



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

On the Kyivan Princely Tradition from the Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries

Author(s): OLENA V. RUSYNA and Marco Carynnyk

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3/4 (December 1994), pp. 175-190

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036900>

Accessed: 29/09/2014 16:24

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.*

<http://www.jstor.org>

## On the Kyivan Princely Tradition from the Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries

OLENA V. RUSYNA

Commenting in the last third of the seventeenth century on the confirmation of the Lithuanian palatine Martin Gasztołd in Kyiv in 1471, the compiler of the *Synopsis* noted: “И от того времени преславное самодержавіе киевское, Богу тако грех ради человеческих попустившу, в уничиженіе толико приіде, яко от царствія в княженіе, а от княженія в воеводство пременися.”<sup>1</sup> Although this observation was entirely correct from a factual point of view, the history of Kyiv cannot serve as an illustration of the well-known paraphrase “Sic transit gloria urbis,” for even after Kyiv lost its political significance (which was determined by the presence of the “senior” Rus’ prince and the metropolitan of all Rus’) it retained for several centuries its charismatic status as the “first among all cities and lands.”<sup>2</sup> This is clearly evident in sources from the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries in which Kyiv is described as the “chief city of all Rus’” (an epistle by Patriarch Nil in 1380), the “mother and head of all Rus’ cities” (the trip to Constantinople in 1419 by Zosyma, deacon of the Trinity-Serhiiv Monastery), the “head of all Rus’ lands” (a letter by Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas in 1427), the “glorious great city of Kyiv, mother of cities” (the Kyiv Condensed, or Volhynian Concise, Chronicle from the first half of the sixteenth century), the “blessed city, also known as the mother of cities in the Rus’ land” (a charter by Patriarch Maxim, dated 1481, but in fact a late sixteenth-century forgery).<sup>3</sup> Sebastian Kl’onovych expressed this idea in poetic form in his poem *Roxolania* (1584):

Know all people that in Rus’ Kyiv means as much  
As ancient Rome once did for all Christians.<sup>4</sup>

No wonder these ideas were frequently used in the political and ideological sphere. In the sixteenth century, in particular, the claim that Kyiv continