeatedly broken. Russian officials and military commanders soon began to exact from the Ukrainian people contributions of money, oxen, cattle, grain, hemp, flax and other produce. The Hetmanic government protested, initially with some success. At the time of Hetman Brukhovetsky, who was at first a willing tool of Russian interests, St. Petersburg tried to make further inroads into Ukraine's financial autonomy by claiming the capitation tax, whiskey levy and import duties. In 1666 Russian tax collectors arrived in Ukraine and began collecting money, honey and grain for the Russian fisc. Their behavior was so abusive and insulting that it contributed substantially to another Ukrainian-Russian war.

Things changed considerably for the worse at the time of Peter the Great. This Czar was most ruthless in extracting taxes from the Ukrainian people in order to finance his numerous wars. In an attempt to free Ukraine, Mazepa joined the anti-Russian coalition during the Northern War, but the fateful outcome of the Poltava battle delivered Ukraine into the hands of the Russians, who since that time have dominated and exploited the country. The following table is an indication of their increasing efficiency in this respect.<sup>15</sup>

Year	Rubles collected	Hundredweights of grain collected
1722	45,527	16,781
1723	85,854	27,524
1724	141,342	40,693

Another form of revenue exacted by the Russians was obtained by strong pressure upon the Ukrainian people to sell their produce to the Russian government and to Russian merchants for exceedingly low prices. Russian officials and Russian troops took an active part in this official extortion.

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### UKRAINE AFTER 1781

#### **A captive nation, a contiguous colony**

The year 1781 must be accepted as the end of a thousand years of economic independence or semi-autonomy for Ukraine. During most of the pre-Kievan period, Ukraine was free. The times of the Kievan Empire and the Galician-Volhynian state were eras of great political developments. The dark age of Mongol rule was relatively short and was followed by the semi-autonomous development of Ukrainian culture and the economy in the Lithuanian-Ukrainian (Rus) Commonwealth. The 16th century brought a Polish domination of short duration, but eventually the National Revolution of 1648 restored full sovereignty to Ukraine. This independence was gradually reduced following the Battle of Poltava in 1709. Nevertheless, Ukraine preserved some degree of political autonomy until 1781, at least in part of her territory.

In 1781 Ukraine was incorporated into the Russian Empire. Since that time the country has been dominated by Russia, politically and economically, although not spiritually or culturally. Ukraine had become a contiguous colony of Russia, with her eventual absorption into the Russian state as her intended fate. She possessed neither autonomy nor freedom. The so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and its economic autonomy are a farce. It is this status as a captive nation which differentiates the economic history of Ukraine after 1781 from that which preceded.

The literature evaluating the captive status of Ukraine is a rich one. Among the scholars who were engaged in lifetime research in this area have been Slabchenko, Ohloblin, Volbuiev, Dzhendzhora, Sichinsky, Miakotin, Konenenko, Dubrovsky, Tishchenko, Modzelevsky; and recently, Vinar, Kachor, Kalinik and others. The exploitation of Ukraine was temporarily interrupted in the years 1918-1921 when Ukrainian statehood was reestablished by the National Revolution of 1918.

Lyashchenko, the official Soviet economic historian, stated clearly that during the first half of the 19th century Ukraine was

still a colony. This seems to be a repetition of Lenin's statement in connection with the economic evolution of the Russian Empire. The second half of that century was unchanged, as Diminsky Balzak, Vasiutin and others indicated. The traditional doctrine of an all-Russian market developed into the "Eurasian" concept of Russian economy, according to which the imperial economic life was centered around interprovincial commerce, to establish for Russia a relative self-sufficiency. Ukraine's position in this framework was that of a source of raw material and food. She was forced to accept from other areas of the Empire some three-fourths of her manufactured goods, goods manufactured mainly from Ukrainian raw materials. She was permitted to export mostly agricultural products and these had to pass through the Baltic ports despite the nearness of the Black Sea ports.

Although the use of the Black Sea ports was more economical for Ukrainian domestic trade, these ports were neglected and Ukrainian commercial fleets were confined to the coastal trade.<sup>1</sup>

The unfavorable position of Ukraine within the overall economic structure of Russia is illustrated by the following example. To stimulate the development of the Russian-Eurasian markets, special railroad rates were adopted which in effect subsidized distant shipments between Russia proper and her contiguous colonial possessions. Ukraine, being relatively close to the Russian market and the Black Sea, did not profit by reduced rates.

Of course, the second half of the 19th century brought the development of Ukrainian industries such as mining, heavy machines, textiles, etc., into such areas as the Donets Basin, the Krivii-Rih district and the Kharkiv industrial areas. But since the capital investment was predominantly Russian and foreign, large payments of interest and dividends were made to Russia and other foreign countries. To retard further the development of Ukrainian-owned capital and enterprise, Russian authorities opposed the creation and growth of the Ukrainian cooperative movement.

Russian gains from the possession of Ukraine have been otherwise enormous; thus the Ukraine economy contributed about 20 per cent of the imperial gross national product, while about 12 per cent was returned to Ukraine for her domestic purposes. It was only due to the heavy Ukrainian export of grain that Russia could maintain a favorable balance of trade prior to World War I. Ukrainian wheat exports, for instance, amounted to 90 per cent of the total wheat export of the Russian economy. The production of sugar beets in Ukraine, their refining, the Russian consumption of this

sugar and its export were also considerable items among the credits of the imperial economy. On the other hand, a negligible percentage of Russian imports was allocated to Ukrainian consumption. In addition, Russia received heavy fees for the transportation of products of Ukrainian origin.<sup>2</sup>

As a matter of Russian policy, certain Ukrainian industries were deliberately neglected in order to retain Ukraine as a source of raw materials and an outlet for manufactured goods produced in Russia proper. The exploitation of Ukraine by the Communist government of the Soviet Union is indicated indirectly in a publication of Harry Schwartz, entitled "Russia's Soviet Economy." The incorporation of the Ukrainian economy into the Russian system of taxation contributed greatly to Russian internal revenue collections. These revenues were used largely for the development of other areas of Russian-dominated territory and eventually for the establishment of additional competition for Ukraine in Russia proper.

The struggle for the economic emancipation of Ukraine during Czarist times was almost hopeless because Ukraine was artificially divided into several administrative units. But this fight flamed during the New Economic Policy period when the Ukrainian Communists demanded the economic independence of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic from Moscow. The leaders in this struggle were liquidated by a general purge of Ukrainians in the Communist Party of Ukraine.<sup>3</sup>



## NOTES TO THE TEXT

### Chapter 1. *The Land and the People*

1. The name "Rus" as the national identification of Ukraine in the prehistoric era, seems to date back to the seventh and eighth centuries. Greek historical documents of the eighth century referred to Rus or Ros as an aggressive northern people. The Arabic and Persian merchants and writers of the ninth and tenth centuries mentioned having seen travellers, merchants, and slaves coming from "Rus". Around that time also, the areas of Donets and lower Don were included in the territorial and national concept of "Rus". N. Chubaty, "The Ukrainian and Russian Conceptions of the History of Eastern Europe," *Proceedings*, Shevchenko Scientific Society, New York-Paris, 1951, Vol. I, pp. 17-18; Yu. Sherekh, *Nazva "Rus"*, *Encyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, pp. 13-14; G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, New Haven-London, Vol. I, *Ancient Russia*, 1951, pp. 96-98; Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, 1952, pp. 116-119. The usage of the term "Rus" in later centuries: E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom in Kampf um die Ukraine*, Leipzig, 1942, pp. 1-71; also numerous medieval historical documents, German and papal; H. Lozhnytsky, *Ukrainska Tserkva mizb Skbodom Zakhodom*, Philadelphia, 1954, 76-90, Reference Notes, pp. 623-640; S. Shelukhin, *Ukraina*, Introductory chapter, Praha, 1936-37.

2. About the origin of the name "Rus": M. Korduba, *Najnowsze teorje o poczatkach Rusi*, Warszawa, 1932; Sherekh, *op.cit.*, p. 14; M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, Vol. I, Lviv, 1898, pp. 236-238. According to still other theories, the name "Rus" could have been derived from the ancient tribe of the Roxolans, who had established a relatively strong state organization in Ukraine, between the Don and Dniepr rivers, in the second and third centuries A.D. Later on, the name of the Roxolans was used in a distorted version, either as "rugs" or "rox". The term "Rus" might have been the final products of that ethnological process. As late as the seventeenth century, Ukrainian statesmen, such as Khmelnytsky and Vyhovsky, in their foreign relations, referred to Ukraine as "totius terrae Russiae antiquae vel Roxolaniae". V. Sichynsky, "Naistarshi Nazvy," *Encyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, p. 13; also, Vernadsky, *op.cit.*, *Ancient Russia*, p. 97.

3. Chubaty, *loc. cit.*; Shelukhin, *loc. cit.*

4. O. Martovych, *Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times*, Edinburgh, p. 24; N. Fr-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, p. 160: "An artificial identification of the political beginnings of Muscovy with the Kievan Empire was officially initiated by Peter the Great in 1713, when he renamed Muscovy as Russia by an imperial decree in order to legalize his aggressive plans in Ukraine and the Black Sea areas."

5. D. Doroshenko, *Die Namen "Rus", "Russland", und "Ukraine" in ihrer historischen und gegenwaertigen Bedeutung*, *Abhandlungen des Ukr. Wissenschaftlichen Instituts in Berlin*, III, 1939; Ya. Rudnycky and V. Sichynsky, *Nazwa "Ukraine"*, *Encyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, pp. 14-16;

## Notes to Chapter 1

& Rus and Ukraine; I. Krypiakievych, "Nazva", *Ukrainska Zabalna Encyklopedia*, Lviv-Stanislaviv, 1935-1937, Vol. III, pp 361-363.

6. The proclamation of the sovereign Ukrainian Democratic Republic on January 22, 1918, and of the West-Ukrainian Democratic Republic on November 1, 1918, ultimately affirmed the term "Ukraine" as the national-political designation of the country and people: Rudnycky and Sichynsky, loc. cit.

7. "The chief of the imperial police Valuyev announced in 1863 that there was not, is not, and cannot be, a Ukrainian people and Ukrainian language; his successor Rozafovich in 1876 forbade the printing in Russia of anything in Ukrainian and their ideas were echoed by the majority of the Russian linguists and historians in the universities," Chubaty, op. cit., p. 11.

8. The riches of the Ukrainian economic resources; comprehensive coverage; V. Kubiyovich, *Geografia Ukrainy i sushchynyye zemel*, Krakiv-Lviv, 1943; I. Tesla, *Nasba Batskivschohyna*, Krakiv-Lviv, 1942, pp. 22-33; V. Kubiyovich, *Geografia Ukrainy*, Munich, 1949, pp. 23-24 & 40-46; "Black soil is the best and most fertile soil in our world. It is a real foundation of the Ukrainian agriculture, and by the same token, the foundation of the wealth of our country"; also, R. Dyminsky, Economic Life, in "Ukraine and Its People," Munich, 1949, pp. 125-126, 131-132, 146-163; the same, Korysni Kopalyny i Dzerela Energii, *Encyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I-III, pp. 1074-1084. A general description of the Ukrainian economy and her economic resources: T. Shabad, *Geography of the U.S.S.R., A Regional Survey*, New York, 1951, pp. 434-463.

9. M. Slabchenko, *Organizacia Hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Odessa, 1923, Part. I p.1: "Ukraine was held for a golden country, a country of fabulous riches, where it was enough to kick slightly the earth in order to open the golden deposits."

10. From the most ancient times the old "Rus" was very active in international trading. Greek, Persian, and Arabic merchants traveled in Ukraine, and the Ukrainian tradesmen were seen in Constantinople and Baghdad as early as the eighth century. Numerous trade routes met in Ukraine: P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 77-80; Vernadsky, op. cit., *Kievan Russia*, pp. 117-121.

11. To quote only a few cases from the Ukrainian history: in 1340 the last Galician-Volhinian duke, George II, died, and the Galician aristocracy prepared to take over the government, but the Polish king, Casimir the Great, immediately intervened and invaded the country. The northern dukes of Suzdal interfered in the domestic affairs of Ukraine in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The Poles and the Muscovites continuously bothered Ukraine by their interference during the Cossack era. Their intrigues contributed to the domestic difficulties of the Cossack republic at the time of Yurii Khmelnytsky, Ivan Vyhovsky, Petro Doroshenko, and other hetmans. Immediately after the Ukrainian declaration of independence in 1918, the Russians and the Poles launched wars against the young republic.

## Notes to Chapter I

12. Western experts estimated the Soviet population by 1956, as high as 220 million souls. But according to later Soviet data, it seemed that this figure had to be reduced to about 200 million. On the other hand, the Soviet total statistical figures do not agree with the Soviet figures, published for individual regions and cities. The latter are much higher. The Ukrainians amount to 21.2% of the total population of the U.S.S.R.; This would mean some 40 million Ukrainians in the entire Soviet Union: *Statistical Handbook of the U.S.S.R.* by National Industrial Conference Board, 1957, pp. 16-19; *SSSR v Tsyfrakh v 1960 Gadu*, Central Statistical Bureau, Moscow, 1961, pp. 63-65.

13. J. Kotkowski, *Latopis Nestora*, Kiow, 1860; R. Trautman, *Die Nestorchronik* Leipzig, 1931; *Ipatievskaja Letopis*, *Polnoie Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, I, Petrograd, 1923; *Laurentievskaja Letopis*, *Polnoie Russkikh Letopisei*, II, Leningrad, 1926; Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. J. Migne.

14. The Hellenic-Iranian heritage: Vernadsky, op. cit., *Ancient Russia*, Vol. I, pp. 84-100, 191-199; A. Dombrovsky, *The Spiritual Trend of Ukraine in Antiquity*, Proceedings, Shevchenko Scientific Society, Vol. I, New York-Paris, 1951, pp. 52-55; V. Shcherbakivsky, *Ukrainska Praistoria, Nasba Cultura*, I, Warszawa, 1935-37; M. Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine*, New Haven-London, 1941, pp. 11-12. The Roxolans and the Sarmatians, who populated Ukraine for a long time, were of the Iranian extraction: M. Rostovtsev, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, Oxford, 1922.

15. D. Doroshenko, *Narys Istorii Ukrainy*, Warszawa, 1932, Vol. I, pp. 63-68; M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, Vol. I, New York, 1954, pp. 549-555; C. Manning, The Kremlin's New Theses in Ukraine, *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 1, New York, Winter 1954, pp. 22-31; m. Hrushevsky, *Velyka, Mala, i Bilarus*, Kiiiv, 1917; Chubaty, loc. cit.; Vozniak and Shakhmatov brought irrefutable linguistic evidences of the existence of three separate Slavic languages in Eastern Europe already in the seventh and eighth centuries: M. Vozniak, *Istoria Ukrainskoi Literatury*, Lviv, 1920, Vol. I, pp. 16-17. Russian interpretation: Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 116-118; M. Florinsky, *Russia, A History and An Interpretation*, New York, 1953, Vol. I, pp. 42-44, 73-79; A. Soloviev, *Der Begriff "Russland" in Mittel Alter*, Studien zur aelteren Geschichte Osteuropas, Festschrift fuer Heinrich Felix Schmidt, Graz-Koeln, 1956, pp. 143-168.

16. Vernadsky, op. cit., pp. 213-222; "The Khazars were originally a horde of horsemen which succeeded in controlling politically the neighboring agricultural tribes. Their domination was, however, much milder for the subject peoples than that of the Avars or even of the Bulgars. The Khazars' interest in trade added a peculiar feature to the character of their power". (p. 213).

17. Vernadsky, op. cit., *Kievan Russia*, Vol. II, pp. 104-105.

18. Shelukhin, loc. cit.

## Notes to Chapter I

19. The Russian historiography attempts to regard the Lithuanian-Polish influences as having been primarily responsible for the creation of the Ukrainian and Byeloruthenian nationalities: Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 117; Manning, op. cit. p. 23-26; M. Chubaty, Do choho zmahaye teperishnia nacionalna polityke Kremlu v Ukraini, "Amerika", Philadelphia, July 30, 1957, extremely along the Russian official trend of the historiographical interpretation of the European South-East (Ukraine): W. Allen, *The Ukraine, A History*, Cambridge, 1940, pp. 1-68.

20. I. Mirchuk, The Basic Traits of the Ukrainian People, in "Ukraine and Its People, Munich, 1949, pp. 35-54.

21. The reader is referred at this point to another work of the author, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957. Some Russian historians, like Kluchevskii, Soloviev, and Diakonov, paid rather little attention to the Mongol influences. But they could not ignore the issue entirely, and did not deny some Mongol elements in Russian literature, language, law. Others, like Karamzin, Pokrovskii, Trubetskoi, Vladimirskii-Budanov, Sergeevich, Golubinskii, Kostomarov, Lubavskii, and Presniakov, regarded the Mongolian factor as primary in the growth of the Great Russian people: N. Karamzin, *Istoria gosudarstva rossiiskavo*, 12 vols., St. Petersburg, 1851-53, Vol. V, pp. 365-384; E. Golubinskii, *Istoria russkoi tserkvi*, 2 vols., Moscow, 1900-1917, Vol. II, Part I, p. 461 and others; N. Trubetskoi, *Nasledie Jingbis-Khana*, Berlin, 1925; A. Presniakov, *Obrazovanie velikoruskavo gosudarstva*, Petrograd, 1918; a very good, comprehensive study in this field, Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. III, *The Mongols and Russia*, especially pp. 333-390.

22. Pogodin's theory has been broadly discussed by Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy*, Vol. I, New York, 1954, pp. 551-556, where he stressed the Makymovich's contribution to refute the Pogodin's views. The Pogodin hypothesis, although little credible, is still accepted by many recent historians, like Florinsky, Vernadsky and others,

23. "Theses on the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the unification of Ukraine and Russia", *Pravda*, January 12, 1954; Interpretation of the act: Manning, op. cit.; Chubaty, op. cit.; Vozniak, op. cit., pp. 5-18, brings the historical, linguistic and anthropological proofs to refute the "theses".

## Chapter II. The Basic Traits of Ukrainian Socio-Economic Development

1. V. Kluchevskii, *A History of Russia*, London-New York, 1911, Vol. I, pp. 49-54, analyzed at length the significance of commerce for the Kievan Rus; the same, *Boyarskaia дума drevnie Rusi*, Moscow, 1909, p. 13, stated erroneously that trading was the basic occupation of the Kievan Ukrainians. J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, London-Toronto-New York, 1914, p. 12, noncritically following Kluchevskii's statements, wrote: "Trade in general appears to have been so profitable that, up till the end of the Tenth century, the Russians did not trouble themselves about agriculture." The reader should notice that both authors followed the official, Czarist historiographical pattern of Russian history, and tried to identify the Ukrainians with the Russians.

## Notes to Chapter II

2. B. Grekov, *Kievskaiia Rus*, Moscow and Leningrad, 1944, p. 35. The same view also: G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven, 1951, pp. 99-102; S. Rudnitsky, *Ukraine*, New York City, 1918, pp. 255-256: "Since the very first beginnings of the history of Ukraine, the main occupation of its people has been, and has remained to this day, agriculture". Similarly, Hrushevsky, Doroshenko, and others; Dyminsky, R.: "Zahalna Kharakterystyka Narodnoho Hospobarstva Ukrainy," *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Vol. III, Munich-New York, 1949, p. 1033: "Because of that, the natural conditions of Ukraine were among the most favorable for the growth of agriculture in the whole world. Ukraine is a land of black soil, which amounts to 68% of the entire national territory."
3. I. Mirchuk, "The Basic Traits of the Ukrainian People," in *Ukraine and its People*. A handbook edited by I. Mirchuk, Munich, 1949, pp. 35-42: "This has meant that the population of these areas has always been in closest touch with the soil and that this intimacy with Mother Earth is particularly characteristic of the entire Ukrainian peasantry even in our own days". Also, Rudnitsky, op. cit., & Ukrainian Culture, pp. 190-210.
4. About the beginnings of the Cossacks and the Cossack colonization of the Black Sea steppes, M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1956, Vol. VII, pp. 66-170.
5. C. Daugherty, *Labor Problems in American Industry*, Boston-New York-Chicago, Dallas-Atlanta-San Francisco, 1948-1949, p. 38.
6. Hrushevsky, loc. cit., also G. Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 63-64; M. Antonovych, "The History of Ukraine," in *Ukraine and Its People*, ed. I. Mirchuk, pp. 85-86: "They (Cossacks) began to set up a military organization of their own and to attack the Tartars independently. A profound feeling of independence developed among the Cossacks...". All historians agree in stressing the spirit of individualism, especially among the Ukrainian Zaporizhe Cossacks.
7. Mirchuk, op. cit., pp. 35-36.
8. Mirchuk, op. cit., pp. 39-40: "...and still more their actual conduct, are all based on the individual; and to restrict the right of the individual even in the interests of the community, is always resented as an encroachment on the freedom of will. The Ukrainian's individualism is most evident in his attitude to the social order...". Also, V. Yaniv; "Ukrainska Rodyna", in the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, pp. 1134-1136; the author is stressing the influence of Ukrainian individualism on the development of the Ukrainian economic life (p. 1136).
9. Ukrainian "hromada" and the Russian "mir"; Rudnitsky, op. cit., p. 198; "The Ukrainian community (hromada) is a voluntary union of freemen for the sake of common safety and the general good... the Russian (mir) is something entirely different. It is a miniature absolute state, although it appears in the garb of a

## Notes to Chapter II

communistic republic" About the communal aspects of the "mir"; H. Schwartz, *Russia's Soviet Economy*, New York, 1954, pp. 40-41. Foreign observers, like Wallace and Haxthausen, studied with great interest the institution of the "mir". Russian socialists, like Tkachov, held the "mir" as an indication of the communist tendencies in Russian society: N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 139-140.

10. For example: the rebellion of Pushkar and Barabash against Hetman Vyhovsky, the rebellion of Sirko against the same Vyhovsky, and the rebellions of individual commanders, like Petryk and Palli, against Hetman Mazepa: M. Hrushevsky, *A History of Ukraine*, New Haven, 1941.

11. The reader may obtain extensive information about the nationalistic movement in Ukraine from the following works: J. Armstrong, *Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-45* New York, 1955; C. Manning, *Twentieth Century Ukraine*, New York, 1951; O. Martovych, *Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times*, Edinburg, pp. 34-170.

12. E. Karskii, *Russkaia Pravda, po drevnieisbemu spisu*, Leningrad, 1930, also Kluchevskii, op.cit. pp. 144-181, broadly covered the subject of the Rus'ka Pravda and indicated the individualism of the property rights: "The individual is looked upon not so much as a member of the community, (but rather) as a possessor or a non-possessor, a producer or a non-producer, of capital." "The Code is first and foremost an exposition of the rights of capital." (p. 163); M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskobo prava*, mimeographed edition, Munich, 1947, pp. 27-34.

13. P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, p. 69: "This clan order and large family began to disintegrate toward the ninth century"; p. 108: "By the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in the midst of the predominant free, small type of landownership and cultivation by the smerds, privately owned households using slaves or bonded peasant labor were becoming a common occurrence in Kiev Rus'" Penalties were established by Rus'ka Pravda on violation of private land properties: G. Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 105-106.

14. The question of the feudal organization in Kievan Ukraine is still discussed. Some historians deny the existence of any feudal forms in Kiev; others (especially the Soviet historiographers) insist on scholastic acceptance of the feudal period in medieval Ukraine. The issue will be analyzed more comprehensively in Chapter Four.

15. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 256.

16. M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizacia Hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part One, Odeca, 1923, pp. 19 and 21: "Revolution of 1648-1654 brought the liquidation of the large land-holding of the aristocracy and a transition of the land in the hands of the working peasantry.", also Shymansky, *Kyivska Staryna*, 1883, I, p. 83.

17. The anti-Stolypin attitude of the Russian general opinion; collectivist and anti-individualist ideology of the Tsarist Russia: E. Malaniuk, *Do problemy*

## Notes to Chapter II

*bolshevizmu*, New York, 1956, pp. 78-79. "It was very indicative that a real sorrow after the death of Stolypin covered Ukraine only: the masses of the peasantry were thankful to him..." (p. 79).

18. *The Black Death of the Kremlin, A White Book*, Vol. 2, *The Great Famine in Ukraine in 1932-33*, ed. Dobrus, Detroit, 1955; O. Kalynyk, *Scbo nese z soboiu kommunizm?* Munich-Toronto, 1953, a compilation of the original documents about the preparation for the famine; M. Verbytsky, *Nailbilsbyi zlochyn Kremla*, London 1952; P. Lutarewych, "Tsifri i fakty pro holod v Ukraini," *Ukrainian Review*, by the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the U.S.S.R., Bk. 2, Munich, 1955, pp. 80-98.

19. W. Kubijowytsch, "Das geografische Bild und die Bevoelkerung der Ukraine," in *Handbuch der Ukraine*, ed. by J. Mirschuk, Leipzig-Berlin, 1941, p. 5-23.

20. Rudnytsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-162, explains why the Russians have proved to be a most dangerous enemy of Ukraine.

21. O. Martovych, *op. cit.* This work may give the reader a fairly good understanding of Ukrainian struggle for national independence; about the Ukrainian Insurgent Army: M. Lebed, U.P.A., *Ukrainska Povstanska Armia*, 1946.

22. C. Day, *Economic Development of Europe*, New York, 1942, p. 478: "The Russians showed in their history more succeeding persistence, more continuity of thought and action and less mobility than other Slavic peoples. This discipline they suffered under Asiatic rule contributed to this result." This continuity in the growth of Russia has been proved by N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *op. cit.*

23. Lyashchenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-117.

24. The Russian government proceeded rather slowly with the annexation of Ukraine, and gradually introduced various innovations of the Russian type. A final step was made by St. Petersburg in 1782 by integrating the Ukraine in the Russian administrative organization.

## Chapter III. *The Social and Economic Heritage of the Prehistoric Period.*

1. Aristotle, *Politics*, Bk I, Chapter II: "Man is naturally a social animal." Aristotle maintained that from the initial organizational cell of the family household, gradually through village association, man forms the state.

2. A survey of the theories of state organization will be found in E. Jarra, *Ogolna teorja prava*. Warszawa, 1920, pp. 91-97, or *Encyclopedia Americana*, 1951, "State." For centuries thinkers provided evidence of the natural character of state associations, and denied anarchism.

3. *Poviest vriemiennikb let, po Lavrentievskamu Spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, year 862, p. 20.

### Notes to Chapter III

4. G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 154-157. The authors stress the difference in woman's social status in old Ukraine, on the one hand, and in Muscovy, on the other. Ukrainian women enjoyed much greater social respect than Russian women. Monogamic and matriarchal traditions in Ukraine: V. Yaniv, "Ukrainska Rodyna," in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Vol. I-III, pp. 1134-1136; the elevated position of the Ukrainian woman in the old code of law "Ruska Pravda." N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der Staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, Graz, 1943 (doctoral dissertation), p. 48.
5. O. Balzer, *Verfassungs Geschichte Polens* (Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaft), Krakow, 1906, p. 102, indicates the limitations of the power of the family eldest and clan chieftain among the Slavs. S. Kutrzeba, *Historja Ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, pp. 4-5; discussed the authorities of the clan council, and the importance of the chieftain's individual qualities for the extent of his power in each individual case. About the constitution of the clan: M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskobo prava*, Part I, Munich, 1947, pp. 36-37.
6. *Ipatievskaja letopis*, col. 10, and *Laurentievskaja letopis*, introduction, events prior to 853, mentioned the two brothers, Radim and Viatko, who presumably were the ancestors of two Russian tribes of the Radimichians and Viatichians. Also the legends about the three brothers, Lekh, Czech and Ruth, who founded the Poles, Czechs and Ruthenians (Ukrainians) and about the three brothers, Kyt, Shebek and Khoriv, who originated the growth of the Polianians, may have indicated the agnate element in the development of all these ethnic phenomena. It was, however, a very distant reminiscence of a blood relationship. Hrushevsky said in this matter: "But this (agnate element) in the ninth and tenth centuries was only an echo of the past ... The tribes were already too big, and territorially too extensive, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, as to be able to retain any traditions of a common genealogy ... On the new territories they were doubtlessly formed under the impact of the geographical circumstances." M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1954, Vo. I, pp. 357-358.
7. K. Bestuzhev-Riumin, *Russkaja Istoria*, Vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1872, p. 190-205; also *Laurentievskaja Letopis* in the years 862, 945, 1097, 1127, etc. Freischyn-Chirovsky, op. cit., pp. 48-53.
8. P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 72-74: "In the south, among the Polyane, who were a more civilized tribe ... the town as a form of fortified settlement began to develop earlier."
9. Chubaty, op. cit., p. 38; also F. Koneczny, *Dzieje Rosji*, Warszawa, 1917, Vol. I, p. 85.
10. Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 321-322, is very skeptical with respect to Valinana, and the Masudi's relation to its military and political power. He does not find any proof of the existence of a powerful organization of the Dalebians. While Kluchevskii (*A History of Russia*, London-New York, 1911, Vol. I, p. 35) and Mavor (*An Economic History of Russia*, London-Toronto-New York, 1914,



### Notes to Chapter III

Vol. I, pp. 8-9, as well as Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 208, accept Masudi's words at their face value and do not doubt the historical possibility of a strong military organization in the ninth and tenth centuries. The question of the Moravian rule over West Ukraine also has not been unanimously interpreted by historiography. S. Tomashivsky, *Ukrainska Istoria*, Lviv, 1919, Vol. I, p. 38, held that the Moravian rule over Galicia was most probable. Soloviev and Hrushevsky denied any such possibility on the grounds of a faulty acceptance by Tomashivsky of the historical document of the establishment of a Prague Diocese, on which his entire theory is based. S. Soloviev, *Istoria Rossii s drevnieisbikk vriemen*, St. Petersburg, 1894-1895, Vol. I, p. 180; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 490.

11. Kiev is frequently associated with the legendary capital of the Ostrogothic king Ermanarick on the banks of the Dniepr. The thesis is mainly represented by German and Scandinavian historiography on the basis of the legend of the Gothic historian, Jordanis: L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Staemme bis zum Ausgange der Voelkerwanderung*, 1904, p. 99; D. Doroshenko, *Narys istorii Ukrainy*, Warszawa, 1932, Vol. I, p. 30: "The Goths developed on the banks of the Dniepr their empire, with its center in the city of Danparstadt, which is identified by some with Kiev." Other authors accept an even more ancient origin of Kiev than the Gothic era, always associating its growth, however, with its most convenient location on the commercial routes.

12. A good survey of the problem of social stratification may be found in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, 1935, Vol. III, "Castes," pp. 254-256, "Classes," pp. 531-538; also Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

13. "As may be expected, that society was complex enough, although there were in Kievan Russia no such high barriers between single social groups and classes as existed in feudal Europe of the same period": Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, p. 136; also, Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 47-48; the ancient legend about various heroes, who sometimes came from lower classes, like Oleksa Popovych and Duka Stepanovych, may also indicate the flexibility of the old Ukrainian social stratification.

14. V. Kluchevskii, *Istoria soslovii v Rossii*, Moscow, 1913, pp. 41-42; also M. Vozniak, *Istoria Ukrainskii Literatury*, Vol. I, Lviv, 1920, pp. 9-10.

15. V. Yaniv, "Suspilni verstvy," in the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Vol. I-III, Munich-New York, 1949, pp. 1136-1137, discussing the cause of the gradual decline in class distinctions within medieval Ukrainian society, said: "Three fundamental classes—noblemen, freemen and slave—did not have the character of exclusive castes, and the transition from one class to another was relatively easy. This was facilitated by the division of individual classes into many sub-classes and groups with minute differentiation in the privileges and obligations; differentiation within the individual class softened the social barriers all through ... The "borderland" character of Ukraine, ... required a permanent readiness for defense, ... (which) produced the solidarity ... and prevented any class and rigid social stratification."

### Notes to Chapter III

16. The most rational division of the economic evolution of mankind into a number of periods of approximate characteristics, acceptable for the analysis of the economic history of any people, was given by Fridrich List in his *National System of Political Economy*. He differentiated the following stages of evolution: original barbarism, pastoral condition, agricultural condition, agricultural-manufacturing condition and agricultural-manufacturing-commercial condition." (Bk. II, New York, 1904, p. 143.)
17. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 102: "Hunting provided the more valuable products used in food and clothing. Among the princes and their retinue the hunt was particularly popular—as a diversion, of course. But the mass of population obtained from these industries the chief products necessary for tribute, taxes, and the market." D. Bahalii, *Naris Istorii Ukrainy Na Socialno-ekonomichnomy Grunti*, Vol. I, Kiev, 1928, pp. 177-180, 256.
18. Vernadsky, loc. cit., Primitive hunting and fishing in old Ukraine: I. Krypiakych, Pobut, in *Istoria Ukrainskoi Kultury*, Lviv, 1937, pp. 12-14; Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 255-264.
19. The development of the institution of money: G. Obst, *Geld-Bank-und Boersewesen*, Stuttgart, 1944, p. 2: "Je nach der Hauptbeschäftigung und dem Kulturstande wurden Vieh, Getreide, Muscheln, Perlen, Kakobohnen, Messingstabe, Wollzeuge, Elfenbein, Tabak, Tee und andere Gegenstände gewählt ... (und) Geldcharacter verliehen ..."
20. Krypiakych, op. cit., pp. 17-18; Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, *Kiewan Russia*, pp. 115-116.
21. J. Kulischer, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Jena, 1925, Vol. I, pp. 88-89.
22. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, from *De Administrando Imperio*, Chapter IX.
23. *Laurentiiskaia letopis*, in *Polnoie Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, under the years 883, 946, 969, 945, 946, 947, which over and over again relates about fur, honey, wax, and slaves and which immediately suggests their immense importance for the old Slavic economy; also, Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 66
24. "Initially we learned mostly from the Orient, from the Turanian peoples—the Iranians and Arabs, since the tenth century the Byzantinian influence prevailed, and since the twelfth century the Western influences, primarily German, gained more and more significance": Krypiakych, op. cit., p. 18.
25. In 860, relates Photius, Rus attacked Byzantium, after having dominated the neighboring territories: *Photii epistolae*, London, 1864, p. 178. About six to eight thousand warriors participated in the expedition against the Greek capital. The extent of that major military undertaking leads us to assume the existence of a strong political organization of the Ukrainian Slavs of that time.

### Notes to Chapter III

26. e.g., Krypiakovich, op. cit., pp. 12 and 18. His thesis is faulty. Farming was already developed in prehistoric Rus. Archeological excavations and ancient documents provide sufficient evidence of a relatively well developed agriculture at the time of the migration of the Slavs. Linguistic studies prove the same. Excavations proved that agricultural traditions existed in Ukraine in the Scythian and Bosphoran epochs: Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. I, *Ancient Russia*, pp. 45-47, 93: "The economic foundation of the Bosphoran kingdom was of the same type as in Scythian times. Wheat was the staple product." Agriculture at the time of the early Slavic settlements: V. Gotie, *Ocherki po istorii materialnoi kul'tury vostochnoi yevropy*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1925; B. D. Grekov, *Kievskaya Rus*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1944, pp. 21-33; also Grekov, op. cit., p. 35: "In Kievan ... Russia agriculture was the main occupation of the people." Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 259-264; Kievan Ukraine was predominantly agricultural.
27. The Jewish traveler, Ibn-Jacob, and the Greek Emperor, Mauricius, noted "all types of fruit stacked in piles." Mauricius wrote in the sixth and Ibn-Jacob in the tenth century.
28. Lyaschenko, op. cit., p. 108-109: "However, the existence of a large quantity of slaves in the hands of the owning classes ... assumed a great importance in the future development and organization of large-scale, privately owned estates." And so, the slaves changed from an article of trade "into an instrument of production."
29. Kulischer, op. cit., pp. 86-88; Grekov, op. cit., pp. 36-50; Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, p. 108.
30. Kulischer, loc. cit. Agricultural economy: I. Vitanovich, *Naris Socialno-ekonomichnoi Ukrainskoi Istorii*, Lviv, 1934, pp. 5-6.
31. The types of Ukrainian villages: M. Kulitsky, Forma osel, in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, Vol. I, Munich-New York, 1949, pp. 179-181; V. Kubiyovich, Polozhenia osel, in the same encyclopedia, pp. 178-179; Vitanovich, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
32. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 73: "The social division of labor and the rise of the town were gradually progressing." The emergence of the primitive town: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 361-365; Lyaschenko, op. cit., pp. 71-74.
33. The commercial character of the Slavic economy: V. Kluchevskii, *Boiarskaia дума drevnie Rusi*, Moscow, 1909, p. 13; J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, London-Toronto-New York, 1914, p. 12.
34. A detailed analysis of the commercial trading of the Ukrainian Slavs was given by Hrushevsky (op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 283-300). However, he was not very successful in separating the Ukrainian commerce of the prehistorical era from the development of trade at the time of the Kievan Empire. (Trade in the Kievan realm will be covered in this work later, in the framework of the Kievan-Galician period.) Also Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 277-294.

### *Notes to Chapter III*

35. A. Garkavi, *Skazania muzulmanskikh pisatelei o sloviianakh Russkikh*, 1870, p. 49; *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*, ed. by M. De Goje, Lyeden, 1889, pp. 115 and 154; also Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, pp. 360-365, *Russia and the East*.
36. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 288-289, and 298, about the slave trade in the eighth and ninth centuries.
37. "... agriculture (cultivation of grains and textile fiber plants) and the care of livestock, provided the chief products vitally needed to sustain the life of the mass of the population—food and clothing." Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 68-69.
38. Garkavi, op. cit., pp. 221, 268, 85; the relations of Ibn-Hawkal, Ibn-Dasta, Ibn-Fadhlan, and others.

### *Chapter IV. The Political Background and the Social Structure.*

1. The reader will find a critical evaluation of the Pogdin-Sobolevskii theory in Hrushevsky's *Istoria Ukrany-Rusi*, New York, 1954, Vol. I, pp. 551-556; the Russian view: A. Soloviev, *Der Begriff "Russland" in Mittel Alter, Studien zur aelteren Geschichte Osteuropas, Festschrift fuer Heinrich Felix Schmidt*, Graz-Koeln, 1956, pp. 143-168; for further references: chapter one, *The People*, in this work.
2. G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, p. 18.
3. M. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation*, New York, 1953, Vol. I, pp. 48-54: "...the decline of the influence of the veche were among the chief characteristics of this period." (54)
4. Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 16, and in his other work, *A History of Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 63-64: The author gives the Zaporoge Cossacks, a strictly Ukrainian socio-political phenomenon, as an example of the democratic element of the Russian soul. His view is in accord with the Russian political tendency.
5. D. Doroshenko, *Narys Istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932, Vol. I, pp. 63-68; M. Kostomarov, *Dvi ruski narodnosti*, Leipzig, 1922; also the works of M. Pokrovskii, A. Presniakov, M. Lubavskii, and A. Krymsky, analyzing the process of the formation of the Russian people.
6. S. Tomashivsky, *Nowe teorijs o poczatkach Rusi*, *Kwartalnik historyczny*, Vol. I, Year XLIII, pp. 290-295; also, M. Korduba, *Najnowsze teorijs o poczatkach Rusi*, Warszawa, 1932; also, Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 602-624.
7. R. Trautmann, *Die Nestor-Chronik*, Leipzig, 1931, pp. 33-35; also, "Poviest vremennikh let," Hypatian version, in *Polnoie Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*, Petrograd, 1923; *Povist po Laurentievskomu Spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, p. 6-7, Year 862, and others.

*Notes to Chapter IV.*

8. The Normanistic School was represented by Schlozer, Muller, Kunik, Pogodid, Tamashivsky, Kluchevskii, and Tompson; the Anti-Normanistic by Ilovaiskii, Lomonosov, Kachenovskii, Ewers, and Hrushevsky. The Khazar theory: Ewers. *Vom Ursprung des Russischen Staates*. The West-Slavonic approach: Herberstein, Maksymovich, and Gedenov. For a detailed analysis, the reader will be referred to Tomashivsky, op. cit., and Korduba, op. cit. Tomashivsky said that in the Anti-Normanistic School nothing is scholarly reliable, and every kind of interpretation is permitted. Nevertheless, the Normanistic theory has had its own inadequacies. For example, no official document of that time was written in the Swedish language, although some were signed exclusively by Norman names. Furthermore, the name "Rus," as an identification of a nation of warriors was known in the Orient long before the Northmen arrived in Ukraine: Hrushevsky, loc. cit.

9. F. Koneczny, *Dzieje Rosji*, Warszawa, 1917, Vol. I, p. 61.

10. Chubaty enumerates five major factors forming the national unity of the Ukrainian South: 1. The leading role of Kiev, as the capital; 2. One dynasty; 3. Princely meetings; 4. Common law, codified in "Ruska Pravda," and 5. One all-inclusive church organization: *Oblad Istorii Ukrainshoho Pravda*, Munich, 1947, pp. 46-47. Also Z. Kuzela, "Das Ukrainische Volk," in *Handbuch der Ukraine*, ed. by I. Mirtschuk, Leipzig-Berlin, 1941, p. 35; at another place he said: "Nations of Slavonic peoples began to form between the third and fourth centuries A.D." This is a direct refutation of the Russian theory, according to which the Ukrainian people developed first in the 15th century or later.

11. "Southern Russia" (Ukraine), as such, made no special appeal to the grand dukes of Vladimir, and their sporadic interference in southern affairs, inspired by narrow regional considerations, merely added to the political confusion and disintegration of the south," Florinsky, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 51.

12. S. Soloviev, *Istoria Rossi s drevneisbihs vremen*, St. Petersburg, 1894, Vol. I, pp. 7-8, Koneczny, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 97; N. Kostomarov, "Mysl o federativnom nachale v drevnei Rusi," *Sobranie Sochinenii*, Book I, Petersburg, 1903; also S. Soloviev, *Istoria odnosbeniia mezhdn kniaziami Rurikovo doma*, Moscow, 1847.

13. V. Kluchevskii, *Geschichte Russlands*, Leipzig-Berlin, 1925, Vol. I, pp. 149-150; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 192-208, and 536-539; A. Presniakov, *Kniazboie pravo v drevnei Rusi, Ocherki po istorii X-XII*, St. Petersburg, 1909. A complete survey of various theories concerning the constitution of the Kievan Empire: M. Vladimirovskii-Budanov, *Obzor istorii russhavo prava*, Petrograd-Kiev, 1915, and Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 49-53.

14. On the agreements of Lubetch and Vetychi, and the institution of the princely "izgoidom," which largely contributed to the constitutional changes in the Kievan state: N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, doctoral dissertation, University of Graz, 1943, pp. 33-34; also, Soloviev, op. cit., Vol. I-II.

*Notes to Chapter IV.*

15. M. Vladimírskii-Budanov, *Kristomatia po istorii russkavo prava*, Kiev, p. 23; also Kluchevskii, *Istoria soslovi v Rossii*, Moscow, 1913, pp. 41-48.

16. A. Zimin, ed., *Pamiatki Prava Kievskavo Gosudarstva, Russkaia Pravda prostrannoï redakcii*, Moscow, 1952, p. 109 and 122; art. 89.

17. V. Yaniv, *Suspilni verstvy, Entsiklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, Vol. I, Book III, p. 1137.

18. "Socially it (the boyar class) consisted of diverse elements. Some of its members were prominent even before joining it; others were of low origin and some had even been the prince's slaves." Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 138. On the ethnical composition of the nobility: Vladimírskii-Budanov, *Obzor*, op. cit., pp. 25-31, and V. Kluchevskii, *Bojarskaia дума drevnie Rusi*, Moscow, 1909, Chapters I-II. The Antic, Alanic, Magyar, Cuman, Nomanic, and Turkman ethnic elements entered the boyar class at various times by the way of their membership in the princely team-guards.

19. The boyardom of the Kievan-Galician period was plutocratic rather than aristocratic. The descendants of the clergy, merchants, or even peasantry could become boyars if they only managed to acquire considerable wealth. Foreign trade was very profitable at that time, so that whoever had the opportunity, whether prince, boyar, or merchant, engaged himself in commercial activities. M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskobo prava*, Munich, 1947, p. 51: "The princes ....also held controlling shares in the foreign trade." Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 124; "Some were the descendants of the old tribal aristocracy; others, especially in Novgorod, must have come into prominence because of their wealth, more often than not derived from foreign commerce." Vernadsky, *idem*, p. 139.

20. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 316-317.

21. Kluchevskii, *Istoria, soslovii v Rossii*, Moscow, 1913, p. 49.

22. Chubaty, op. cit., 54-55.

23. B. Grekov, *Kievskaja Rus*, Moscow and Leningrad, 1944, pp. 26-36.

24. Freischyn-Czyrowski, op. cit., p. 15

25. Politically, the townspeople expressed themselves in the people's meetings, an ancient democratic organization of the Ukrainian Slavs. Nevertheless, two factors gradually restricted the political role of the meetings (vitche): the dukes and the boyars. Sometimes the dukes used the townspeople and their meeting in their attempt to liquidate the power of the boyars. In Galicia, however, both the dukes and the townspeople lost the political struggle, and the boyar aristocracy managed to break the monarchical and democratic principles, and to establish their supremacy to a large extent. This, of course, had unfavorable social and economic impacts on the position of the townspeople: Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 185-187; A. Linnichenko, *Cberty iz istorii soslovii v Zapadnoi (Glaichoi) Rusi. XIV-XV st.*, Moscow, 1894, p. 210.

*Notes to Chapter IV.*

26. Kluchevskii, op. cit., p. 55-60.

27. Kluchevskii, op. cit., p. 58.

28. Especially in the second half of the 11th century, the princely "izgois" became a very serious social and political problem in Kiev. As a result of the seniority principle, at least nine junior princes of the Rurik house were deprived of their lands, and they tried all available means in order to re-establish themselves, thereby creating chaos. The three sons of Rostislav, Rurik, Volodar and Vasil, were the most notorious cases. Eventually, they established themselves in Galicia, and their rights were confirmed in Lubech. This was the beginning of the separate political development of Galicia, which, at the time of the Mongol invasion, succeeded Kiev in the political leadership of the Ukrainian south. Then the death of the Galician duke, Roman, and the izgoihood of his sons, Daniel and Vasil, also resulted in considerable political upheavals in the Galician-Volhinian realm.

29. The Hipatian Chronicle, under the date 1259, related that Daniel of Galicia invited the Poles and the Germans to settle in Kholm, the newly erected town. J. Abraham, *Organizacja Kościoła łacńskiego na Rusi*, Lwow, 1904, Vol. I, p. 91, and others. The strangers in the Galician boyar class: R. Bestuzhev-Riumin, *Ruskaia istoria*, St. Petersburg, 1872, Vol. I, p. 212. The last Galician duke frequently invited foreigners and introduced the Magdeburg law in his towns: Freischyn-Czyrowski, op. cit., p. 23.

30. The Jews settled and were very active in Ukraine since time immemorial; the Armenians arrived in Galicia in the 13th century: S. Kutrzeba, *Sprawa Żydowska w Polsce*, Lwow, p. 2; Linnichenko, op. cit., pp. 221, 231-246.

31. K. Marx, *Secret Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1899, pp. 76-77.

32. P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 96-99. Lyashchenko quotes Marx, and dogmatically accepts feudalism in Kiev, but he still makes some reservations, basing his views on the reports of the Lavretian chronicle.

33. G. Vernadsky, "Feudalism in Russia," *Speculum*, 14 (1939), pp. 300-323; also G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New-Haven-London, 1951, pp. 163-172 and 209-210. An opposing Soviet view: B. Grekov, op. cit., and also the same, *Rabstvo i feodalizm v Drevnie Rusi*, Academy of the History of Material Culture, 1932, Issue 86; D. Bahalii, *Naris istorii Ukrainy na socialno-ekonomichnomy grunty*, 1928, Vol. I, pp. 316-329.

34. J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, London-Toronto-New York, 1914, Vol. 1, pp. 23-24.

## Notes to Chapter IV.

35. Vernadsky, op. cit., (*Kievan Russia*), pp. 184-185: "All this is a clear evidence of the process of feudal dismemberment of the principality of Galicia in the period. The Galician boyars tried to assert themselves as a feudal aristocracy." Following the West European customs, George Boleslav, the last Galician ruler, enobled some boyars, which act again indicated the perpetration of feudal institutions.

## Chapter V. Extractive Industries

1. V. Sergelevich, *Russkaia Pravda v cheteriokh redaktsiakh*, St. Petersburg, 1904, pp. XIX-XX. About the unifying effect of the *Ruska Pravda*: M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskoho prava*, mimeographed writings, Munich, 1947, p. 28; also, N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, doctoral dissertation, Graz, 1943; a comprehensive analysis of the code: V. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia*, London-New York, 1911, Vol. I, pp. 128-143.
2. G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 171-172.
3. I. Kripiakevich, "Pobut," in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, ed. by I. Kripiakevich, Liviv, 1937, p. 13: "Hunting the forest animals was done also to get meat, especially before military expeditions in order to provide food for the armies."
4. Ibid.: At that time the entire population of certain villages individually specialized in specific types of hunting. Frequently, the name of the village was derived from its main occupation, like Bibrka, from hunting beavers, Sokolniki, from falcon-hunting.
5. Ibid., p. 12; the elevation of hunting as a princely occupation: Monomakh's instructions, in *Poviest vriemiennikh let, po Laurentievskomu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, years 1092-1096, pp. 238-242; also, M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, Vol. I, New York, 1954, p. 260.
6. Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 107: "In the same period," he said, "fishermen from Galicia established themselves on the lower Danube river"; also, Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 14. It is important to stress here that in the 12th century the Galician Duchy extended almost to the littorals of the Black Sea. Hunting, fishing, and beekeeping in the Kievan economy: D. Bahalii, *Naris istorii Ukrainy na socialno-ekonomichnomu grunti*, Vol. I, 1928, pp. 255-256.
7. Although fish was generally known among medieval Ukrainians as an important food, it was, however, regarded as food for the poor. Royalty and boyardom frequently sought dispensation from abstinence during lent and consumed meat with great pleasure. The religious orders (monasteries), however, had to abide by the rules strictly. Therefore, as the author says, they were much more interested in fishing rights.
8. op. cit., Vol. I., p. 256.



Notes to Chapter V.

9. G. Engleman, "Die Katzen in Alterthum," in *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archaelogischen Instituts*, 1899.
10. P. Lyaschenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, p. 65. A. Garkavi, *Skazania muzulmanskikh pisatelei o sloviaanakh i russkikh*, St. Petersburg, 1870, relations of Ibn-Hauqual, Ibn-Dasta, and others.
11. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 14-15. *Lavrentievskaia letopis*, year 1288. All kinds of domestic animals were known in the Kievan time. A. Zimin, ec., *Pamiatki prava kievskavo gosudarstva, Russkaia Pravda prostrannoï redakcii*, Moskva, 1952, arts. 33, 45, 47, 81, 84, and others, pp. 108-121; also, *Russkaia pravda, Akademicheskii spisok*, arts. 11, 12, 25, 26; Also, *Poviest vremennikh let, po Lavrentievskomu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, mentioned various animals under several years. Cattle raising in Kiev: Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 257-259.
12. *Hipatievskaia letopis* related under 1146, that during the war between the two branches of the Rurik House, Davidovichi and Olehovichi, the former having over-run the cattle ranch of the Olehovichi, seized and took three thousand mares and one thousand stallions.
13. *Poviest vremennikh let*, op. cit., years 883, 912, 945, 969, 992, and many others. Also, Zimin, op. cit., arts. 71, 72, 75-76, 79-80, pp. 130 and others.
14. Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 16. Differently, Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 109, who accepted widespread cultivation of buckwheat in the Kievan economy. A comprehensive discussion of the Kievan agriculture: B. Grekov, *Kievskaa Rus*, Moskva-Leningrad, 1944, pp. 36-50; I. Kultscher, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Jena, 1925, Vol. I, pp. 86-88. Also, N. Aristov, *Promesblennost drevniei Rusi*, St. Petersburg, 1866, pp. 64-68; Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 259-264.
15. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 16-17.
16. At the same time in Suzdal, Rostov, and Vladimir (later Russia proper) neither the use of draft animals, horses and oxen, nor the use of animal manure, was widely known: S. Harcave, *Russia, A History*, Chicago-Philadelphia-New York, 1952, pp. 41-46; N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 2-3; *Poviest vremennikh let*, op. cit., year 1103, and others.
17. Primarily agricultural character of the Kievan economy: Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 67; Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 259-264.
18. *Paterik kievo-pecherskavo monastiria*, ed. by D. Abramovich, St. Petersburg, 1911, chapter on St. Theodosius' life: gardening and orcharding, vegetables and fruits, were mentioned several times. The references to the above occupations were also made by the Lavrentian chronicle.

## Notes to Chapter V.

19. In the sixth century the Byzantine Emperor, Mauricius, wrote that endless quantities of all types of fruit stacked in piles could be found among the Slavs; Prince Daniel of Galicia developed in the 13th century in the newly established city of Kholm a beautiful garden-orchard: Bahalii, op. cit., p. 264. The references indicate the popularity of fruit and vegetable production among the Ukrainian Slavs throughout the early centuries.

20. Zimin, op. cit., arts. 83-84, p. 131, and others. Also, *Karamzinskii spisok*, arts. 83-84. The Hipatian and Lavrentian chronicles, years 946 and 981, and other records of the time frequently noted buying, selling, confiscation, and gifts of landed property. We cannot accept Roznov's denial of the private property clauses of *Ruska Pravda*. He said that the code did not know any free buying and selling of real estate: *Obzor russkoi istorii s sotsiologicheskoi tochki zrenia*, St. Petersburg, 1903, pp. 33-34; also, the same, *Ocherki istorii truda v Rossii*, 1924. D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932, Vol. I, p. 74; "The free and economically independent peasantry, preoccupied by the agricultural industry, was the very foundation of the entire social constitution of the Ukraine-Rus." The reader is also referred at this point to Chapter Four, section on "Peasants," in this book.

21. Slavery and land availability: E. Bogart and D. Kemmerer, *Economic History of the American People*, New York-London-Toronto, 1951, pp. 396-402, "Economics of Slavery"; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 337-338.

22. "They were thus deprived of the rich mining areas. It must be added that, even if they had not been, they could hardly have made proper use of any deep mineral deposits since they were not sufficiently acquainted with the techniques of mining." Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 102.

23. M. Devnar-Zapolskii, *Istoria russkavo narodnovo kbaziistva*, Kiev, 1911, Vol I, pp. 248-249. Aristov, op. cit., pp. 111-112. G. Vernadsky, "Iron Mining and Iron Industries in Medieval Russia," in *Etudes dediees a la memoire d'Andre Andreades*, Athens, 1939, pp. 361-366. Also, Hrushevsky, Vol. I, pp. 264-266.

## Chapter VI. Urban Centers and their Industries.

1. *Poviest vremennikh let, po Lavrentievskamu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, under the years 882, 947, 988, and others; various towns and cities mentioned in various places; V. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia*, London-New York, 1911, Vol. I, pp. 52-54; P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 71-75, and 110-112; J. Comhaire and W. Cahnman, *How Cities Grew*, Madison, N.J., 1962, pp. 73-74.

2. P. Savitsky, "Podiem i depressii v drevnie-russkoi istorii," *Yevraziiskaia Kbronika*, II, 1936, pp. 65-100.

Notes to Chapter VI

3. Kluchevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 116; a general coverage of the political role of the people's meeting: S. Soloviov, *Istoria Rossii s drevnieisbikh vriemen*, 1894, Vol. I, pp. 694 and others; N. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainiskoho prava*, mimeographed writings, Munich, 1947, Vol. I, pp. 70-45; about the three elements of the Kievan political constitution: G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 177-186.
4. The people's meeting versus the Boyardom: M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1954, Vol. II, pp. 476-480. Longinov believed that the institution of the people's meeting was still influential throughout the 13th century in the Galician principality: A. Longinov, *Gramoti maloruskovo kniazia Yuria*, II, Moskow, 1887, pp. 19-20. Also pertaining to the problem: N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staats rechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, Graz, 1943 (doctoral dissertation), pp. 53-55.
5. Gardariki, a Scandinavian, identified the land of the Slavs as a land of towns or forts: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 361-362.
6. Thitmar of Merzeburg, *Chronicle*, written between 1012 and 1018: "The city of Chitau (Kiev), ... is extremely well fortified. ... In this great city are over 400 churches and 8 market places, and a great multitude of people." Quoted after V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953; pp. 36-37; D. Doroshenko, *Narys istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932, Vol. I, p. 76.
7. I. Kripiakovich, "Pobut," in *Istoria ukraininskoï kultury*, Liviv, 1937, p. 10.
8. Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 77. An excellent coverage of the old Ukrainian construction and architecture industry: V. Sichinsky, *Istoria ukrainiskoho mistetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I, pp. 13-56.
9. V. Kluchevskii, *Boyaraskaia дума drevniei Rusi*, Moscow, 1909, p. 13. M. Pokrovskii, *Ocherki istorii russkoï kultury*, Moscow, 1923, pp. 50-65. An agricultural interpretation of the Kievan material civilization: M. Dovnar-Zapolsky, *Istoria russkavo narodnavo kbaziitva*, Kiev, 1911, Vol. I, p. 266 in particular, otherwise, Chapters 3, 4, and 6; D. Bahalii, *Istoria Ukrainy na socialno-ekonomichnomu grunti*, 1928, Vol. I, pp. 259-264. Also, Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 99, and 110-111: "The most important factor in the dissolution of the old social forms ... was not the development of trade and the military commercial town ... but the most profound regeneration of the social activities arising from the main production basis of the national economy, agriculture." (99)
10. A. Zimin, ed., *Pamiatki prava kievskavo gosudarstva*, *Russkaia Pravda prostrannoï redakcii*, Moscow, 1952, art. 15, and other places. Also *Karamzinskii spisok*, art. 15: only twelve "hrivnia" had to be paid as blood money for a murder of an artisan, while in other cases the murder of a princely man or a free man, the death money amounted to 40 or even 80 hrivnia.

## Notes to Chapter VI

11. "What the city elders decide, this will be also followed by the suburbs": a quotation from *Laurentian chronicle*, which indicated an administrative subordination of the suburbs to the city. About the conditions of the medieval city: Hrushevsky, Vol. I, pp. 361-365; Comhaire, op. cit., pp. 71-75.
12. *Poviest vremennikh let*, op. cit., referred in many places to various trades, under the years 907, 988, 1016, and others. A. Garkavi, *Skazania muzul'manskikh pisatelei o slovianakh i russkikh*, St. Petersburg, 1870, Ibn-Fadlan, pp. 85-102. Al Masudi, pp. 125-141. Ibn-Dasta, pp. 262-270. Ibn-Khoradabih, pp. 48-49. Also other foreign travellers relative to the occupations of the Slavs. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio in Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. by J. Migne, CXIII, Book IX. Also V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, Chapter One, pp. 27-36.
13. Zimin, op. cit., art. 97; *Karamzinskii spisok*, arts. 12 and 69; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 340-344.
14. Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 114.
15. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 113.
16. S. Cross, *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, Harvard University, 1930, pp. 143-144. Garkavi, op. cit., p. 47. V. Sichinsky, *Naris ukrainskoi promislivosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 85-88.
17. "The copper axe gets spoiled if used to cut dry wood": a proverb quoted by the monk (later bishop), Cyril of Turiv, who was an outstanding preacher and writer of the 12th century. "Axe" is also mentioned in the *Poviest vremennikh let*, the Laurentian and Hipatian versions, in the *Paterik*, ed. by Abramovich, and in the relations of the Arab merchants; Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 16. The saw, however, first came into general use in the 16th century.
18. Until just before World War II there was in St. George's Cathedral in Lviv, West Ukraine, a churchbell dated 1341. This might serve as evidence of bell production in medieval Ukraine.
19. Zaloziecky, W., "Byzantinisch-ruthenische Kunst," *Deutschtum und Ausland*, Heft 28/29, Muenster in Westfalen, 1930; M. Holubets, "Mystetstvo," in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, p. 466: "The first stone and brick churches in Ukraine had the Byzantinian characteristics, but they could not be identified strictly with the church style of Byzantium proper, since not only Greece but also Christian Armenia, Georgia, and the Balkans, as well as the non-Christian cultures of Syria, Arabia, Iran, and India participated in shaping Ukrainian civilization. Therefore, the terminology "Byzantine" should be understood in its broadest sense, including the whole area where directly or indirectly the traditions of the old Hellenistic civilization were inherited and absorbed": Vernadsky, op. cit., pp. 256-263; V. Sichinsky, *Istoria ukrainskoho mystetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I.

## Notes to Chapter VI

20. Garkavi, op. cit., p. 266: "It is so cold in their country, that everyone has to dig a kind of a cellar in the earth, then cover it with a wooden roof, and he puts earth on it for protection."
21. Cross, op. cit., p. 220; *Poviest vremenikh let*, Laurentian version, under the year 1016.
22. Ibid., under the year 945: "... the princely palace was in the town ... and there was there a stone hall."
23. "In minor towns and rural districts ... wooden churches prevailed," said Vernadsky (op. cit., p. 113), making a special qualification for Russia proper. But this was true for Ukraine as well: V. Sichynsky, *Istoria Ukrainshomo miststva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I., chapter on wooden architecture.
24. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, op. cit., Chapter IX; V. Sichynsky, *Gubzbynci pro Ukrainu*, Lviv, 1938, pp. 26-27. The Emperor tells of boat construction, the organizational scheme of the entire commercial expedition down the river Dniepr, the difficulties of moving the flotilla below the Dniepr cataracts, and the course of the journey along the coasts of the Black Sea.
25. Garkavi, op. cit., p. 130: Masudi related, "In the upper part of the Khazar (Volga) river there is a connection with the Naitas (Black) Sea which is called 'Rus Sea,' since there nobody but the Rus navigates, which lives on one of the littorals."
26. *Ruska Pravda*, quoted after Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 114. A few centuries later, the Ukrainian Zaporozhe Cossacks used very similar river and sea going boats for their adventurous and military expeditions. This indicates the continuation of the same navigating traditions of the Ukrainian people. D. Evarnitskii, *Istoria Zaporozhskikh Kozakov*, St. Petersburg, 1892, I, pp. 454-456. G. de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, New York, 1959, pp. 464-465. "It (Cossack Host) is the tribe of the glorious Rus, descendants from the Jafet clan, which fought against the Greek empire by land and sea ..." *Memorandum of the Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy to the Polish authorities from 1621*.
27. "In the conditions of the Nomad way of life ceramics and the production of dishes from clay were not very useful, thus, the ceramic industry develops only in the atmosphere of a civilization of permanent settlements. Migrations regularly brought a decline in that art.": Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 262-263. He shared here Florinsky's views, expressed in *Pervobitie Slovia*, II, pp. 192-193. The oldest excavations in ceramics in Ukraine date as far back as 2,000-2,500 B.C., from the time of the Tripolitan culture, and disclose heavy Greek and Roman influence on the Ukrainian culture of that era.
28. Kripiakovich, op. cit., pp. 18-19. It seems to us that Vernadsky is incorrect when he says: "... there is no definite evidence that glass was produced in Kievan Russia." (op. cit., Vol. II, p. 116.) V. Sichynsky, *Naris z istorii ukrainshoi promislouos*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 36-39.

## Notes to Chapter VI

29. The archaeological excavations of the ancient Ukrainian gravemounds disclosed a great deal of Greek-made glassware in Ukraine in the Kievan eras: Sichinsky, *ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

30. In one of the early "laws" issued by Yaroslav the Wise some time prior to 1051, penalties were established for stealing "white pants or linen or petticoats."

31. About the military and naval use of linen, the chronicles related as follows: "And Oleh advised his men to build the wheels, and to put the boats on those wheels, and when a favorable wind came it blew against the sail cloth and thus they rode to the city (of Constantinople)." This was done because the Greeks had closed all their city gates on the Black Sea, making it impossible for the Ukrainians to enter the capital from that side. Thus, Oleh used the said device and induced the Greeks to surrender. In other places the old Ukrainians praised their strong linen sail cloth which could easily withstand a violent wind, while the silk sail cloth of the Greeks would be torn to pieces. : *Poviest vrieminnikh let, po Laurentievshamu spisku*, under the year 907, pp. 29-31. Ibn-Fadlan told about the widespread usage by the old Ukrainians of coarse woolen fabrics they themselves must have produced. : *Grakavi*, *op. cit.*, pp. 93, 96, and 98. The textile industry in Kievan Ukraine: Sichinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-61.

32. Kriplakevich, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

33. Aristov, *op. cit.*, p. 150. Lyashchenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

34. *Poviest vrieminnikh let*, as quoted, p. 82, under the year 985: "And Dobrinia said to Vladimir, 'Look, those people wear boots. They will give no tribute. We have to look for those who wear only the bast footwear (lapti)'."

## Chapter VII. Trade and Finance.

1. Yu. Lypa, *Prinznachennia Ukrainy*, New York, 1953, pp. 105-112: "The constitution of that traveling body (clan) of merchants (chumaki) was established and sanctioned by a tradition two thousand years old." p. 106.

2. "In the domestic trade, salt and metals must have been especially important, since as far as the consumer's needs were concerned, they were largely covered by local production." : Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 302. The trading routes received their names, particularly, from the chief articles which were handled through those channels. Thus, one was called "Salt route," another, "Iron route," since time immemorial in Ukraine. The reader is requested to compare the section on commerce in Chapter Three of this work. Also from the 15th to 18th century, metals and salt still occupied a predominant position in the "chumak" trade. : Lypa, *loc. cit.*

3. Domestic trade in the Kievan Ukraine: N. Aristov, *Promisblennost drevnei Rusi*, St. Petersburg, 1866, pp. 170-172; I. Kulischer, *Russische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Jena, 1925, Vol. I, pp. 103-105; M. Dovnar-Zapolsky, *Istoria russa-*

## Notes to Chapter VII

*kavo narodnavo kbazaiistva*, Kiev, 1911, Chapters 3 and 4; D. Bahalii, *Naris istorii Ukrainy na socialno-ekonomichnomu grunti*, 1928, Vol. I, pp. 277-294.

4. A. Zimin, *Pamiatki prava kievskavo gosudarstva*, *Russkaia Pravda prost-rannoï redakcii*, Moscow, 1952; arts. 35, 37, 38, 40-46, and a few others deal with thefts. The search for stolen goods was legally limited to the town and its vicinity.

5. A. Garkavski, *Skazania muzulmanskikh pisatelei o slovianakh i russskib*, St. Petersburg, 1870, Ibn Dasta quoted, p. 267: "They have a king whose name is Kahan-Rus; invade the Slavs ... and take them into slavery ... and sell them." V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 29; relations of Emperor Constantine Prophyrogenitus: "About the Rus who travel by boats from Rus to Constantinople..." "...All travel down the Dniepre river, and stop at the castele of Kiova. ... Their Slav subjects, some of whom are called Kryvteiny and Lenzniiny ..."

6. About the foreign trade of the Kievan Ukraine: Aristov, op. cit., pp. 183-258; Dovnar-Zapolsky, *ibid.*, and Chapter VI; Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 285-294; Kulischer, op. cit., pp. 118-157. The historical literature about the old Kievan trade is extensive: Garkavi, op. cit., Stüve, *Die Handelszuge der Araber unter den Abassiden durch Africa, Asien, und Westeuropa*, 1836; L. Goetz, *Deutsch-Russische Handelsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Luebeck, 1922. A. Szelagowski, *Najstarsze drogi z Polski na Wschod*, Krakov, 1909. M. Berezchkov, *O torgovle Rusi z Ganzoiu do kontsa XV veka*, St. Petersburg, 1879, and many other works.

7. E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine*, Leipzig, 1942, pp. 1-17. I. Mirchuk, "The Basic Traits of the Ukrainian People," in *Ukraine and its People*, Munich, 1949, pp. 35-54.

8. M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1954, Vol. I, p. 304.

9. N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 32 and 36; also, Mirchuk, op. cit.

10. About the favorable economic and legal position of foreign merchants in Kiev: Zimin, op. cit., arts. 54 and 55; *Russkaia Pravda*, *Karamzinskii spisok*, arts. 44-45, 47-48, 66, 68-69; also, M. Vladimirskii-Budanov, *Kristomatia po istorii russkavo prava*, Kiev, 1908, Vol. I, pp. 100-108. Similar preferential treatment was granted by the city of Smolensk to German merchants in 1229.

11. *Poviest vrieminnikh let, po Laurentievskomu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, for the year 945.

12. Hrushevsky, Vol. I, p. 286; he quotes Margolin's *Try yevreiskie putisbestvienniki XI i XIIst.*, 1881, p. 138. About the Bizantinian trade: Garkavi, op. cit., pp. 48-49; Ibn-Khordadbe; pp. 125-141: Al-Massudi; pp. 63-64. Ibn-Jacob; *Hipatievskaia letopis*, St. Petersburg, 1871, pp. 19, 39-40, 44, 46.

## Notes to Chapter VII

13. "And Sviatoslav said to his mother and his boyars, 'I don't like to live in Kiev. I want to live in Pereyaslav on the Danube, which is the center of my earth. There all goods are brought; gold, fabrics, vine and various fruits from Greece, silver and horses from Bohemia and Hungary, and skins, wax, honey, and slaves from Rus.'": *Poviest vremennikh let*, under the year 969. Economic motivation of the early wars of the Kievan dukes: G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, pp. 34-38, and 45-47.
14. A brief coverage of the Crimean trade: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 289-290; also, W. de Rubrucus, *Rescueil des voyages publie par la societe de geographie*, IV, 1839, pp. 215-219.
15. Ibn-Khordadbeh refers to Ukrainian merchants trading in the Caspian area, and even bringing their goods on camels as far as Bagdad: Garkavi, op. cit., p. 49. About the Arab reports concerning the commercial relations of the old Ukrainian Slavs: Garkavi, op. cit., and Sichynsky, op. cit.
16. Garkavi, *ibid.*, pp. 85-102. Ibn-Fadlan, *Zapiski*: "They (Rus) come from their land, anchor on the Ityl, which is a great river, and build large houses on its banks; and in one house they live ten, twelve, or even more men together."
17. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrado Imperio, Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. by J. Migne, CXIII, Book IX. I. Kripiakevich, "Pobut," in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, p. 14.
18. "... the Russians tried desperately to keep the road to the Caspian open as well, and it is from this point of view that we may best understand the interest of the Russian princes of the 10th and 11th centuries in Tmutorokan and the importance of that city in ... the early Kievan period." : Vernadsky, op. cit., Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, p. 118. The struggle for Tmutorokan: *ibid.*, pp. 64-69, and 74-79.
19. Ibn-Khordadbeh, loc. cit.
20. In 1141 there was a famine in Novgorod the Great because the Ukrainian grain transports did not arrive due to military developments; Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 16. In 1279 grain was sent to Yatvingians by Prince Volodimir of Volhinia to help them in distress: Galician-Volhinian chronicle, year 1279; also, Kripiakevich, loc. cit.
21. L. Goetz, *Deutsch-Russische Handelsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Lubeck, 1922. T. Ediger, *Russlands alteste Beziehungen zu Deutschland, Frankreich und die romische Kurie*, Halle, 1911. Regensburg held the key position in the early Ukrainian-German trade relations; V. Vasilevskii, "Drevnia torgovlia Kieva s Regensburgom," *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvещения*, 1898, pp. 121-150; also Szelagowski, op. cit.



## Notes to Chapter VII

22. D. Prozorovskii, *Moneta i ves v Rossii*, St. Petersburg, 1865. I. Tolstoi, "Drevnie russkie monety," *Zapisky, Russkoié Arkheologicheskoié Obschbestvo*, 6, 1893, pp. 310-382.
23. Rubricus, op. cit., p. 329
24. M. Holubez, *Velyka, Istoria Ukrainy*, Lviv, 1935, p. 276.
25. *Russkaia Istoricheskaja Biblioteka*, VI, p. 24; a very good and concise coverage of the monetary system of Kievan Ukraine: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 347-352; he mentioned especially the difficulties involved in deducing the value of monetary units from written sources, like *Ruska Pravda*, and to relate this to the archeological monetary findings.
26. G. Ostrogorsky, "Lohne und Preise in Byzanz," in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 32, 1932, pp. 293-333; also, C. Zacharia von Lingenthal, *Geschichte des griechisch-romischen Rechts*, Berlin, 1892, p. 311; the relation was stressed by Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 125.
27. *Poviest vremennikh let* reports for the year 1075 a visit of the German Emperor's envoy to Sviatoslav's court in Kiev. The envoy was astonished by the enormous accumulation of wealth, gold, silver, and fabrics, by the prince. The Novgorodian chronicle relates that in 1050 Sadko the Wealthy erected a wooden church in Novgorod. In 1115 another merchant, his name unknown, built there a stone church; in 1192 a merchant's daughter, Shirozhkina, also built a stone church in that city. Since Thitmar counted four hundred churches in the Kiev of his times, no doubt some of these were also erected by rich merchants. But stone churches, as a rule, were erected by the sovereign dukes. : V. Sichynsky, *Istoria ukrainskoho mystetstva*, Vol. I, Architecture, New York, 1956, pp. 29-57.
28. M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskoho prava*, Munich, 1947, Vol. I, p. 60: "At that time the princely income was not separated from the public income of the state; revenue from the private estates of the prince and the tax collections were kept in the princely treasury, and from that source the prince covered also his private as well as the public expenditures for the needs of the country. Whether there was any separation between the first and the second, it is hard to say." As a matter of fact, the same officials administered the affairs of the princely household and the state. : N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, Graz, 1943, pp. 64-66. M. Vladimirovskii-Budanov, *Obzor istorii russkavo prava*, Petrograd and Kiev, 1915, pp. 82-89.
29. M. Koneczny, *Dzieje Rosji*, Warszawa, 1917, Vol. I, p. 86.
30. *Poviest vremennikh let, po Lavrentievskomu spisku*, St. Petersburg, 1910, years 883, 885, 945, 985, and later.

## *Notes to Chapter VII*

31. *Povest*, *ibid.*, year, 946; Vernadsky erroneously identifies the tribute (dan) with the capitation (poludia); *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 190. However, these concepts should be strictly differentiated. Vladimirkii-Budanov, *loc. cit.*, on early finances. V. Kluchevsky, *A History of Russia*, London-New York, 1911, Vol. I, p. 79.

32. The people of Kiev complained about these excessive fees, for example, in 1093. : Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 258.

## *Chapter VIII. The Political Background and the Social Structure.*

1. N. Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 8-9. The author stresses there the difference in the impact of the Mongol rule upon the Ukrainian South and the Russian North. A detailed analysis of the Mongol era in East Europe: M. Hrushevsky, *History of the Ukraine-Rus*, New York, 1954, Vol. III, pp. 143-191.

2. In the middle of the 19th century, Polish historians began to emphasize and exaggerate the degree of the Mongol devastation in Ukraine in order to establish the theory of their civilization mission in the East. Presumably, the Polish rule brought economic and cultural revival to Ukraine, where nothing was left after the terrible invasion. The Russians overstressed the impact of the invasion in order to affirm the hypothesis of the Russian origin of the Kievan Empire. The Pogodin-Sobolevskii theory was discussed at length in Chapters One and Four of this volume.

3. Johann de Plamo Carpini, *Geschichte der Mongolen und Reisebericht*, trans. by F. Risch, Leipzig, 1930. Careful analysis of Carpini's journey accounts does not indicate any northbound emigration from Ukraine or complete depopulation of the Kievan regions. Pogodin presented his theory for the first time in the form of a letter to Sroznievskii in 1851, and then in printed form in 1856. Pogodin's theory was repudiated by Ukrainian historians: M. Maksymovich, "O Mnimom zapustinii Ukrainy v nashestvie Batlevo," in *Russkii Besid*, 1857; M. Vladimirkii-Budanov, "Nasielenie Yugo-Zapadnoi Rossii ot poloviny XIII v. do poloviny XV v.," in *Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, part VII, Vol. I, 1886, and others.

4. Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 154, pointed out the relatively lenient character of the Mongol domination.

5. In fact, Daniel extended his authority not only over the Galician and Volhynian territories, but also over Kiev, Podolia, Carpathian Ukraine, and even over some eastern Polish areas, including Lublin. He initiated the negotiations with the Holy See to unite the Orthodox Ukrainians with Catholic Rome. His campaign against the self-governing communities under Tartar protection resulted in a major war with the Khan: G. Vernadsky and M. Karpovich, *A History of Russia*, Vol. III, *The Mongols and Russia*, New Haven-London, 1953, pp. 146-147, 157-159.

*Notes to Chapter VIII*

6. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 181: "Thus, after the Mongol Invasion, the Dniepr Ukraine disintegrated; Kiev and Prereyaslav territories disintegrated into tiny town communities, without any ducal authorities and subjected directly to the supremacy of the Tartars, Chernihiv disintegrated into a very large number of petty principalities."
7. M. Chubaty, *Oblad Istorii Ukrainskobo Prava*, Munich, 1947, Vol. II, pp. 59-63.
8. The terminology in the case of Yerodiakon Yakin, *Moskovskie Cbtenia*, 1883, I, p. 2.
9. S. Kutrzeba, *Przywilej jedlenski z 1430 roku i nadanie prawa polskiego dla Rusi Krakow*, 1911. Chabaty, op. cit., pp. 34-35. A detailed analysis of the first phase of the Polish drive to dominate Galicia: H. Paskiewicz, *Polityka Kazimierza Wielkiego*, Warszawa, 1925; he said that Kazimierz's policy toward Galicia was a direct act of violation of all agreements and contracts, only to dominate that country. (p. 156). A concise coverage of the subject: N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, (Doctorial Dissertation), Graz, 1943, pp. 70-78. I. Vitanovich, *Naris Socialno-ekonomichnoi Ukrainskoi istorii*, Lviv, 1934, pp. 10-17: about the economic decline of the country.
10. Concerning the vitality of the Ukrainian ethnic element: S. Rudnitsky, *Ukraine, the Land and Its People*, New York, 1918, pp. 176-189 and 211-220, chapters on the historico-political traditions and aspirations, and on the relations between the soil and the people of Ukraine. See also, above, Chapter Two, "Vitality."
11. O. Ohloblin, *Dumky pro Kbmelnichbinu*, New York, 1957, pp. 7-27.
12. Chubaty, op. cit., p. 68: The names such as Bey, Halibey and Halamay, still prevailing among the Ukrainians, indicate that development.
13. Yu. Lypa, *Priznabennia Ukrainy*, New York, 1953, pp. 140-145. "E.g., and now, when the Crimean Tartars are in the process of a rapid decline, we may draw some conclusions from the facts of their three-centuries-long raids. They were those nomads who terrorized the Ukrainian country most of all. And, according to the anthropologists and ethnographers, their influence has been equal almost to nothing." Also Chirovsky, loc. cit.
14. An excellent coverage of the nationality problem within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was given by M. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, New York, 1955, pp. 235-293. Also D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warszawa, 1932, Vol. I, pp. 105-143.
15. In 1340, Kazimierz (Casimirus) of Poland promised to keep and to respect the rights and traditions of the Ukrainian people: J. Abraham, *Organizacja kos-*

## Notes to Chapter VIII

*ciola laciniskiego na Rusi*, Lwow, 1904, p. 218. But, this contractual promise was soon broken: M. Hrushevsky, "Szlachta ukraińska na przelomie XVI-XVII w.," in *Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Włodzimierza Antonowicza, Sawiciego, i Tadeusza Rylskiego*, pod redakcją, W. Lipińskiego, Kijów, 1912. Also, M. Holubez, *Za ukraiński Lviv*, Lviv, 1927. O. Halecki, *Das Nationalitätenproblem im alten Polen*, Kraków, 1916. J. Ptasnik, *Miasta i mieszczaństwo w dawnej Polsce*, Kraków, 1934. Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 36-37, 64-65.

16. S. Kutrzeba, *Historja ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, pp. 88, 173-174. K. Chodynicki, *Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska, 1370-1632*. Warszawa, 1934. M. Chubaty, "Katolicka cerkwa," *Zabauka ukraińska encyklopedia*, Lviv, Vol. III, pp. 901-902. V. Bidnov, *Pravoslavna Tserkva, Zabauka ukraińska encyklopedia*, Lviv, Vol. III, pp. 915-919.

17. Ptasnik, op. cit., pp. 285, 332, 335, and other places. Also J. Caro, *Geschichte Polens*, Gotha, 1863, Vol. III, p. 59. "The Ruthenians seemed to have an inferior position in the constitutional and social developments and relations of the city, but not with respect to their numerical proportion of the population." : Holubez, op. cit.

18. Ptasnik, loc. cit.

19. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1955, Vol. V, 370: "The founder—a German or Pole, however, in the 14th and 15th centuries usually not a Ukrainian, ... received a privilege and an advice to establish a village ... *in iure teutonico* ... "

20. *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Lwow, 1868-1935, I-XVI; Ukrainian names among the gentry and the slow process of Polonization: *Akta*, Vol. VII, no. 55, 53, 63; IX, no. 81, 110; Vol. XIII, nr. 1491, and many other cases of strengthening the Polish elements at the expense of the Ukrainian nationality. M. Vladimírskii-Budanov, op. cit. A. Linnitchenko, *Cberti iz istorii soslovii v Yugo-Zapadnoi Galickoi Rusi XIV-XV v.*, Warszawa, 1874.

21. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 99: the author quotes the old Lithuanian principle of the 14th and 15th centuries: "We do not interfere with the old customs, and we do not introduce any new ones."

22. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukraińshoho prava*, Munich, Vol. II, 1947. p. 73.

23. V. Antonovich, "Proiskhozhdenie zaporoskavo kozachestva," in *Kievskaja Starina*, 1884, VIII and IX. Doroshenko, op. cit., pp. 145-156, supplied a general survey of various theories concerning the beginnings of the Cossacks.

24. The decree of Lviv's bishop, Gedeon Balaban, from 1587: Instruction must be made available to everybody "of every class, the poor will get a free education, and the rich will pay tuition." No difference will be made in the treatment of pupils of different social segments.

## Notes to Chapter VIII

25. Kutrzeba, op. cit., p. 169. O. Balzer, *Verfassungsgeschichte Polens*, Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaft, Krakau, 1906, p. 123. Only in some particular cases the aristocratic title of "Prince" was retained for the ancient families, descending from the old Lithuanian and Ukrainian ruling dynasties of Gedimin and Rurik.
26. Linnichenko, op. cit., pp. 25-52. Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 80-82.
27. O. Balzer, *Skartabelat w ustroju szlachectwa polskiego*, Krakow, 1911. Ennoblements were usually granted in times of war, and they were largely limited to Catholics.
28. Exemption was made by Polish law only for the city of Lviv. The townspeople of Lviv (Lwow) could own landed properties: Kutrzeba, op. cit., p. 170. About the personal and property rights of the gentry: *ibid.*, section on "Szlachta" (gentry); briefly on the subject matter: Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 75-78.
29. Soil bondage was finally introduced by a constitutional law in 1496, and later decrees of 1503, 1510, and 1511 only extended and enlarged the burden of serfdom: Kutrzeba, op. cit., pp. 96-97. Linnichenko, op. cit., p. 130. The growth of serfdom in Poland was closely connected with the development of her commercial agriculture for export of grain to West Europe: J. Rutkowski, *Poddasstwo wloscian w XVIII w. w Polsce i niektorych krajach Europy*, Poznan, 1921, p. 21. O. Balzer, *Verfassungsgeschichte Polens*, Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaft, Krakow, 1906, p. 123. Of course, the rich, black soil of Ukraine was enormously important to the agricultural export economy of the Commonwealth.
30. Linnichenko, op. cit., pp. 79-80; the remnants of slavery remained until the second half of the 15th century: *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie*, Vol. XII, No. 120, 435 and 480; Vol. XIII, No. 7; Vol. XIV, No. 263, 918, 943, and many other court and administrative cases recorded; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 112-116.
31. *Lithuanian Statute* of 1588, Chapt. XII, art. 21, definitely liquidated the status of slavery, and made *de iure* all previous slaves peasants of a lower order.
32. *Lithuanian Statute* of 1529, Chapt. XI, arts. 7 and 9; of 1566, Chapt. XII, art. 7, limitation of the half-free status.
33. Rutkowski, op. cit., p. 63. Kutrzeba, op. cit., p. 180. Linnichenko, op. cit., p. 130. A comprehensive coverage, J. Rafacz, *Ustroj wsi samorzadowej malopolskiej w XVIII w.*, Lublin, 1922.
34. About the low efficiency of unfree and half-free labor in general: E. Bogart and D. Kemmerer, *Economic History of the American People*, New York-London-Toronto, 1955, pp. 386-410.
35. Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 82-84.

*Notes to Chapter VIII*

36. Kutrzeba, op. cit., p. 170; the privilege was granted to the city of Lviv as a reward for its armed resistance against the Cossack armies in 1648-1649.
37. Kutrzeba, op. cit., pp. 102-103; also, J. Rutkowski, *Skup solectw w Polsce w wieku XVI*, Poznan, 1921.
38. Actually, a continuous trend to lower the import tariffs in order to benefit the gentry, and a maintenance of the export tariffs, as well as government regimentation of commerce by statutes, price fixing, and market policing, finally ruined the town. Free competition was not allowed.
39. The obligation of the armed defense of the town by the craft guilds: Ptasnik, op. cit., pp. 152-153; various activities of the guilds: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 111-114. The merchant guilds first developed in the 17th century: Ptasnik, *ibid.*, p. 170.
40. Religious and national discrimination in the guilds: *Aktu grodzkie i ziemskie*, Vol. VI, no. 1. Houbez, op. cit. Same, ed. *Velyka Istoria Ukrainy*, Lviv, 1935, pp. 439-442.
41. O. Balzer, *Sadownictwo ormianskie w sredniowiecznym Lwowie*, Lwow, 1909, p. 164.
42. S. Kutrzeba, *Historia zrodel prawa polskiego*, Lwow-Warszawa-Krakow, 1925, Vol. II, pp. 287-297; also, Balzer, op. cit.
43. Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (also in Ukraine): S. Kutrzeba, *Historja ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, pp. 109-111, 185-187; same, *Sprawa zydowska w Polsce*, Lwow, pp. 1-60. M. Balaban, *Zydzi lwowscy na przelomie XVI-XVII w.*, Lwow, 1906. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 254-260, and 651-652.
44. The most significant privileges which established the legal and social position of the Jews in the Commonwealth were those of Prince Boleslav—from 1264, King Casimir the Great—from 1334 and 1367, Vitovt of Lithuania—from 1388, and King Casimir Jagiellonczyk—from 1453. The privilege from 1367 was supposedly forged, but later it was accepted by the Polish government at its full face value as a precedent for subsequent grants and privileges: S. Kutrzeba, *Historia zrodel prawa polskiego*, Lwow-Warszawa-Krakow, 1925, Vol. II, pp. 297-318.
45. "It seemed that the old Polish economic system was based on two elements—latifundium land holdings and forced labor," which resulted in the ruin of the small-scale (peasant) land holdings: M. Slabchenko, *Organizacja gospodarstwa Ukrainy*, Part One, *bogodarstw betmansobchyny*, Odesa, 1923, pp. 8 and 16. P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 259-261.
46. *Ibid.*, pp. 251-252.

## Notes to Chapter VIII

47. Chubaty, op. cit., pp. 169-172. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. V., pp. 631-634. Hrushevsky inclined to accept the existence of a specific Lithuanian "feudalism," M. Dovnar-Zapolskii, *Gosudarstvennoye kbazialstvo Velikavo Kniazbestva Litovskavo pri Yagellonakh*, 1901, Vol. I, pp. 85, and others. The author does not deny certain feudal elements in the economy of Lithuania, but he is unwilling to accept the theory of a feudal Lithuanian-Ukrainian Commonwealth; neither is Liubavskii. I. Balinsky, "Naris z istorii feodalnogo prava v Polshchi, Litvi, ta na Ukraini," *Zbirnyk Socialno-Ekonomichnobo Viddilu*, Ukrainaska Akademia Nauk, No. 6, Kiev, 1926, pp. 252-273; the reader is referred to the section on feudalism in Chapter Four of this book.

48. M. Liubavskii, "Nachalnaia istoria maloruskavo kozachestva," in *Zburnal ministerstva narodnovo prosvieshchbenia*, 1895, Vol. III. V. Antonovich, "Proiskhozhenie zaporoskavo kozachestva," in *Kievskata Starina*, 1884, bk. VIII and IX. Doroshenko, op. cit., pp. 145-160.

49. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VII, 1956, pp. 75-81: The name "Cossack," its history and meaning.

50. About the growth, political ambitions, and wars of the Cossacks: *Ibid.*, pp. 135-252. Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 261-263. The Polish and Russian historiographies evaluate the Cossacks highly negatively, as an anarchistic and destructive element, which was unwilling to subordinate to any authority (Szajnocha, Korzon, Soloviov, Kliuchevskii), while the Ukrainian historians appraised them very positively and favorably, as the heroic bearers of Ukrainian independence, and the warriors for the freedom and sovereignty of Ukraine (Hrushevsky, Doroshenko, Antonovich, and others). Obviously, the conflicting political interests of those three nationalities decidedly influenced their respective interpretations of the socio-political phenomenon of the Cossack Host.

## Chapter IX. Extractive Industries of the Economy of the European Frontiers.

1. M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus*, New York, 1954, Vol. III, pp. 333-338. The rarity of any major famine in Ukraine seems to be another convincing argument against Pogodin's theory of migration. Since the famines in the Russian North were frequent, it seems highly improbable that the people would leave fertile Ukrainian areas and settle in the North under Mongol oppression and the much more intensive threat of famine; I. Vitanovich, *Naris socialno-ekonomichnoi Ukrainshoi i istorii*, Lviv, 1934, pp. 13-20.

2. I. Krypiakovich, "Pobut," in *Istoria Ukrainshoi kultury*, ed. I. Krypiakovich, Lviv, 1937, pp. 83-84; P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 255-256: "In the early fourteenth century Galicia still retained its independent existence, ... Under the favorable climatic conditions and fertile soil found there, agriculture not only became the main branch of the national economy but also succeeded in improving its technique .." (255). The names and differentiation between the "right-bank" and "left-bank" Ukraine were created in the seventeenth century, referring to the areas on the right and left banks of the river Dniepr.

## Notes to Chapter IX

3. M. Liubavskii, "Nachalnaia istoria malorusskavo kazachestva," in *Zburnal ministerstva narodnovo prosvieshcheniia*, 1895, Vol. VII, p. 264.
4. *Akty litovskoi metriki*, ed. by F. Leontovich, Warszawa, 1896-1897, Issues I-II, No. 37, 68, 223, 235, 299, 314, and other cases; also *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, 1859-1893, Parts III-VIII, Prt. IV, Vol. I, pp. 44-49, and Prt. VII, Vol. I, pp. 589-590. In all the recorded deeds, descriptions, and grants, from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century, forest and fishery rights were stressed, and farming scarcely mentioned.
5. Krypiakovich, loc. cit., M. Slabchenko: *Organizatsiia Hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part One, "Hospodarstvo hetmanshchiny," Odesa, 1923, p. 2-5.
6. D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*. Vols. I-II, Warszawa, 1932, Vol. II, pp. 225-227.
7. *Lithuanian Statute*, 1529, Chapter VIII, art. 11, Chapter IX, art. 20; *Lithuanian Statute*, 1588, Chapter IX, arts. 18 and 19, Chapter X, arts. 3, 5, 13, 14, 17, 18, and in many other places of the code the property rights on forests, wild animals, and birds were legally protected; also, R. Kobrynsky, "Lis i myslivstvo v davnim ukrainskim pravi," in *Ukrainskyi lisnytskii almanakh*, New York, 1958, pp. 65-76.
8. *Lithuanian Statute*, 1529, Chapter IX, art. 1; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 165.
9. *Ibid.*, Chapter IX, arts. 9 and 10.
10. Krypiakovich, op. cit. pp. 89-90.
11. V. Sichynsky, *Chuzhynetsi pro Ukrainu*, Lviv, 1938, pp. 49-56, and 66-79; information about Ukraine by M. Litvin, B. Vigenere, and others, from the sixteenth century, and *Description of Ukraine* by Beauplan; also G. V. de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, New York, 1959, pp. 448 and 473.
12. Sichynsky, op. cit., Michael Litvin's report from about the 1550's, on his journey in Ukraine, p. 50: "Wild goats come from the steppes and woods at winter time in such quantities, that every peasant kills them in thousands each year."
13. Trade with articles of hunting, fur and meat: W. Lozinski, "Kupiectwo Lwowakie w XVI wieku," *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 1891, III, pp. 438-439 and others; Sichynsky, op. cit.; also M. Dovnar-Zapolskii indicates trade with articles of the extractive industry *Gosudarst-viennole khaziatstvo velikavo kiazhestva litovskavo pri yagtiellonakh*, 1901, Vol. I, pp. 322, and others.
14. *Lithuanian Statute*, 1588, Chapter X, arts. 3, 6, 13, and 14 established the legal protection of apiculture. Violation of these rights was punished by law, primarily by prescribed monetary compensation; Kobrynsky, loc. cit.



## Notes to Chapter IX

15. The predominance of extensive economies: *Akty litovskoi metriki*, like above, reference 4, also Nos. 571 and 573; Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 256-257; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 147.
16. Sichynsky, loc. cit.; de Beauplan, loc. cit.
17. Krypiakovich, op. cit., p. 95.
18. de Beauplan, op. cit., pp. 463-464, and 473; Krypiakovich, ibid.
19. An excellent analysis of economic transitions in Ukraine, from the old extensive system to modern commercial agriculture can be found in Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus*, Vol. VI, pp. 141-212: Chapter II, "Farm Economy."
20. "The land is so fruitful, it often produces such abundance of corn, they know not what to do with it ... and that they will not work but just when necessity obliges them, ...": de Beauplan, op. cit., p. 448; also, "They say, that the soil of that country is so good and so fertile, that if a plow would be left in the fields, so after two or three days it would be covered so well by a new grass that nobody would find it": B. de Vigenere, *La description du Royaume de Pologne*, Paris, 1573, quoted after Sichynsky, op. cit., pp. 52-53; Slabchenko, op. cit., p. 1.
21. Krypiakovich, op. cit., p. 90. According to Vernadsky, buckwheat was raised as early as the Kievan period. Actually, buckwheat was first cultivated in Ukraine at the end of the fifteenth century, and later that crop became very popular: G. Vernadsky, *A History of Russia*, Vol. II, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven-London, 1951, p. 109.
22. A. Szelagowski, *Pieniadz i przewrot cen w XVI i XVII wieku w Polsce*, 1902, p. 155. One lasht was approximately equal to 25 hundredweights (centners). As a matter of fact, Polish historiography did very little, as Hrushevsky said, to research the problem of money and prices in old Poland.
23. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 258. A brief but good description of economic developments in Ukraine under Polish domination: Doroshenko, op. cit., pp. 137-143. A documentary source material for the social and economic conditions in Ukraine in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: A. Jablonowski, "Ziemie ruskie, Wolyn, Podle"; *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. XIX, Warszawa, 1889, Ukraina, Klow-Braclaw, *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. II, Warszawa, 1897.
24. U. Werdum, traveling in Ukraine between 1670 and 1672, quoted after Krypiakovich, op. cit., p. 91.
25. Ibid., p. 92.
26. I. Baranovich, *Magnatskoe kbxiazstvo na yuge Volintv XVIII v.*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 105-116.

## Notes to Chapter IX

27. Iron ore deposits were scattered throughout the forest areas of Ukraine, especially in the Peremishl, Lviv, Belz, Kholm, and Polesia districts: A. Jablonowski, *Czerwona Rus, Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. XVIII, Warszawa, 1888, p. 459, Throughout these areas numerous villages and townships even nowadays are called "Rhuden," "Rudnik," "Rudki," these names being derived from the word "ruda" meaning "iron ore" in the Ukrainian language. About the importation of iron: Hrushevsky, op. cit., p. 219; O. Ohloblin, *Dumki pro Kmelnicbcbinu*, New York, 1957; pp. 12-14, stressed the enormous growth of iron mining and metalurgy in Ukraine, in all her parts and provinces. He said: "While at the end of the sixteenth century the number of iron mines probably did not exceed ten, then on the eve of the national revolution it increased to one hundred." (p. 13); V. Sichinsky, *Narisi z istorii Ukrainshoi promyslovotsi*, pp. 87-88: iron extraction and processing; Lozinski, op. cit., p. 433.

28. de Beauplan, op. cit., p. 448: "They are very expert at preparing of saltpetre, whereof there is a great plenty in those parts, and make excellent cannon-powder"; *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. XVI, p. 421.

20. Ibid.

30. S. Kutrzeba, *Handel Polski ze Wschodem w wiekach srednich*, Krakow, 1903, p. 60 and following; the same, "Handel Krakowa w wiekach srednich," *Rozprawy wydzialu historycznego*, XLIV, 1902, p. 133 and following; *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vols. II and VII, Warszawa, reference to salt mining in various places; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 212-219; salt mining in the Kievan era: N. Aristov, *Promisblennost drevnei Rusi*, St. Petersburg, 1866, pp. 68-73.

31. The same techniques of boiling out water and dirt to get edible salt were also used in the Kievan time: Aristov, loc. cit.

32. *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. II, p. 57.

33. The idea of bringing wood from other areas, where forests were not yet devastated by wasteful exploitation, however, did not gain popular acceptance, because of the administrative difficulties resulting from private renting of the royal estates, and resulting conflict of private interests involved. This difficulty certainly affected the whole business negatively.

## Chapter X. Industrial Growth

1. M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus*, New York, 1955, Vol. VI, pp. 83-84; M. Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskobo prava*, Munich, 1947, Vol. II, pp. 82-85; also, S. Kutrzeba, *Historia ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, pp. 105-109.

2. V. Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953; p. 53: Mueller, *Memoirs*; p. 54: Lassota, *Tagebuch*, p. 64: Horsey, *Voyages*; G. de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, New York, 1959, pp. 447, 450, 454,

## Notes to Chapter X

and numerous cities named in his map of Ukraine; *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie*, Vols. II, no. 1, 5, 11; III, no. 18, 97; VI, no. 105, and in many other places, refer to various Ukrainian towns.

3. Sichynsky, op. cit., pp. 40-51; Michael the Lithuanian, *Diary*; p. 53; Mueller, *Memoirs*; Michael the Lithuanian said: "...Kiev is filled with imported merchandise, ... on this route all oriental merchandise, such as precious metal, stones, silk and silk textiles, incense, perfume, saffron, pepper, and other spices from Asia, Persia, India, Arabia and Syria go to the north to Moscovia, Pskov, Sweden and Denmark."

4. J. Ptasnik, *Miasta i mieszczanstwo w dawnej Polsce*, Krakow, 1934, pp. 152-153, and 170; also, I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevich), "Pobut," pp. 81-82, in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, ed. by Tyktor, Lviv, 1937.

5. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 233: "... economy and industry in the hands of the gentry developed into a stimulus for an enormous devastation of the natural resources of the country, ... Having brought their own trade and mercantile population to a decline, not having any ability and eagerness of their own to facilitate the growth of trade and commerce, the gentry simply exhausted the country, its population, and its economy, ..."; a devastation was going on in the forest economy, *ibid.*, pp. 183-191, in the production and exportation of grain, *ibid.*, pp. 193-203; M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizatsia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Odesa, 1923, Part I, pp. 10-13.

6. In the West, the crafts and craft guilds developed along with the growth of the over-all economic importance of the town and townspeople, while the transplanting of the western patterns into Ukraine did not find the same favorable environment. Only in Lviv, and in a few West Ukrainian cities, therefore, the crafts attained a relatively high level of development. And even there, the crafts were forced to the niveau of the bare subsistence minimum by social discrimination and regimentation.

7. *Pomniki dziejowe Lwowa*, Vol. III, municipal accounts of 1414-1426; Beauplan, op. cit., p. 74, said: "It is therefore to be understood, that among these people in general there are men expert in all sorts of trades ... as house and ship-carpenters, cartrights, smiths, armourers, tanners, curriers, shoemakers, coopers, tailors ... they are all ingenious enough, but they go no further than what is necessary ..." Obviously, the adverse circumstances for any development of trades were the cause of their relative backwardness; about the terminology: Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 97.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 102: "Lviv was the center of those crafts. Lviv's swordmakers with pride recalled in 1590 ... that the craftsmen from Lviv always manufactured the best arms."

9. *Loc. cit.*; also the same, ed., *Istoria ukrainskobo viiska*, Winnipeg, 1953, pp. 147-149; "In Ukraine, the first muskets appeared in Lviv, in 1394 ... In

## Notes to Chapter X

1468, there was in Lviv the first municipal workshop established to manufacture muskets and cannons for the city and various castles in the neighborhood"; G. Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*. New York, 1959, p. 448.

10. Kripiakevich, "Pobut," in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, p. 102.

11. Grajowski's order from 1564, in *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rosii*, VII, Vol. II, pp. 351-352; Relation of Lavrentii, forest master from Velunch, in *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rosii*, VII, Vol II, p. 317; *Zrodla dziejowe*, III, pp. 192 and 333; VII, p. 25; V. pp. 119-120 and 131, and many other places; a general analysis: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 184-191, and 233.

12. U. Werdum, who traveled extensively in Ukraine in the years 1670-1672, told about the broad use of wood in the economy and households of the people.

13. V. Sichynsky, *Istoria ukrainskoho mystetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I, pp. 57-69; W. Zalozecki, *Gotische Baukunst in Osteuropa*, Kolon, 1932.

14. Sichynsky, op. cit., pp. 69-81: "The Renaissance came to Ukraine at the beginning of the sixteenth century, coinciding with the development of the towns ..."

15. Ibid.

16. Sichynsky, op. cit., pp. 96-111; the same, *Ukrainske dereviane budivnytstvo*, Lviv, 1936.

17. V. Sichynsky, "Keramika," in *Encyklopedia ukrainovnavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, pp. 301-302; Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 103; On glass: V. Sichynsky, *Naris z istorii ukrainskoi promyslovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 22-23.

18. Kripiakevich, loc. cit., p. 98.

19. A. Jablonowski, "Rus' Czerwona," in *Zrodla dziejowe*, 1903, Vol. XVIII, p. 132; the same, *Wolyn i Podole*, *Zrodla dziejowe*, 1889, Vol. XIX, p. 43; About the rentals and payments: *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. II, pp. 297-298.

20. M. Dovnar-Zapolskii, *Gosudarstvennoie kbaziaistvo Velikavo Kniazbestva Litovskavo*, Kiev, 1901, Vol. I, p. 419; Hrushevsky, op. cit., p. 222.

21. "During the fairs, the peasants also bought bread baked in the city," Hrushevsky, op. cit., p. 99.

22. Beauplan, op. cit., p. 448: "There is nobody among them, of what age, or condition soever, that does not strive to outdo another in drinking and carousing effectively ..." He refers in a few places to the drinking habits: pp. 468-469.

23. Dovnar-Zapolskii, op. cit., p. 370.

## Notes to Chapter X

24. W. Lozinski, *Patryciat i mieszczaństwo lwowskie*, 1892, p. 48, tells the story of a mercantile agent of a nobleman, Herbert, who forged the municipal seal and attempted to sell wax in an illegal way, and was sentenced to death by hanging for the crime. Similar control of exportation was also introduced in the Lithuanian areas: Dovnar-Zapolskii, op. cit., p. 472.
25. Dovnar-Zapolskii, op. cit., p. 441; T. Lubomirski, "Starostwo ratenskie," *Biblioteka Warszawska*, 1855, II, p. 219; Lubomirski said that in this particular area (district of Raten) brewing was free. The principle applied similarly to other provinces.
26. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 227-229; Kutrzeba, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 190: About the lease system in the manorial industries: I. Baranovich, *Magnat-skoie kbatziaistvo na yuge Volini v XVIII v.* Moscow, 1955, pp. 31, 117-137; the rent-lease system was perfected in the next period of the Cossacko-Hetmanic Ukraine.
27. *Zrodla dziejowe*, IX, 1894-97, pp. 275-279; V, 1887, pp. 78-79, 103-104, 107, 108, 118-120, 132-133, and many other figures about tax collections in Ukraine in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.
28. About the development of the trades and crafts in Ukraine during the Lithuanian Polish era: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 212-230; P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 248-263; Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 95-103; D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932, Vol. I, pp. 133-138; A. Maciejowski, *Historia rzemiosl rzemieslnikow, i rzemieslnicznych wyrobow w Polsce od czasow najdawniejszych az do konca XVIII w.*, Warszawa, 1877.
29. Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 170-171; F. Umanets, "Kn. K. V. Osrozhs-ky," *Russkii Arkhiv*, 1904, IV.
30. V. Sichinsky, *Naris z istorii ukraïnskoï promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 6-9; J. Ptasnik, *Papiernie v Polsce XVI w.*, Krakow, 1920, pp. 17-20, 34-35, and other places; *Zrodla Dziejowe*, XVIII, Vol. I, p. 50; Vol. XIX: Register from 1589, p. 149; Also, *Rozprawy wydzialu filozoficznego*, Vol. XI, Documents Nos. 18-20.
31. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 136-138; D. Vimik, *Ukraïnskaia SSR, Kratkoi istoriko-ekonomicheskii ocherk*, Moscow, 1954, p. 16.

## Chapter XI. Commercial Growth

1. J. Ptasnik, *Miasta i mieszczaństwo w dawnej Polsce*, Krakow, 1934, pp. 152-170; O. Balzer, "Verfassungsgeschichte Polens," *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaft Krakau*, 1906, pp. 110-112; S. Kutrzeba, *Historia ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, *Korona*, pp. 101-109, and 174-178; also, M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, Vol. VI, p. 119: "Absence of competition had a bad effect ..."

## Notes to Chapter XI

2. Stapel right was applied in its absolute and relative versions. Absolute stapel right meant a compulsion to sell all merchandise in the city which held it; relative stapel right was an obligation to display the merchandise for sale for a specified period of time: Kutrzeba, op. cit., p. 102; S. Clough, *The Economic Development of Western Civilization*, New York-Toronto-London, 1959, pp. 114-115.
3. Similar exemption of the Lithuanian gentry from trade restrictions was granted by the Parliament in 1551; then, it was extended in 1553, 1559, 1563, and 1566: *Akty yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, Vol. III, 1861, pp. 42, 62, 98, 103 and 128.
4. I. Rudchenko, *Chumatski narodni pisni*, Kiev, 1874; Yu. Lypa, *Priznachennia Ukrainy*, New York, 1953, pp. 105-112; A. Nestorenko (Nesterenko), *Rozvitok promislivosti na Ukraini*, Part I, *Remeslo i manufaktura*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 115-116.
5. Bishop Piasecki, *Chronica*, pub. 1645, p. 454. Quoted after Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 97.
6. In West Ukraine only the city of Lviv obtained the privilege of an absolute stapel right, and in this way it established its commercial superiority: Ptasnik, op. cit., p. 164.
7. W. Lozinski, *Patrycyat i mieszczanstwo Lwowskie*, 1892, p. 373, referred to a case when a small merchant had to defend himself against a serious charge of dealing in "wealthy merchandise."
8. A. Jablonowski, "Handel Ukrainy w XV wieku," *Atbenum*, 1895, II; A. Verzilov, "Ocherk torgovli Yuzhnoi Rusi c 1480-1569," *Zemskii Sbornik cbernigovskoi gubernii*, 1898, I-VI; E. Rulikowski, "Dawne drogi i szlaki na prawym brzegu," *Atbenum*, 1878, III and IV; S. Kutrzeba, "Handel Polski ze Wschodem," *Przeglad polski*, Krakow, 1903, Vols. 148-150; D. Olanchin, "Torhovelini znosyny Ukrainy z Breslavom v XVIII st.," *Nasba Kultura*, Warsaw, 1935, Book 8; Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 10-72.
9. Hrushevsky, *ibid.*, pp. 171-196; an excellent coverage of foreign trade of Ukraine of that era, documented with a very comprehensive literature and source material.
10. It resulted from a drastic national discrimination against Ukrainian merchants which was broadly discussed in the previous chapter; N. Freischyn-Czyrowsky, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, Doctoral dissertation, Graz, 1943, pp. 82-83; M. Holubez, *Za ukrainskii Lviv*, Lviv, 1927; Ptasnik, op. cit., pp. 286-332, 335.
11. "At that time, the Black Sea trade, as we know it, was taken over mainly by the Italians, above all the Genovians, ... also by the Armenians, ... also the Jews, Greeks and Truks participated in it ..." Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 7; Vol. IV, p. 249; Vol. V, pp. 251-252.

## Notes to Chapter XI

12. *Kniga posolskaia, Metrika velikavo kniazbestva litovskavo*, editors: Obolenskii and Danilovich, 1843, pp. 26-30; also Michael from Lithuania related in his *Memoirs* about the illegal detours of the commercial caravans and the resulting trouble.
13. Erich Lassota, envoy of the Emperor Rudolf II, wrote at the end of the sixteenth century: "Lviv is the capital city of Red Ruthenia (Galicia) ... In the city there is a very rich trade ..." Sichynsky, op. cit., p. 64; Michael of Lithuania emphasized the trading activities of Kiev: "Kiev is filled with imported merchandise, because there is no better way than this ancient and well known route from the Black Sea port of Kaffa ... into Kiev." Sichynsky, *ibid.*, p. 50.
14. Rulikowski, "Dawne drogi i szlaki na prawym brzegu Dniepru," *Ateneum*, 1878, III-IV. Michael of Lithuania mentioned the ancient route to the South; the so-called "Tartar route," from Lviv, through Podolia, and southwards toward the Crimean Peninsula, was known since the fourteenth century; the Wallachian route was used for the Ukrainian-Balkan exchange, from Kamianets to Suchava.
15. Dovnar-Zapolskii, *Gosudarstvennoie kbaziaistvo Velikano Kniazbestva Litovskavo*, Kiev, 1901, V.I, p. 370; an indication of a free manufacturing and distribution of drinking honey, also, *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, ed., M. Vladimirovskii-Budanov, VII, pp. 83-84, 96, and others.
16. About grain exportation in particular: Naude, *Die Getreidebandelspolitik der Europaeschen Staaten vom 13 bis 18 Jhrh.*, 1896 (Acta Borusica), Chapter VI; worthwhile data about trade and finance: A. Szelagowski, *Pieniadz i przewrot cen w XVI i XVII wieku w Polsce*, Lwow, 1902; W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, Leipzig, 1923, Vols. I-II; Verzolov, op. cit.; S. Kutrzeba, "Handel Krakowa w wiekach srednich," *Rozprawy wydzialu historyczno-filozoficznego, Akademia Umiejentnosci*, Vol. 44, 1902; also, the same, "Handel Polski ze Wschodem," *Przeglad Polski*, Vol. 148-150, Krakow, 1903.
17. Szelagowski, *Pieniadz i przewrot cen w XVI i XVII wieku w Polsce*, 1902.
18. Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 199-200; also, A. Jablonowski, *Rus Czerwona*, in *Zrodla dziejowe*, Vol. XVIII, Warszawa, 1903, p. 407; W. Lozinski, *Prawem i Lewem*. Lwow, 1903, p. 137.
19. *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie*, Vol. V, pp. 319-320, 438-439; VI, no. 114; also, the report of the Horodok district for 1534-1535, from *Warszawskie Arcbiwm Skarbu Koronnego*, notations from June and July.
20. *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, II, Nos. 92 and 94; exportation of wax: Lozinski, *Patrycyat*, p. 48.
21. Szelagowski, op. cit., Chapters II, VII and VIII; Hrushevsky, Vol. VI, pp. 85-86.
22. Szelagowski, *ibid.*

## Notes to Chapter XI

23. Gresham's Law was defined in England in the sixteenth century, but it was noticed earlier by Bishop Nicholas Oresme in 1360; about the money situation in West Europe, which fared better than in the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth: Clough, op. cit., pp. 104-105, and 185-192.
24. Szelagowski, *ibid.*, pp. 95-96.
25. Clough, op. cit., pp. 111-112; Slabchenko, *Organizacia kbaziaistva Ukrainy*, p. 1, Odessa, 1923. pp. 105-107.
26. S. Kutrzeba, *Historya ustroju Polski*, Lwow, 1917, Vol. I, Korona, pp. 68-70, 160-164; Chubaty, *Oblad istorii ukrainskobo prava*, Munich, 1947, Vol. II, pp. 152-158.
27. "At the beginning of this era (after the Lublin Union of 1569), the separation of the royak treasury from the state fisc was finally accomplished; some revenues were transferred to the royal account; others, on the state account"; Kutrzeba, loc. cit. But later on, however, still other changes were introduced, such as those of 1632, 1649 and 1717. Two treasuries became an established fact in the seventeenth century, while already in 1649, Ukraine, except for her western provinces, became a sovereign state.
28. Kutrzeba, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 161, Vol. II, Litwa, Lwow, 1914, pp. 181-185.
29. Dovnar-Zapolski, op. cit., pp. 472 and the following; Chubaty, loc. cit.; Kutrzeba, op. cit., Vol. II, Lwow, 1914, and Monopole, p. 185.
30. Kutrzeba, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 179-180: At first a tribute, called "Tatarschina" (Tartar contribution), burdened the Ukrainian population until the end of the fifteenth century. It was paid by the local princes as evidence of their vassal relationship to the Horde. From the beginning of the sixteenth century, the contribution was replaced by a "Ordinschina" (Horde tax), collected by the Grand Duke and the territorial dukes, to finance their relations to the Khan and his Golden Horde.
31. Kutrzeba, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 177-179; Chubaty, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 156.
32. The gentry did not want to pay taxes. When an absolute need for additional funds to provide for standing armies developed, the gentry immediately resorted to the royal possessions to obtain the necessary money, attempting to avoid any additional tax burden on themselves.
33. Additional information about the Polish finances of that era: N. Freischyn-Czyrowski, op. cit., pp. 125-127; Balzer, op. cit., pp. 129-130; M. Liubavskii, *Ocbek istorii litovsko-ruskavo gesudarstva do lublinskoj unii vklucbitielno*, Moscow, 1910; T. Lubomirski, *Trzy rozdzialy z historyi skarbowosci w Polsce (1507-1532)*, Krakow, 1868.



## Chapter XII. The Political Background and the Social Structure

1. About the beginnings of the Cossack Host, I. Kamanin, "K voprosu o kozachestvi do Bohdana Khmel'nitskavo," *Chytania v obschbestvi Nestora-Litopisca*, Vol. VIII, Kiev, 1894; D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warszawa, 1932, Vol. I, pp. 149-160, and 186-195; M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, New York, 1956, Vol. VII, pp. 66-180; L. Okinshevich, *Lekcii z istorii ukrain-skobo prava*, Munich, 1947, mimeographed writings, pp. 20-27.
2. Okinshevich, op. cit., pp. 85-89; the same, "Hetmanska derzhava," in *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Vol. I-II, pp. 645-646.
3. On the text and interpretation of the articles of the Agreement of Pereyaslav: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. IX, Book II, New York, 1957, pp. 812-820; Okinshevich, *Lekcii z istorii ukrain-skobo prava*, Munich, 1947, pp. 30-36; A. Yakovliv, "The Juridical Character of the Pereyaslav Treaty and its Fate," in *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 1, New York, Winter, 1954, pp. 51-59; also, in the same periodical: B. Krupnytsky, "The Treaty of Pereyaslav and the Political Orientation of Bohdan Khmelnytsky," pp. 32-40; O. Ohloblyn, *Treaty of Pereyaslav*, Toronto-New York, 1954; and, S. Ivanynsky, *Pereyaslavskii dobovir 1654 roku*, New York-Detroit-Scranton, 1954.
4. Text of the Treaty of Hadiach: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vol. X, New York, 1958, pp. 331-357.
5. The division of Ukraine into two parts, the left and the right bank, came about during the first term of George Khmelnytsky's Hetmanate. A brief interpretation of the Agreement of Andrusov, between Poland and Russia, in 1667: N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 56-57.
6. A thorough coverage of the history of the Cossacko-Hetmanic period: Hrushevsky, op. cit., Vols. VII, IX, and X; Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 1-279; a brief coverage: B. Krupnytsky, "Doba kozatsko-hetmanskoj derzhavy," in *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 443-466; C. Manning, *The Story of the Ukraine*, New York, 1947. As a result of the partitions of Poland, and subsequently, of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, only a relatively small part of Ukraine, Galicia, Lemko Land, Carpathian Ukraine, and Bukovina, was not dominated by the Russians. The provinces mentioned were incorporated into the Austrian Empire.
7. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 342-343. The English translation of Lyashchenko's work applied, however, an erroneous terminology, using the name "Urban Ukraine"; the term "Village Ukraine" is correct. The history of that colonization: D. Bahalii (Bagaley), *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizacii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Moskva, 1887; Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 224-239.
8. B. Krupnytsky, *Hetman Danilo Apostol*, Augsburg, 1948, pp. 111, 113, 123, and other places.

## Notes to Chapter XII

9. V. Hrishko, "Do problemy providnoi verstvy za hetmana Bohdana Khmel'nitskoho," in *America*, Ukrainian Catholic Daily, Philadelphia, August 2, 3, 6, and 7, 1957; the same, "300 littia Khmel'nichchiny," in *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva imenem Sbevcbenka*, Vol. CLVI, Munich, 1948, pp. 7-60; Okinshevich, *Lekcii z istorii ukrainskobo prava*, Munich, VIII, pp. 28-30, and 59-67; the same, "Hetmanska derzhava," in *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 643-647; also, V. Lipinski, *Z dziejow Ukrainy*, Krakow, 1912, chapters on Stanislaw-Mykhailo Krychevsky and the role of the Ukrainian gentry in the National Revolution; also, I. Kamanin, "Uchastie yuzhao-russkavo nasielenia v vozstannii Khmel'nitskavo," in *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, Part III, Vol. IV, Kiev, 1914; an opposite view: Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, New York, 1956, Vol. III, Part II, pp. 117-119; Miakotin, *Ocherki socialnoi istorii Ukrainy v 17-18 vv.*, Prague, 1924, I, pp. 63, 136.

10. A. Nestorenko (Nesterenko), *Rozvitok promislovosti na Ukraini, P. I.*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 55-71; Lyashchenko, *op. cit.*, 342-347; O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doda*, New York, 1960, pp. 112-125.

11. Krupnytsky, *op. cit.*, p. 112: Degradation of the Cossack class; some Cossacks were reduced to the level of the peasants, others received the status of the nobility.

12. V. Hrishko, "300 littia Khmel'nichchiny," in *Zapiski naukovobo tovaristva im Sbevcbenka*, Vol. CLVI, Munich, 1948, p. 38: "The Cossacks, after having established their class rights ... and formed themselves as a special class, made private property the foundation of their social structure"; pp. 42-43: Their landed estates, temporarily associated with holding an office, soon evolved into private property rights on the land of the nobles. M. Slabchenko, *Organizacia bodpodarstva Ukrainy, Part I, hospodarstvobehmanshecbiny*, Odesa, 1923, pp. 41-46: Individual land ownership was a leading principle in Ukraine. The idea of collectivized landed estates (obshchina) was artificially championed by the Russian historiography; pp. 56-59: Slabchenko said that no collectivism existed in agriculture. To prove his point, he quoted Shimansky, from *Kiivska Starina*, 1883, I, 83, who maintained that individual property was a generally accepted principle, although its extent was flexible. Hetman Brukhovetsky was defeated, mainly because he attempted to introduce collectivism; p. 62: There were traces of a collective Cossack land holding, but they were soon overcome; Doroshenko, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 128-139. Individualism was traditional among the Ukrainians since prehistoric and Kievan times, as opposed to the Muscovite collectivism: Chirovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-140; also, H. Schwartz, *Russia's Soviet Economy*, New York, 1954, pp. 40-42.

13. Slabchenko, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

14. Decree referred to the gentry of the Lubech district, saying that since the "beginning of the war (the National Revolution) it defended the public good." Reference is to the decree which affirmed the noble duty of the military service; quoted from Okinshevich, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.

## Notes to Chapter XII

15. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho Doba*, New York, 1960, pp. 77-88, Doroshenko, loc. cit., Hrishko, op. cit., pp. 31-33. During Mazepa's time, gentry still demanded a separate social status, but its social prerogatives were gradually withering away, particularly since 1691. The code, entitled "The Laws according to which justice is done among the Little Russian people," from 1743, refers to the gentry as a separate stratum in Chapter IV.
16. "Bohdan Khmenlytsky, already at the beginning of the Revolution, promulgated his universals, by which he affirmed not only the rights of the religious orders to possess land, but also the rights to use the serf labor of the peasants living in their possessions and estates"; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 132; Hrishko, op. cit., pp. 44-46.
17. On the civil law in Hetmanic Ukraine: A. Kistiakovsky, *Prava, po ktorim sudiatsia malorossiiskii narod*, Kiev, 1879; M. Slabchenko, *Opiti po istorii prava Molorossi XVI-XVIII vv.*, Odessa, 1911; K. Miakotin, *Ocherki socialnoi istorii Ukrainy v XVII-XVIII vv.* I-III, Praha, 1924-1930; a concise coverage: V. Hrishko, "Istoria civilnoho prava," in *Enciklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Vol. I, Part II, Munich-New York, 1949, p. 345.
18. Miakotin, op. cit., v. I, pp. 129-130, and others; Krupnytsky, op. cit., p. 116: Difficult position of the peasants, since their obligations and legal position were not definitely described by law; also, Hrishko, "300 litvia Khmelnichchiny," in *Zapisky Naukovobo Tovaristva imenem Sbeuchenka*, Vol. CLVI, Munich, 1948, pp. 54-55.
19. Krupnytsky, op. cit., p. 115. At the time of Hetman Mazepa, the "usual obedience" of serf labor did not yet exceed two days in a week. The "Kolomats Statute" of 1687 still provided the peasants a possibility of changing their class association.
20. The situation resembled very much the later developments in North America where, under the impact of expanding Western frontiers, labor conditions were more tolerable than in Western Europe. According to Daugherty, the frontiers resulted in wages for the American laborer which were considerably higher than those of the European laborer: C. Daugherty, *Labor Problems in American Industry*, Boston-New York-Chicago-Dallas-Atlanta-San Francisco, 1948-1949, pp. 37-39. Okinshevich, op. cit., p. 82: "... the social position of the peasantry in Hetmanic Ukraine was doubtlessly a better one than that of the analogous social groups in other contemporary countries.
21. Slabchenko, *Orbanizacia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Odesa, 1923, I, pp. 96-98: Hetman Mnohorishny introduced penalties for attempted emigration.
22. "War prisoned Tartars were in Ukraine in the status of slaves, and Mnohorishny sent them to Muscovy as gifts for the grandees": Slabchenko, op. cit., p. 155.

*Notes to Chapter XII*

23. de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, New York, 1959, p. 448.
24. *op. cit.*, p. 76.
25. Okinshevich, *op. cit.*, p. 78
26. P. Klimenko, "Misto i teritoria na Ukraini za Hetmanshchiny," in *Zapiski Istorichno-Filolobichnobo Viddilu Ukrainskoi Akademii Nauk*, Vols. VII-VIII, Kiev, 1926, also; Hrishko, *op. cit.*, p. 49: the author expressed there most resolutely his view that the towns in Hetmanic Ukraine were economically well developed. Some foreigners, visiting Ukraine at that time, commenged on the neatness and wealth of her cities: V. Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1954, p. 95; Paul Alepo; pp. 132-133: Jul Just, who was in Ukraine in 1711; p. 144: John Bell, in Ukraine in 1737.
27. Okinshevich, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 54: "... any legal discrimination on the grounds of national descent was unknown in the Ukrainian Hetmanic state."
29. "And this faith, which is against the Greek Orthodoxy ... cannot be. And union is abolished in Poland and Lithuania ... Roman faith is allowed to be freely exercised in the Kievan, Braclav, and Chernihiv idistricts": the text of the Agreement written down on April 29, 1659; quotation from Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, New York, 1958, Vol. X, pp. 334-335.
30. About the Byeloruthenian regiment in a vassal relation to Ukraine: Okinshevich, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-136.
31. The landmark of the Russian expansion toward the Don-Donets was established by the Russian victory over the Mongol on the Kulikovo plain, in 1380. And, although the Mongol invasion of 1382 restored the supremacy of the Golden Horde over the Russian territories once more, the year 1380 is the first strong indication of the disintegrating power of Sarai: M. Florinsky, *Russia, A History and an Interpretation*, New York, 1953, Vol. I, p. 94; Chirovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 81-83.
32. Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, New York, 1956, Vol. VIII, Part II, pp. 73-77; D. Bahalii (Bagaley), *Materialy dlia istorii kolonizacii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1886, pp. 13-17; I. Miklashevskii, *Z istorii kbaziastvennavo Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Part I: *Zasielenie i selskoie kbaziastvo yuzbnoi okrainy XVII v.*, Moscow, 1894, p. 308; Doroshenko, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 224-240; Lyashchenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-343.
33. Slabchenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 97-101; Ohloblin, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-67.
34. Miklashevskii, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-169.

## Notes to Chapter XII

35. Bahalii, op. cit., pp. 15-16, 42-50, 187, the same, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1887, pp. 174-179 (Ostrianin), 184-186 (Chuhaiev), pp. 504-524 (Role of the Monasteries).
36. Bahalii, *Materialy dlia istorii kolonizatsii i byta ...*, Moscow, 1886, p. 187; Doroshenko, p. 229; Miklashevskii, op. cit., p. 77; a frequent differentiation between the "Cherkasians and the regiment people." The term Cherkasians meant the Ukrainian peasants, and the regiment people the Cossacks; Bahalii, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1887, pp. 246-247, 378-569, 418-420 (records of cattle, horses and sheep).
37. About the social and economic development of the Cossack territory: Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 345-347; Okinshevich, op. cit., pp. 136-150; Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 135-136; B. Krupnytsky, "Doba kozatsko-hetmanskoj derzhavy," in *Encyklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 462-463.
38. M. Luibavsky, "Nachalnaia istoria moloruskavo kazachestva," in *Zurnal ministerstva narodnovo prosvishcbenia*, 1895, Vol. VII; also, P. Kulish, "Pervii period kozatstva od yoho pochatku do vorohuvannia z Lakhami," *Collected works of P. Kulish*, Vol. VI, Lviv, 1910; a short coverage: Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 261-263; also, compare in this book Chapter VII, section on the beginning of the Cossacks.
39. Joseph Shumlanski initiated the action for the Church union already in 1677, but it was promulgated first in 1700. The last Orthodox bulwark in Galicia, the cloister of the Maniava Skit, became Catholic in 1708. Inferior social and legal position of the united Catholic clergy: B. Krupnytsky, *Geschichte der Ukraine*, Leipzig, 1939, pp. 249 and others; E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampf um die Ukraine*, Leipzig, 1942, pp. 95-100: "Am aufmersamsten wachten daruber die romisch-katholischen Polen, die eine Angleichung der unierten Kirche nicht Wunschten, sondern deren Aufl6sung in der lateinischen Kirche ..." (96).
40. S. Kutrzeba, *Historya ustroju Polski*, Vol. I, Korona, Lwow, 1917, pp. 169-185, and 227-237.
41. M. Holubez, ed., *Velika istoria Ukrainy*, Lviv, 1935, pp. 560-562.
42. V. Antonovich, "O Haidamakakh," in *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossi*, No. III, Vol. II, Kiev, 1876; F. Rawita-Crawronski, *Historya ruchow bajdamackich*, Vols. I-II, Lwow, 1899-1901.
43. About the economic decline: Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 344-345; Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 196-201.
44. A. Stefan, *From Carpatho-Ruthenia to Carpatho-Ukraine*, New York, 1954, pp. 18-19, and 28-30; V. Francev, *Obzor vazbniisbikh izuchenii Uborskoi Rusi*, Warsaw, 1901; I. Vytanovich, "Ukrainski zemli pid Avstrieyu i Uhorshchinoyu," in *Encyklopedia Ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 489-492; Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 276-278.

### Chapter XIII. Growth of the National Economy, Extractive Industries

1. The development of a modern concept of a national economy is in close connection with the growth of the national states, and their conscious application of the mercantilistic doctrine to support their political expansion on a base of a strong economy and a nationalistically minded economic policy during the period extending from the 16th to the 18th centuries: B. Vinar, *Rozvittok ukrainskoi lebhkoï promislivosti*, Denver, 1955, p. 5.
2. O. Ohloblin (Ogloblin), *Dumki pro Kbelnicbcbinu*, New York, 1957, pp. 12-15.
3. M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizacia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part I, *Hospodarstvo Hetmanscbcbiny*, Odessa, 1923, pp. 19-20.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 75-77.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-59, 74, and 78-80: the author proves convincingly that there was no collectivism in 17th and 18th century Ukraine. In order to support his views, he quotes Shimansky, an author of the 1890's.
6. K. Kononenko, *Ukraine and Russia*, Milwaukee, 1958, pp. 8-9. A. Nesterenko (Nestorenko), I. Romanenko, and D. Virnik, *Ocberki razvittia narodnavo kbaziastva Ukrainskoi SSR*, Moscow, 1954, pp. 23-27; V. Miakotin, *Ocberki socialnoi istorii Ukrainy v 17-18 vv.*, Prague, 1924, II, p. 6.
7. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 77-88; Nesterenko, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
8. D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Vol. II, Warszawa, 1933, pp. 245-246.
9. *Ibid.*, pp. 262-263; Nesterenko, *op. cit.*, p. 27; Ohloblin, *op. cit.*, pp. 196-203.
10. I. Vitanovich (Vytanowych), *Suspilno-ekonomichni tendentsii v derzhavnomu budivnytstvi Ivana Mazepy*, *Papers*, Shevchenko Scientific Society, Chicago, 1959; B. Krupnitsky, *Hetman Danilo Apostol*, Augsburg, 1948; Ohloblin, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-68.
11. Slabchenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-100; Ohloblin, *op. cit.*, 65-67, 112-125, and 201-203; Kononenko, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-9: Reinstatement of Serfdom: Miakotin, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 127-133, and II, pp. 60-80, and others: the authors have analyzed the social transitions from the Polish system, through the revolutionary transitions, back to the reinstatement of bondage and large landholdings.
12. Vinar, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-8; I. Dzhidzhora (Dzhedzora), "Ekonomichna politika rosiiskoho pravitelstva suproti Ukrainy v 1710-1730 rr," in *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva im. Sbevcbenka*, vv. 98, 101, 103, 105; Vitanovich, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-16; M. Volobuiev, "Do problemy ukrainskoi ekonomiki," in *Bilshovik Ukrainy*, Nos. 2 and 3 for January and February, 1928; Krupnitsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 and up. O. Ohloblin, "Hetman Ivan Mazepa i ukrainska promislivist," in *Kalendar Svobody* for 1959, Jersey City, 1959, pp. 108-109.

### Notes to Chapter XIII

13. Compare the colonization process of the 17th century with that of the 15th and 16th centuries, during the Polish-Lithuanian era: Doroshenko, loc. cit.; P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 344-345.
14. Doroshenko, op. cit., pp. 247-248.
15. Ibid., p. 231; Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 342-243.
16. "It means that Physiocracy was known in Ukraine at that time as a most gainful occupation:" Slabchenko, op. cit., p. 171. About the principles of Physiocracy: Ch. Gide and Ch. Rist, *A History of Economic Doctrines*, Boston-New York-Chicago-Atlanta-San Francisco-Dallas, 1947, pp. 21-45.
17. V. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, pp. 125, 146-149; J. Marshall, *Travels*, London, 1772; G. de Beauplan, *A Description of Ukraine*, New York, 1959, p. 448.
18. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 96, 100, 125.
19. Marshall, op. cit., pp. 165-166, 175-182. Also, Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 152-155.
20. I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevich), "Pobut," in *Istoria ukrainshoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, pp. 92-93.
21. Krupatsky, op. cit., pp. 143-144; Kripiakevich, loc. cit.
22. Kripiakevich, loc. cit.
23. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 96, 124, 162.
24. Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 110.
25. Slabchenko, op. cit., pp. 49-50.
26. Werdum said that because vegetable growing requires hard and exact work, it does not develop in Ukraine, where the people are not used to that kind of intensive labor. But traveling in Galicia, he saw all kinds of vegetables there, such as beets, cabbage, cucumbers, watermelons, and tobacco. He also noticed the same vegetables growing in Podolia.
27. The Polish gentry was able to continue its advanced manorial economies without any revolutionary disturbances. And above all, the Polish noblemen traveled extensively through the West, and had ample opportunity to become acquainted with progressive agricultural techniques: Slabchenko stressed the more favorable conditions for advanced farming in the manorial economies (op. cit., pp. 50, 167-169). Especially, the manorial farms of the religious orders (monasteries) could afford progress.

### Notes to Chapter XIII

28. The Ukrainian peasantry suffered an oppressive shortage of money and capital because of the steadily growing material burdens: O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 94-100. The extent of the monetary burdens was not limited by any legislation, nor were the abuses of the nobles, the Cossack grandees and the monasteries seriously suppressed by any government action. Furthermore, a continuous inflation existed, and the peasants sank ever further into debt: Slabchenko, op. cit., pp. 107-113, 177; Kononenko, op. cit., pp. 3-7.
29. Marshall, op. cit., pp. 172-174.
30. Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 93. The advanced techniques in the Hetmanic possessions: I. Baranovich, *Magnatskoe khaziatstvo na yuge volini v XVIII v.* Moskva, 1955, pp. 105-116.
31. Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 346; A. Skalkovskii, *Opit statisticheskavo opisanja Novorossiiskavo kraja*, Odessa, 1853, Vol. II, pp. 92-93. At the end of the 18th century in the district of Poltava (Hetmanic Ukraine) the harvests for a decade were as follows: 2,024,241 hundredweights of rye, 556,940 of wheat, 491,365 of barley, 1,080,782 of oats, 452,599 of buckwheat, and 262,925 of millet: Slabchenko, op. cit., pp. 170-172.
32. Marshall, op. cit., 176-177.
33. Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 163: "From the description of Ukraine by Huelldenstaedt it is clear that Ukrainian industry in the second half of the 18th century was well developed, due to the fact that the country was on the road to economic recovery during the time of the Ukrainian Kozak state;" p. 131: Jul Just, *Memoirs*: "The inhabitants of Kozak Ukraine live in prosperity and often sing."
34. D. Bahalii (Bagaley), "Generalnaia opis Malorossii," in *Kievskaja Starina*, 1883; same, *Istoria Slobidskoi Ukrainy*, Kharkov, 1918; same, *Materialy dla istorii i bitia stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo gosudarstva*, Kharkov, 1886. Bahalii published considerable material on the history of the Ukrainian borderlands, in particular, in its social and economic projection.
35. Kononenko, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
36. About the well-to-do conditions of the Ukrainian peasantry: Marshall, loc. cit., p. 132.
37. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa i yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, p. 199: author quotes the figure from the data of the inventories and stock accounts of 1690, documents of the Institute of Polish Culture, the State Public Library, Ukrainian SSR.
38. Ibid., p. 202; also, A. Yaroshevich, "Kapitalistichna orenda na Ukraini za polskoi doby," in *Zapiski Socialno-Ekonomichnobo Viddilu UNA*, V-VI, Kiev, 1927, p. 210; Lyashchenko, op. cit., p. 344: "The Cossack and Ukrainian serf population sought refuge beyond the Dniepr inside the Moscow state. Agriculture fell in ruin."



### Notes to Chapter XIII

39. Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 241-244.
40. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 89-90.
41. R. Kobrinsky, "Lis i myslivstvo v davnim ukrainskim pravi," in *Ukrainskii lisnitskii almanakh*, New York, 1958, pp. 73-76. A. Kostiakovsky, *Prava, po ktorim suditsia malorossiiskii narod*, Kiev, 1879, Arts. 15/4, 17/8, 14, 19/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, 22/9; also *Lithuanian Statute*, from 1588. A. Yakovliv, "Ukrainskii Kodeks 1743 roku," in *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva im. Shevchenka*, Vol. 159, Munich, 1949.
42. Kostiakovsky, op. cit., Arts. 19/9 and 22/9; Kobrinsky, op. cit.
43. P. Gordon, *Passages from the Diary*, 1684; excerpts in Sichinsky's *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 110; Just, op. cit., Baranovich, op. cit., pp. 85-88.
44. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 160-162; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 246.
46. M. Hrushevsky, *Istoria Ukrainy-Rusi*, Vol. VI, New York, 1955, pp. 156-158; N. L. Freischyn-Czyrowski, *Geschichtlicher Abriss der staatsrechtlichen Einrichtungen in Galizien*, Doctorial Dissertation, Graz, 1943, pp. 99-100; S. Kutrzeba, *Historia ustroju Polski*, Vol. I, Korona, Lwow, 1917, pp. 93-95; A. Stadnicki, "O wsiach t.zw. woloskich," *Biblioteka Ossolinskich*, Lwow, 1848; Slabchenko, op. cit., p. 46.
47. Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 139-140.
48. Ibid.
49. Krupnitsky, loc. cit.; A. Nestorenko (Nesterenko), *Rozvitok promyslovosti na Ukraini*, Part I, *Remeslo i manufaktura*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 152-153. "The interests of Russian business unequivocally dictated the liquidation of Ukrainian commerce"; O. Ohloblin (Ogloblin), *Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi fabriki, Manufaktura v betmanscbini*, Kiev, 1925, pp. 38, 44-47, and in many other places there are indications of Russian colonial-type exploitation of Ukraine; B. Vinar, *Ekonomichnii kolonializm v Ukraini*, Paris, 1958, pp. 11-28; same, *Rozvitok ukrainskoi lebkoi promislovosti*, Denver, 1955, pp. 5-9; R. Diminsky, "Economic Life," in *Ukraine and its People*, Munich, 1949, pp. 126-129; Slabchenko, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 105 and 161, Vol. II, Kharkiv, 1925, pp. 92, 150, and others; M. Volobuiev, "Do problemi ukrainskoi ekonomiki," *Bolshevik Ukrainy*, Nos. 2-3, 1928.
50. Beauplan, op. cit., 480; Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 113-114, and 115-117. The dishes and the pattern of consumption may distinctly prove the way of consumption in a society.
51. O. Ohloblin, *Dumki pro Kbmelnichcbinu*, New York, 1957, p. 13.

### *Notes to Chapter XIII*

52. O. Ohloblin, "Khmelnichchina i zalizorudna promislovist Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy," *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva im Sbevcbenka*, Ist.- Filoz. Sektsia, Munich, 1948, Vol. CLVI, pp. 129-137; V. Modzalevsky, *Huty na Cbernibivsbcbini*, Kiev, 1926.
53. D. Bahalii (Bagaley), *Istoria Slobidskoi Ukrainy*, Kharkov, 1918, p. 166; the same, *Materialy dla istorii kolonizatsii i bitia stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo Gosudarstva*, Kharkov, 1886, Vol. I, p. 37; O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 74-75.
54. O. Ohloblin, *Dumki pro Khmelnicbcbinu*, New York, 1957, p. 13; and a bibliographical material: pp. 150-151 in his "Hetman Mazepa," as quoted above.
55. Vitanovich, op. cit.; Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 267-268.
56. O. Ohloblin, "Khmelnichchina i zaliznorudna promislovist pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy," *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva im. Sbevcbenka*, Ist.-Filoz. Sek., Munich, 1948, Vol. CLVI, p. 136.
57. Kononenko, op. cit., p. 145.
58. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, p. 72.
59. Hrushevsky, Vol. VI, op. cit., pp. 212-217. Weihe said that the Ukrainians had salt and iron mines: Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 125; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 246, said that the Cossacks exported annually about a thousand carloads of salt to Poland from their own territory.
60. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 160-162.
61. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 109, and 170-171.
62. Ohloblin, op. cit., p. 77. A large scale construction industry existed in Hetmanic Ukraine: V. Sichinsky, *Istoria ukrainskobo mystetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I, pp. 115-146.

### *Chapter XIV. Trades and Industries*

1. V. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 113.
2. M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizatsia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part I, *Hospodarstvo betmansbcbiny*, Odessa, 1923, pp. 161-164; O. Ohloblin (Ogloblin), *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 67 and 244; about Mazepa's rule and his defense of Ukraine's business interests: *History of Ukraine*, by I. Nahayevsky, Philadelphia, 1962, pp. 172 and following.
3. B. Krupnitsky (Krupnytsky), *Hetman Danilo Apostol*, Augsburg, 1948, pp. 124-233; D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932-33, Vol. II, p. 193; also,

## Notes to Chapter XIV

E. Radakova, *Hetman D. Apostol v roli kolonizatora*, *Kievskaja Starina*, 1891, Book VI.

4. Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 209; P. Nechiporenko, "Fabriki Rozumovskoi na Posemi," in *Zapiski istorich-Filologicbnoho Viddilu Ukrainskoi Akademit Nauk*, Kiev, 1927, Vol. XI, the same, "Nacionalni stroienia 1748-1765 rr. na Posemi ta ikh vidnoshennia do hospodrstva Hetmana Rozumovskoho, in *Studii z istorii Ukrainy*, Kiev, 1929, Vol. II.

5. I. Dzhidzhora (Dzhedzhora), *Ukraina v persbii polovyni XVIII viku*, Kiev, 1930, pp. 28-32, and other places; Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 150-151: "Thus, there, on the policy status, the whole system was developed to dodge and exploit the Ukrainian merchants"; I. Vitanovich (Vytanowych), *Suspilno - ekonomichni tendencii v derzhavnomu budivnitstvi Ivana Mazepy*, . *Papers*, Shevchenko Scientific Society, Chicago, 1959, pp. 13-16; Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 66-67; the same, "Hetman I. Mazepa i ukrainska promislolist," *Kalendar Svobody na mazepinski rik 1959*, Jersey City, 1959, pp. 108-109; Sichinsky, p. 110.

6. K. Kononenko, *Ukraine and Russia, A History of the Economic Relations between Ukraine and Russia (1654-1917)*, Milwaukee, 1958, pp. 7-12; Vitanovich, op. cit., p. 16; M. Slabchenko, *Organizacia kbaziastva Ukrainy*, Kharkiv, 1925, Vol. II, p. 92, Vol. III, pp. 146, 150, and many other places.

7. The Russian economic plans in Ukraine: N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, pp. 52-63; the same, "Economic Aspects of the Ukrainian-Muscovite Treaty of 1654," *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 1, Winter, 1954, pp. 85-88; B. Vinar, *Ekonomichni kolonializm v Ukraini*, Paris, 1958, pp. 11-25.

8. I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevich), *Bobdan Kbmelnitsky*, Kiev, 1954, pp. 34-35, 294-295.

9. Sichinsky, op. cit., excerpts from the relations of various foreign travelers and visitors in Ukraine in the 17th and 18th centuries, pp. 89-173.

10. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 35-42, 301 and others.

11. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yobo doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 107-112; about the Magdeburg cities: Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 131; D. Bahalli, "Magdeburiskoie pravo v gorodakh levobierezhnoi Malorossii," *Zburnal Ministerstva Narodnavo Prosviesbcbenia*, St. Petersburg, 1892, Book III, a comprehensive coverage, P. Klimenko, *Tsekbina Ukraini*, Kiev, 1929, Vol. I.

12. L. Okinshevich, *Lekcii z istorii ukrainskobo prava*, mimeographed writings, Munich, 1947, pp. 53-54; Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 102-105, and the reference notes, pp. 154-155; Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 307-309.

13. Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 107-112; M. Slabchenko, *Organizacia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part I, *Hospodarstvo hetmanscbiny*, Odesa, 1923, pp. 94-95; about the

## Notes to Chapter XIV

growth of the Cossack element in the cities and its pressure upon the townspeople: A. Nesterenko (Nestorenko), *Rozvitok promislovosti na Ukraini*, Part I, *Remeslo i manufaktura*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 93-94; also, Kripiakevich, loc. cit.

14. Okinshevich, op. cit., p. 77; Doroshenko, loc. cit.

15. Ohloblin, op. cit., pp. 200-201.

16. Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 237; a comprehensive coverage of the history of the Village Ukraine: D. Bahlai (Bagaley), *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy Moskovshavo Gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1887; the same, *Istoria Slobidskoi Ukrainy*, Kharkiv, 1918.

17. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Narisi istorii ukrainskoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 95 and 101: The decline of the guild organization adversely affected metal and wood processing (furniture production, in particular). There the new forms of large-scale manufacturing could not yet be started, while artisans without guild support could not make economic progress.

18. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 300-301; Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 93-95.

19. An analogous transition was going on in West Europe due to science and technology, being only delayed in Ukraine: S. Clough, *The Economic Development of Western Civilization*, New York-Toronto-London, 1959, pp. 149-155 and 160-163.

20. Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 35-36, 301-309.

21. Ibid.; Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 93-103; Klimenko, op. cit.

22. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 62, 89-90, and other places, indicates the nationally heterogeneous composition of the class of artisans; many outstanding foreigners in the building trade: the same, *Istoria ukrainskoho mystetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I, pp. 118-120, 140-141.

23. I. Aksakov, *Issledovanie o torgovle na ukrainskikh yarmarkakh*, St. Petersburg, 1858, p. 166; Nestorenko, op. cit., pp. 158-159.

24. A. Yaroshevich, "Kapitalistichna orenda na Ukraini za polskoi doby," *Zbirnyk sotsialno-ekonomichnobo viddilu*, Ukrainaka Akademia Nauk, Vol. V-VI, Kiev, 1927, pp. 116-259; I. Baranovich, *Magnatskoe kbaziaistvo na yuge Volini v XVIII v.*, Moscow, 1955, pp. 117-137; Ohloblin; op. cit., pp. 82-83.

25. Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 95-96.

26. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, pp. 160-162; salt extraction: Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 179-180.

27. About the milling industry: Nestorenko, op. cit., p. 183; Ohloblin, op. cit.,

## Notes to Chapter XIV

p. 71; the same, *Ocherki istorii ukrainshoi fabriki, Manufaktura v betmanshchyni*, Kiev, 1925. This fundamental work was not available to the present author since most of it was destroyed by Soviet officials before its distribution as disloyal to the party line. Any references to this work are based on the quotations of other more fortunate authors; chapter on mills and milling industry; the same, "Hetman I. Mazepa i ukrainska promislovist," *Kalendar Svobody na mazepinskih rika 1959*, Jersey City, 1959, p. 105; Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 301-303; I. Vitnovich (Vytanowych), *Naris sotsialno ekonomichnoi ukrainshoi istorii*, Lviv, 1934, pp. 22-23; Baranovich, op. cit., pp. 68-71.

28. Kripiakevich, loc. cit.

29. Baranovich, loc. cit.

30. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 100 and 125.

31. Alcohol production: Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 186-191; Baranovich, op. cit., pp. 70-75; Kripiakevich, op. cit., pp. 303-305; O. Ohloblin, *Ocherki istorii ukrainshoi fabriki, Manufaktura v betmanshchyni*, Kiev, 1925, chapter on distilleries and breweries; alcohol distribution: M. Tishchenko, "Huralne pravo ta pravo shinkuvaty horilkoiu v Livoberezhnii Ukraini do kintsia XVIII v." *Zbirnyk Sotsialno-Ekonomichnobo Viddilu*, Ukrainiska Akademia Nauk, No. 12, Kiev, 1927, pp. 150-202; the same, "Borotba kievskikh kozakiv z magistratom za pravo shinkuvaty horilkoiu," *Zb. Sots.-Ekon. Vidd.*, Ukr. Akad. Nauk, No. 6, Kiev, 1926, pp. 198-217; distilleries in Village (Sloboda) Ukraine in D. Bagaley's (Bahalii's) *Ruskaia istoria*, Moscow, 1914, Vol. II, pp. 69, 107, 132 and the following; also, P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, p. 343; 976 distilleries in the Kharkov area alone by 1780.

32. Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 191 and 199.

34. Ibid., pp. 325-326; Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 143-144; tobacco factories in Village Ukraine: A. Nesterenko, I. Romanenko and D. Virnik, *Ocherki rozvittia narodnavo khaziatstva Ukrainshoi SSR*, Moscow, 1954, p. 21.

35. Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 162-163; Hueldenstaedt's report of 1774.

36. V. Sichinsky, *Narisi z istorii ukrainshoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 59-61; also, the reader is requested to refer to the previous sections of this work, dealing with the textile industries in the Kievan and Luthianian eras.

37. Aksakov, loc. cit.: The way people dressed: V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, Hildebrandt's, Werdum's and Gmelin's accounts of their travels in Ukraine in the 17th and 18th centuries, pp. 99-100, 106-107, and 158-159. In most households looms were standard equipment: O. Ohloblin, *Ocherki istorii ukrainshoi fabriki, Manufaktura v betmanshchyni*, Kiev, 1925, p. 87.

38. Kononenko, op. cit., p. 25.

## Notes to Chapter XIV

39. P. Lyashchenko, op. cit., pp. 287-292; Cossack grandees initiated the factory system: Ohloblin, op. cit., p. 38: about the conflict of interests between Russian and Ukrainian manufacturing; M. Slabchenko, *Organizatsiia khaziastva Ukrainy*. Kharkiv, 1925, Part II, p. 92 and other places. General information on the Ukrainian textile industry: also, Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 150-152, 158-160, 235-236, 287-288, and other places; V. Sichinsky, *Narisi z istorii ukrainskoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 63-67; Kononenko, op. cit., pp. 23-25.

40. Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 66; a comprehensive coverage: St. Szuman, *Dawne kilimy w Polsce i na Ukrainie*. Poznan, 1929, T. Mankowski, "Zachod i Wschod w tkactwie polskiem XVII w," *Prace Komisji Historji Sztuki*, Vol. VI, 3.I., Krakow, 1934, pp. 13-14.

41. Nesterenko, op. cit., p. 167.

42. Kurpnitsky, op. cit., p. 146.

43. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 162; Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 172-173: Russian merchants bought out the Ukrainian leather and textile enterprises: B. Vinar, *Rozvittok ukrainskoi lebkoi promyslovosti*, Denver, 1955, p. 9, quoted from *Narisi z istorii Ukrainy*, Issue VIII, Akademia Nauk URSR, Kiev, 1939, pp. 62-63.

## Chapter XV. Trades and Industries (continued)

1. O. Ohloblin (Ogloblin), *Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi fabрики, Manufactura v betmanscbini*, Kiev, 1925, p. 38: "The interests of Russian business unequivocally dictated the liquidation of Ukrainian commerce," quoted from K. Kononenko, *Ukraine and Russia, A History of Economic Relations between Ukraine and Russia (1654-1917)*, Milwaukee, 1958, p. 24. Ohloblin's work was not directly available to the present writer. Fundamental in the field of Ukrainian foreign commerce under Russian pressure in the first half of the 18th century: I. Dzhidzhora (*Dzhedzhora*), *Ukraina v persbii polovyni XVIII viku, Ekonomichna polityka rosiiskoho pravitelstva suproti Ukrainy v 1710-30 rokakh*, Kiev, 1930, pp. 8-9, 20-21, 28, and many others.

2. Dzhidzhora, *ibid.*, pp. 15-16; the reader is also requested to refer to Chapter XII, the section on mining.

3. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 95.

4. V. Sichinsky, *Narisi z istorii ukrainskoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 88-89.

5. I. Kripiakevich, M. Kapustiansky, and others, editors, *Istoria ukrainskoho viiska*, Winnipeg, 1953, pp. 74, 259-262, and 272-274; Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 87-90.

6. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 76 and 148.

*Notes to Chapter XV*

7. Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 273; B. Krupnitsky, *Hetman Danilo Apostol*, Augsburg, 1948, p. 147; A. Nestorenko (Nestorenko), *Rozvitok promislivosti na Ukraini*, Part I, *Remeslo i manufactura*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 315-316.
8. Ohloblin, op. cit., p. 77.
9. W. Lozinski, *Zlotnictwo lwowskie*, Lwow, 1912, pp. 10, 63, 74-76, 80, 95; Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 90-91.
10. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 159; O. Ohloblin, "Do istorii budnitskoi promislivosti Ukrainy za chasiv Khmelnicchini," *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologiczno-Viddilu Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Book X, Kiev, 1927, pp. 303-310.
11. Nestorenko, op. cit., p. 134; V. Zhuiev wrote in 1787 about an extensive use of lime in Village Ukraine to paint the dwellings white: Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 172.
12. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, p. 73.
13. Ibid.
14. Krupnitsky, loc. cit.
15. V. Sichinsky, *Narisi istorii ukrainiskoi promislivosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 23-24; about potash and tar production: A. Lazarevsky, *Opisanie staroi Malorossii*, Kiev, 1888, Vol. I, p. 108, and other places; the author mentioned the potash industry and referred to the name "Buda" given to various villages as a reminiscence of their economy in the past; O. Ohloblin, "Do istorii budnitskoi promislivosti Ukrainy za Khmelnicchini," *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologiczno-Viddilu Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Book X, Kiev, 1927, pp. 303-310; the same, *Dumki pro Khmelnicchiniu*, New York, 1957, pp. 12-13; the same, *Ocherki istorii ukrainiskoi fabriki, Manufactura v hetmanscbini*, Kiev, 1925; M. Slabchenko, *Orbanitsia Hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Kharkov, 1925, Vol. II, pp. 146-153 and other places.
16. Krupnitsky, op. cit., p. 148; about glass manufacturing, in general: V. Madzalevsky, *Huty na Cbernibivscbini*, Kiev, 1926; Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 21-30; Nestorenko, op. cit., pp. 141-145; also review of Modzelevsky's "Huty" by O. Ohloblin in *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologiczno-Viddilu Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Book X, Kiev, 1927, pp. 369-375.
17. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, pp. 96 and 125; the same: *Narisi z istorii ukrainiskoi promislivosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 25-27.
18. Slabchenko, op. cit., Odessa, Vol. II, p. 147-149.

## Notes to Chapter XV

19. D. Bahalii (Bagaley), *Ocherki z istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy Moskovskavo Gosudarstva*, Moscow, 1887, p. 551.
20. Sichinsky, op. cit.
21. Sichinsky, ibid.
22. Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 144-145.
23. Sichinsky, loc. cit., about specialty stores: I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevych), *Bobdan Kbmelnitsky*, Kiev, 1954, pp. 310-311, and 313; there were taverns specializing in the sale of whiskey, beer and whiskey, wine, and wine and honey; also, I. Aksakov, *Issledovanie o torgovle na ukrainskikh yarmarkakh*, St. Petersburg, 1858, p. 19, and other places mentioned specialty stores; Paul Alepo said that Ukrainian females traded various kinds of merchandise in beautiful stores.
24. P. Smolichev, "Do istorii porcelanovoho virobnitstva na Chernihivshchyni," *Yuvileinii zbrinik na chest M. Hrushevskoho*, Kiev, 1928, pp. 92-97; also, Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 42.
25. Nestorenko, op. cit., p. 305; briefly about Ukrainian ceramics: D. Horniatkevich, "Keramika," in *Encyklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich, 1949, Vol. I, pp. 301-303; Yu. Mikhailiv, "Shlakhi ukrainskoi keramiky," *Zbittia i revolutsia*, XI, Kiev, 1926; V. Sichynsky, "Ukrainska narodna keramika," *Nova Kbata*, Lviv, 1936-37.
26. V. Sichinsky, *Narisi z istorii ukrainskoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 14-15.
27. V. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, pp. 95, 132; P. Alepsky (Alepo), "Podorozh patriarkha Makara," *Zbittia i zovannia*, Lviv, 1935-36, Book IV, p. 16; V. Modzalevsky, "Z istorii knihi na Ukraini," *Knibar*, 1918, No. 5.
28. J. Ptasnik, *Papiernie w Polsce XVI w.*, Krakow, 1920, pp. 15, 17-20, 34-35, etc.; I. Ohienko, "Pochatki drukarstva," *Encyklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vols. I-III, pp. 970-972; the same, *Istoria ukrainskoho drukarstva*, Lviv, 1925; S. Maslov, "Ukrainische Druckkunst des XVI bis XVIII Jahrhunderts," *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, Mainz, 1926; also, M. Tishchenko, "Z istorii torhivli knizhkami v XVIII st.," *Ukraina*, July-August, 1929.
29. V. Sichynsky, *Narisi z istorii ukrainskoi promislovosti*, Lviv, 1936, pp. 15-16; I. Kripiakevich, "Pobut," *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, pp. 136-138; also, Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 148-149.
30. Op. cit., p. 100.
31. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 171.



## Notes to Chapter XV

32. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, p. 130.
33. V. Sichinsky, *Istoria ukrainskoho mystetstva*, New York, 1956, Vol. I, pp. 125, 139.
34. Ibid., pp. 126-127; I. Kripiakevich, M. Kapustiansky and others, ed., *Istoria ukrainskoho viiska*, Winnipeg, 1953, pp. 274-276.
35. See Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 115-143: his discussion of the eras of Ukrainian Baroque and Classicism is outstanding, indicating considerable knowledge of the subject matter. Actually, the work is a culmination of a life-time of research and study; also, F. Ernst, *Ukrainske mystetstvo XVII-XVIII vv.*, Kiev, 1918.
36. Sichinsky, op. cit., p. 118.
37. V. Antonovich, "O promishlennosti yugo-zapadnavo kraia v XVIII st.", *Zapiski Yugo-Zapadnavo Otdiela Russkavo Geograficheskavo Obscbestva*, V. I, Kiev, 1874, p. 179.

## Chapter XVI. Commerce.

1. I. Dzhidzhora (Dzhedzhora) *Ukraina v persbii polovini XVIII viku, Ekonomichna polityka rosiiskoho pravitelstva suproti Ukrainy v 1710-1730 rokakh*, Kiev, 1930, pp. 29-30; D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932-1933, Vol. II, p. 179.
2. V. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 149.
3. I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevych), "Pobut," in *Istoria ukrainskoi kultury*, Lviv, 1937, pp. 120-121; Yu. Lypa, *Priznacbennia Ukrainy*, New York, 1953, pp. 109-110.
4. Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 177; D. Olanchin, *Do istorii torbiuli Rusi-Ukrainy z Baltikoiu, zokrema zb Staroduba z Koenigsbergom naprikintsi XVII i poch. XVIII st.*, Zhovkva, 1932.
5. Kripiakevich, op. cit., p. 122.
6. Ibid.; I. Ohienko, "Pochatki drukarstva," in *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Munich-New York, 1949, Vol. I, Part III, pp. 970-972; A. Zhiivotko, a reprint, "Presha," in the same *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva*, Vol. I, Part III, p. 982.
7. Kripiakevich, *Bobdan Kbmelnitsky*, Kiev, 1954, p. 310.
8. O. Ohloblin, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta yoho doba*, New York-Paris-Toronto, 1960, pp. 101-107; Lypa, op. cit., p. 111; A. Nesterenko (Nestorenko), *Rozvitok promislovosti na Ukraini*, Part I, *Remeslo i manufaktura*, Kiev, 1959, pp. 206-215.

## Notes to Chapter XV

9. Krupnitsky (Krupnytsky), *Hetman Danilo Apostol*, Augsburg, 1948, p. 154.
10. L. Okinshevich, *Lektsii z istorii ukrainskoho prava*, Munich, 1947, pp. 76-77: "... the authority in the new state was in the hands of the 'Cossack Military,' which never fully realized the fact of being a government for the whole nation, and felt rather as being a representative of one class."
11. Kriplakevich, op. cit., p. 312; Nestorenko, op. cit., pp. 114-115; Sichinsky, op. cit., pp. 162 and 172; comprehensive coverage, however, I. Akskov, *Issledovanie o torgovle na ukrainskikh yarmarkakh*, St. Petersburg, 1858, p. 19.
12. Sichinsky, loc. cit.
13. Nestorenko, loc. cit.
14. Ibid., p. 186; V. Sichinsky (Sichynsky), *Naris z istorii ukrainskoi promyslovsti*, Lviv, 1936, p. 28.
15. Kriplakevich, op. cit., pp. 310-312.
16. I. Rudchenko, *Cbumatskii narodnii piesni*, Kiev, 1874; F. Shcherbina, *Narisi ukrainskikh artilei*, Odessa, 1880; also, Lypa, op. cit., pp. 105-112.
17. Kriplakevich, op. cit., pp. 315-317; Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 151-152.
18. Ibid.
19. V. Dubrovsky, "Do pitannian pro mizhnarodniu torhovli Ukrainy v pershii chverti XVIII st.," in *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologicbno ViddilU Ukrainkoi Akademii Nauk*, Vol. XXVI, Kiev, 1931; also briefly, Doroshenko, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 176-178.
20. Dzhidzhora, op. cit., pp. 10-30, and other places; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 179-180.
21. V. Sichinsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions*, New York, 1953, p. 162.
22. Dzhidzhora, op. cit., p. 8; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 181.
23. V. Antonovich, "O promishlennosti yugo-zapadnavo kraia v XVIII st.," in *Zapiski Yugo-Zapadnavo Otdiela Russkavo Geograficheskavo Obsbcbestva*, Vol. I, Kiev, 1974, p. 179.
24. M. Tishchenko, "Z istorii torhovli knizhkami v XVIII st.," in *Ukraina*, July-August, 1929; V. Modzalevsky, "Z istorii knihi na Ukraini," in *Knibar*, 1918, No. V.

## Notes to Chapter XVI

25. Dubrovsky, loc. cit., Dzhidzhora, op. cit., pp. 13-14; D. Olanchin, "Torhovelni zviazki Ukrainy z Breslovom u XVIII st.," in *Nasba Kultura*, Warsaw, 1935, Book 8; the same, "Torhovelni zviazki Ukrainy z Liaipzigmom u XVIII st.," *Nasba Kultura*, Warsaw, 1936, Book 6.
26. Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 246; D. Bahalli (Bagaley), *Zaselenia pivdennoi Ukrainy i persbi pochatki ii kulturnobo rozvithku*, Kharkiv, 1920.
27. M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizatsia Hospodarstvo Ukrainy*, Part I, *Hospodarstvo betmansbcbiny*, Odesa, 1923, pp. 102-103: "Khmelnitsky accepted the system of the "open door" in the international trade with the West"; I. Vitanovich (Vytanowych), "Suspilno-ekonomichni tendentsii v derzhavnomu budivnitstvi Ivana Mazepy," in *Papers*, Shevenko Scientific Society, No. 10, Chicago, 1959, p. 8: "Hetman P. Doroshenko ... established on the borders a new system of customs stations..."
28. Dzhidzhora, op. cit., pp. 35-36, 53, and 81.
29. Krupnitsky, op. cit., p. 153: The Poles removed their "stapel right" on produce and merchandise brought by the Ukrainian merchants in 1727.
30. About the Russian policies to kill independent Ukrainian foreign trade: K. Kononenko, *Ukraine and Russia, A History of Economic Relations Between Ukraine and Russia (1654-1917)*, Milwaukee, 1958, pp. 23-25; also, O. Ohloblin (Ogloblin), *Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi fabрики, Manufaktura v betmansbcbini*, Kiev, 1925, p. 38; M. Slabchenko, *Organizatsia kbaziastva Ukrainy*, Kharkiv, Part II, p. 92; Vitanovich, op. cit., pp. 13-16; Dzhidzhora, op. cit., pp. 29-84; Krupnitsky, op. cit., pp. 150-154.
31. Dzhidzhora, op. cit., pp. 18, 58, and 59-60; Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 182.
32. Krupnitsky, loc. cit.,

## Chapter XVII. Commerce

1. M. Slabchenko, *Orbanizatsia hospodarstva Ukrainy*, Part I, *Hospodarstvo betmansbcbiny*, Odesa, 1923, pp. 102-103.
2. Ibid., p. 104.
3. V. Bidnov, "Hroshti," in *Ukrainska Zabalna Encikolpedia*, Lviv-Stanislaviv-Kolomya, Vol. III, p. 995; A. Shuhalevsky, *Moneti i dieniezbniei sbcbot na levo-bierezbniei Ukrainie*, Chernihiv, 1917; also, the same, "Moneta na Ukraini," *Enciklopedia ukrainoznavstva, Slovnikova chastina*, Paris-New York, 1955-57, Vol. I, pp. 447-450.
4. V. Veselaho, "Principi ekonomichnoi politiki Bohdana Khmel'nitskoho," in *Narisi z istorii ekonomichnoi dumki na Ukraini*, ed. by D. Virnik, Kiev, 1956, pp. 96-102.

## Notes to Chapter XVII

5. Bidnov, loc. cit.

6. Analogous developments also took place in colonial and early America where credit had to compensate for the lack of money: E. Bogart and D. Kemmerer, *Economic History of the American People*, New York-London-Toronto, 1951, pp. 125-126, 136-145. The monetary situation in Western Europe at that time: S. Clough, *The Economic Development of Western Civilization*, New York-Toronto-London, 1959, pp. 189-196.

7. Slabchenko, op. cit., p. 107.

8. D. Virnik, *Ukrainskaia SSR, kratkii istoriko-ekonomicheskii ocherk*, Moscow, 1954, pp. 1-20; the same, "Osnovni zavdannia doslidzhen istorii ekonomichnoi dumki na Ukraini," *Narisi z istorii ekonomichnoi dumki na Ukraini*, D. Virnik, ed., Kiev, 1956, pp. 10-20; P. Lyashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia*, New York, 1949, pp. 403-417; Nesterenko, op. cit., pp. 206-212; A. Nesterenko, I. Romanenko and D. Virnik, editors, *Ocherki razvittia narodnovo kbaziistva Ukrainiskoi SSR*, Moscow, 1954, pp. 5-17, 19, 23; all those authors refer to Marx and Lenin as the indisputable authorities on the history of capital accumulation: K. Marx, *Capital*, New York, 1906, pp. 590-805, clearly indicated the idea of exploitation; also, V. Lenin, "The Teachings of Karl Marx," *Handbook of Marxism*, comp. by E. Burns, New York, 1935.

9. V. Modzalevsky, "Pershii vilskovii pidskarbii Roman Rakushka," *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologicchno Viddilu Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Kiev, 1919, Vol. I; V. Rudnev, "Finansovii stan Hetmanshchiny za Petra I," in *Naukovii Zbirnik za rik 1925, Istorichna Sekcia Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Kiev, 1926; L. Okinshevich (Okinshevych), *Lektsii z istorii ukrainskoho prava*, Munich, 1947, pp. 113-114; D. Doroshenko, *Naris istorii Ukrainy*, Warsaw, 1932-33, Vol. II, pp. 125-128.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. I. Kholm'sky, *Istoria Ukrainy*, New York, 1949, pp. 288-289.

13. Slabchenko, op. cit., pp. 180-181.

14. Veselaho, op. cit., p. 98.

15. Doroshenko, op. cit., p. 188; P. Nechiporenko, "Pro proportsii ta ratsii na Hetmanshchini 1725-1750 p." *Zapiski Istorichno-Filologicchno Viddilu Ukrainiskoi Akademii Nauk*, Kiev, 1928, Vol. XX.

## Chapter XVIII. Ukraine After 1781: A Captive Nation, A Contiguous Colony

1. J. Goldstein, *Russia, Her Economic Past and Future*, New York, 1919, p. 46; the reader finds there a statistical table indicating the volume of trade of various

## Notes to Chapter XVIII

Russian ports prior to the First World War. The unfavorable position of the Black Sea ports in this respect, and in comparison with other ports of the Empire is there quite evident; also, R. Diminsky (Dyminsky) "Economic Life," in *Ukraine and its People*, ed. by I. Mirchuk, Munich, 1949, pp. 127-28; N. Fr.-Chirovsky, *The Economic Factors in the Growth of Russia*, New York, 1957, p. 59.

2. S. Balzak, V. Vasyutin, and Ya. Feigin, editors, *Economic Geography of the USSR*, New York, 1952, pp. 122-133; Diminsky, op. cit., pp. 123-129; B. Vinar, *Ekonomicbnii kolonializm v Ukraini*, Paris, 1958.

3. However, a quite different opinion about the role of Russia in the economic development of Ukraine is held by the official Academy of Sciences of the USSR, a submissive tool of Russian rule and supremacy. It joins the actions to praise the Agreement of Pereyaslav of 1654, the unholy Russian-Ukrainian alliance. In 1954, *Ocherki razvitiia narodnavao kbaziastva Ukrainskoi SSR*, a work edited by Nesterenko (Nestorenko), Romanenko and Virnik, was published under the auspices of that Academy. This work is permeated by Marxian and pro-Russian bias. Therefore, it has little scholarly value. Of course, this line was joined by such Soviet scholars as Lyashchenko, Virnik, Nesterenko (Nestorenko), Veselaho and others. I. Kripiakevich (Krypiakevich), for example, expressed quite different views in his work, "Studii nad derzhavoiu Bohdana Khmelnitskoho," *Zapiski Naukovobo Tovaristva im. Shevchenka*, Vols. 129, 130, 134-135, 139-140, 147, and 151, Lviv, 1920-1931, as long as he worked under relative freedom in Poland. In 1944, the Soviets dominated West Ukraine, and Kripiakevich had to write under Communist "supervision." His *Bobdan Kbmelnitsky (1954)* is a complete reversal of his earlier views. His work is filled with Marxism and Leninism, and he expresses pro-Russian ideas. The historical tendency of the Russian-Soviet school may be briefly defined as follows: the Ukrainians are their own enemies and only the Russians know what is good for them.

## INDEX OF NAMES

This index includes the names of the historical personages and those of the authors referred to in the body of this book. The names of institutions, places and events have been omitted. The attention of the reader is called to the fact that in many instances two or three spellings of these names have been given, since various translators of the works of Ukrainian and Russian authors into English, Polish and German used different spellings and transliterations. The present author, quoting these works, adhered to this pattern so that the reader could more easily find the source material. This fact has already been mentioned in the Preface.

- Adam of Bremen, 96.  
Alepo, see Paul of Alepo.  
Aksakov, I., 299, 309, 337.  
Alexander I, of Poland, 151.  
Andreas, of Hungary, 96.  
Andrew, a craftsman, 315.  
Andronikos, of Greece, 82.  
Apostol, Daniel (Danilo), 226, 227, 229, 238, 240, 243, 253, 255, 277, 279-80, 283-285, 287-88, 294-95, 301, 309-10, 314, 316, 326, 335-36, 344, 348-50, 352, 356, 358, 361-62.  
Aristotle, 28.  
Aristov, N. 88.  
Askold, 25, 29, 55, 113, 123.  
Astamatenko, O., 333, 348, 360.  
Bahalii (Bagaley), D., 88, 108, 265, 277.  
Baida-Vishnivetsky (Wisniowecki), D., see also, Vyshnyvetsky, family, 155, 170, 257.  
Balashevich, J., 316.  
Balashevich, K., 316, 317.  
Baluse, J., 283, 289.  
Balzak, S., 365.  
Bandinelli, R., 333.  
Baptist, I., 327-28.  
Baran, V., a craftsman, 321.  
Baranovich, A., 270, 328.  
Barsky, I., 328.  
Batu, Khan, 60, 130.  
Bayer, G., 57.  
Beauplan, de, G., 165, 168, 174, 181, 182, 192, 271, 275, 279, 308, 315, 316, 326, 329.  
Bell, J., 289.  
Bestuzhev-Riumin, K., 32.  
Bidnov, V., 356.  
Bohdanovich (Bohdanovych), S., 235.  
Bohinsky, a craftsman, 321.  
Bilozersky, a craftsman, 321.  
Branicki, family, 257.  
Brückner, A., 56.  
Brukhovetsky, I., 230, 231, 251, 355, 358, 363.  
Casimir (Kazimierz), the Great, of Poland, 133-34, 137-38, 150, 203.  
Catherine, the Great, 227, 285.  
Ceh, see Tseh.  
Charles XII, of Sweden, 226.  
Chojecki, K., 289.  
Chubaty (Chubatyj, Tschubatyj), N., 53, 67, 132, 148, 152-53.  
Constantine Porphyrogenitus (Porphyrogenitus), emperor, 8, 41, 98, 103, 109, 117.  
Cromwell, O., 283.  
Ciril (Cyril) of Turiv, 100.  
Chortoriisky (Czartoryski), princely family, 170.  
Daniel (Danilo) of Galicia, 87, 89, 94, 96, 101, 129, 131.  
Dashkevich, (Dashkovych), O., 155.  
Derevianko, I., 293, 296, 335.  
Diakonov, M., 224.  
Dietko, D., 133.  
Diminsky (Dyminsky), R., 365.  
Dir (Dyr), 25, 29, 55, 113, 123.  
Dolgorukii, family, 287.

- Doroshenko, P., Hetman, 223, 231, 251, 283, 348, 361.
- Doroshenko, D., historian, 53, 96, 273, 347, 355.
- Dovnar-Zapolsky (Zapolskii), M. 97.
- Dubrovsky, V., 342, 346, 364.
- Duran, F., 289.
- Dzhidzhora (Dzhedzhora), I., 273, 345, 353, 364.
- Efimenko (Yefimenkova), O., 230.
- Fedorovich, I., 194.
- Felz-Fein, family, 253, 287.
- Filbert, family, 287.
- Florinsky (Florinskii), M., 77.
- Froelich, a craftsman, 315.
- Gallus Anonomus, 117.
- Gedeonov, S., 57.
- Gedimin (Gedymin), of Lithuania, 132-33, 141.
- Ginghis (Genghis)-Khan, 4, 13, 116, 129.
- George (Yurii), II - Boleslav, 133, 186.
- Gmelin, S., 279, 318.
- Golovkin, family, 287.
- Colubiev (Golubiov), S., 14.
- Gordon, P., 270, 286, 289.
- Grekov, B., 15, 88, 97.
- Hamalia, A., 319.
- Hedvig (Jadwiga), of Poland, 134.
- Henry IV, emperor, 80.
- Herle, a craftsman, 315.
- Herzig, family, 229, 293.
- Hildebrandt, K., 260, 288, 305, 308, 326, 327.
- Hloba, Cossack official, 254, 273.
- Horlenko, D., 253, 310.
- Hrishko (Hryshko), V., 231.
- Hrushevsky (Hrushevski), M., 14, 48, 53, 59, 67, 76, 83, 115, 169, 186, 224, 230.
- Hueldestaedt, J., 260, 261, 271, 280, 289, 302, 311, 313, 329, 337, 343.
- Ibn-Chordadbeh, see Ibn-Khordadbeh.
- Ibn-Dasta (Dusta, Rusta), 8, 34, 49, 83, 109, 115.
- Ibn-Fadlan (Fadhlan), 49, 83, 115-16.
- Ibn-Hawqual (Hauqal), 49.
- Ibn-Jacob, 8, 115.
- Ibn-Khordadbeh (Chordadbeh), 100, 115, 117.
- Ibn-Rusta, see Ibn-Dasta.
- Ihor (Igor), Rurik's grandson, 34, 53, 85, 113, 114, 116, 123.
- Ihor (Igor), Sviatoslavovich, 88.
- Illovaiskii (Illovaysky), D., 57.
- Ivanitsky, a craftsman, 321.
- Jablonowski, family, 257.
- John (Jan) III, Sobieski, of Poland, 137.
- Just, J., 270, 289, 302, 325, 326.
- Kalinik (Kalynyk), O., 346.
- Kachor, A., 364.
- Kalinowski, family, 254.
- Kalnishevsky (Kalnyshevsky), P., 254, 273.
- Karpika, a merchant, 345.
- Kazimierz, see Casimir.
- Keller, von, J., 288.
- Khmelnitsky (Khmelnysky), B., 222-25, 228, 230, 235, 240, 278, 283, 288, 316, 326, 333, 335-36, 340, 341, 347-48, 355, 358, 360-61.
- Khanenko, M., 262, 281.
- Khoriv, (Khoryv, Choryv), 32, 34, 38.
- Kishka, S., 222.
- Kluchevskii (Kluchevsky, Klutchewski), V., 13, 15, 37, 53, 58, 59, 67-68, 76, 86, 95, 97.
- Kmeller, V., 193.
- Kochubei, V., 253, 278, 322, 328.
- Koenigseck, F., 316.
- Konechny, F., 56.
- Konieczpolski, family, 254.
- Kononenko, K., 253, 266, 279, 364.
- Kononiv, craftsman, 321.
- Korkunov, N., 224.
- Kormilchich (Kormylchych), V., 65.
- Kornis, family, 253, 287.
- Kosinsky (Kosynsky), C., 222.
- Kostomarov, M., 59, 76.
- Kotovich, P., 335.
- Kovnir, S., 327.
- Krahl, a craftsman, 315.
- Krichevsky (Krychevsky), M., 235.

- Kripiakevich (Krypiakevich), I., 182, 261, 262, 281, 287, 331, 339-40, 359.
- Krishanivsky (Kryzhanivsky), family, 229.
- Krupnitsky (Krapnytsky), B., 273-74, 302, 306, 312, 320, 350.
- Kulisher (Kulischer), I., 41, 88.
- Kuzhumiaka, K., 41, 105.
- Kuziela (Kuzela), Z., 9.
- Kyi (Kii), 32, 34, 38.
- Lassota, E., 178.
- Lavrik, a merchant, 345.
- Lenin, V., 77.
- Lebed, princess, 34.
- Lev, of Galicia, 96.
- Lisitsa, I., 358.
- Litvin, M., 165.
- Lizohub (Lysohub), Cossack family, 278, 322, 327, 328.
- Lomikovsky (Lomykovsky), I., 278, 301, 322, 358.
- Los, a craftsman, 321.
- Lubart, Gedimynovich, 133.
- Lubavskii (Liubavskii, -ky), M., 152, 158.
- Luke, a craftsman, 315
- Lukasevich (Lukasevych), a pharmacist, 282.
- Lukianov, I., 288, 289.
- Lyashchenko, P., 77, 88, 97, 99, 152-53, 232, 288, 357, 364.
- Lyashchenko, R., 224.
- Lypa, Yu., 339.
- Lypinsky (Lipinsky), V., 224, 231.
- Maksimovich (Maksymovych), (M), a merchant, 293, 296, 335.
- Maksimovich (Maksymovych), M., a historian, 14.
- Mal, prince, 34.
- Manning, C., 53.
- Markovich (Markovych, Markowitz), family, 229, 262.
- Markovsky, family, 322.
- Marshall, J., 259-60, 263-64, 271-72, 288-89, 331, 344.
- Marx, K., 77.
- Masudi, Al, 8, 33, 115, 116.
- Mathew, a craftsman, 315.
- Matvievich, 322.
- Mauricius, emperor, 172.
- Mavor, J., 78.
- Mazepa, I., 223, 225-26, 228-31, 235, 240, 243, 253, 255, 267-68, 277-79, 282-84, 287-88, 292, 294-95, 301, 304, 316, 319, 324, 326-28, 333, 335-36, 348, 350, 357-58, 360-63.
- Meinstein (Manstein), Ch., 289.
- Mengli-Gerei (Girey), khan, 157, 205.
- Menshikov, prince, family, 253, 287, 312.
- Mereder (Merettini, Meretin), 328.
- Meyerberg, A., 327.
- Mezensky, V., 335.
- Miakotin, V., 253, 266, 364.
- Michael, of Chernihiv, 87.
- Miklashevsky, M., 253, 278, 294, 319, 322, 326, 328.
- Mirabeau, Marquis, de, 259.
- Mirovich, I., 294, 326, 327.
- Modzalevsky, V., 364.
- Mohila (Mohyla), P., Metropolitan 328.
- Mnohohrishny, D., 235, 333, 358, 360-361.
- Morozenko-Morozovsky, colonel, 235.
- Mokievsky, K., 294, 326.
- Moskowitz, family, 229.
- Mstislav, prince, 95, 96.
- Mueller, L., 178.
- Munnich (Munnich, Minikh), general, 310, 312.
- Nalyvaiko, S., 222.
- Nebaba, M., 293.
- Nechai, I., 235.
- Nestor, monk, 8, 55, 57, 80.
- Nestorenko (Nesterenko), A., 232, 297, 299, 303, 312, 318, 337-38, 357.
- Nolde, B., 224.
- Odinez, D., 224.
- Ohloblin (Ogloblin), O., 231, 253, 255, 256, 267, 277, 279, 291, 309, 319, 326, 364.
- Okinshevich (Okynshevych), L., 224, 231.
- Oleh (Oleg), 53, 55, 113, 116, 123.



- Olha (Olga, Helga), 34, 83, 89, 103, 114, 123.
- Orlik (Orlyk), P., 229, 278, 301, 322.
- Ostrianin (Ostrianyn), Ya., 161, 222, 244.
- Ostrozhakyy (Ostroski), C., family, 170, 193, 194, 257.
- Palii, S., 230-231, 268.
- Paul Alepo, of Alepo, 260-61, 288, 308, 311, 321, 325-27, 337, 361.
- Pavluk, P., 222.
- Peter, the Great, 2, 26, 226, 228-29, 280, 285, 304, 311, 316, 320, 325-26, 351, 363.
- Petrik (Petryk)-Ivanenko, P., 230.
- Piasecki, bishop, 199.
- Pidkova, I., 155.
- Plano Carpini, de, J., 130.
- Platonov, S., 12.
- Pogodin, M., 13-14, 53, 58, 69, 86, 130.
- Pokrovskii (Pokrovsky), M., 12, 14, 97.
- Polubotok, P., 240, 278, 279, 322, 327, 345.
- Popov, O., 224.
- Potiomkin (Potiemkin), G., 287, 312.
- Potocki, family, 170, 257.
- Potosky, author, 355.
- Presniakov, A., 12, 14, 58.
- Prihoda, K., 319.
- Prokopovich (Prokopovych), S., 278, 322.
- Plasnik, J., 149.
- Pushkar, M., 231.
- Quarenghi, G., 328.
- Quesnay, F., 259.
- Radivil (Radvilas, Radziwil), 152.
- Rakushka, R., 358.
- Rastrelli, B., 328.
- Rinaldi, architect, 328.
- Roman, of Galicia, 65.
- Rosenfeldt, I., 224.
- Rozhkov, N., 89.
- Rozumovsky, C., 223, 227, 240, 264, 280, 282, 284-85, 309, 310, 322-23, 326-28, 353.
- Rubrik (de Rubricus), 119, 338,
- Rurik (Ruryk), dynasty, house, 53, 55, 57-60, 64-65, 86, 94, 129, 131-32, 141.
- Ruzhynsky (Ruzhynsky), B., 155.
- Samoilovich (Samoilovych), I., 223, 228-29, 245, 273, 277, 279, 288, 292, 294-95, 326, 328, 335, 336, 342, 348, 350, 355, 357, 361.
- Savitsky, P., 95.
- Schedel, J., 327-28.
- Schlözer, A., 57.
- Schwartz, H., 366.
- Sergeyevich (Sergeievych, Sergeevich), V. 224.
- Sernikau, A., 327.
- Shafirov, family, 287.
- Shakhmatov, A., 9, 12.
- Shchek, 32, 34, 38.
- Shelukhin, S., 10.
- Shermiev, family, 287.
- Shevchenko, city patrician, 278, 322.
- Shevchenko, T., 262.
- Shirai, S., family, 293, 296, 319, 335.
- Shumlansky, j., bishop, 247.
- Sichynsky (Sichynsky), V., 311, 321, 324, 326, 364.
- Sidoriv, a craftsman, 321.
- Silenko, P., 301.
- Siltman, D., 261.
- Sirko, I., 258.
- Skabichevsky, a craftsman, 321.
- Skoropadsky, I., 226, 253, 267, 284, 287-88, 294-95, 335-36, 348-49, 352, 356, 361-62.
- Skorupi, family, 293.
- Slabchenko, M., 160, 230, 234, 251-52, 256, 259, 262, 266, 320-21, 326, 347, 355, 364.
- Slozka, M., 194.
- Sobolevskii, A., 13, 14, 53, 130.
- Soloviev (Soloviov), S., 58, 60.
- Somko, Ya., 316.
- Startsiv, F., 327.
- Startsiv, J., 327.
- Stephan Batory, of Poland, 156.
- Stolypin, P., 20.
- Stroganovs, family, 287, 312.
- Sviatopolk, the Sinner, 102, 119, 122.

- Sviatoslav, the Conqueror, 53, 55, 85,  
 110, 114-16, 123.  
 Szelagowski, A., 213.
- Tekeley, general, 227.  
 Teteria, P., 232.  
 Teterivsky, I., 335.  
 Thitmar of Merseburg, 96.  
 Tishchenko, M., 364.  
 Tomaris, family, 293.  
 Tomashivsky, S., 55.  
 Triasil (Tryasylo), T., 222.  
 Tisha, M., 293.  
 Tsch, a pharmacist, 282.  
 Tyshkevich (Tishkevich), family, 160.
- Vasiliv, M., 258.  
 Vassal, family, 287.  
 Vernadsky, G., 43, 53-54, 71, 77, 80,  
 89-90, 117, 121.  
 Veselabo, V., 355.  
 Viazamskii, family, 287.  
 Vimina, A., 262, 305, 306.  
 Vinar, B., 364.  
 Virnik, D., 232, 357.  
 Vishnivetsky (Vyshnevetsky, Wis-  
 niowiecki), family, 170, 257,  
 also see Baida.  
 Vitanovich (Wytanovych), I., 283.  
 Vitovt (Witold), of Lithuania, 137,  
 152.  
 Vladimriskii-Budanov, M., 61, 152.  
 Vladislaus, Lokietek, of Poland, 203.  
 Vladislavovich (Vladyslavovych),  
 S., 319.  
 Volobuiev (Volobuyev), M., 256, 364.  
 Volodimir (Vladimir), the Great, 53,  
 55, 57, 59, 79, 94-96, 114, 119, 123.  
 Volodimir (Vladimir), Monomakh, 79,  
 81-82, 95, 121.  
 Volodimir (Vladimir), of Galicia, 65.  
 Volodimir (Vladimir), of Volhynia, 84,  
 86, 87.
- Vorontsov, family, 253, 287.  
 Voltaire, F., 289-90.  
 Vozniak, M., 9.  
 Vuyakovich, M., 328.  
 Vyhovsky, I., 223, 225, 229-31, 235,  
 276, 286, 333.
- Weber, F., 290.  
 Weihe, a Swedish officer, 259-260,  
 263, 272, 305, 321.  
 Weisse, a craftsman, 315.  
 Weissbach, family, 287.  
 Werdum (Verdum), U., 165, 171-72,  
 261, 308.  
 Witte, de, J., 328.  
 Wolff, a craftsman, 315.
- Yagiella (Jagiallas, Jagiello), W.,  
 of Poland, 134, 137.  
 Yakhimovich, G., 278, 322.  
 Yakovliv, A., 224.  
 Yaniv, V., 62-63.  
 Yaroshevich, A., 301.  
 Yaroslav, of Galicia, 82.  
 Yaroslav, the Wise, 55, 57, 59, 79,  
 94-96, 102-3, 114, 119, 123, 124.  
 Yaroslavsky, P., 328.  
 Yurii, see George.
- Zakrevsky, N., 124.  
 Zamojski, family, 160, 170, 254, 257.  
 Zarudny, I., 328.  
 Zaslavsky, family, 257.  
 Zavadovsky, family, 328.  
 Zborovsky, S., 155.  
 Zhuiev (Zhuyev, Zuyev), V., 289,  
 326, 328, 337.  
 Zigmundus (Zygmund), of Poland,  
 137-38.  
 Zolotarenko, I., 293, 316.  
 Zuyev, see Zhuiev.

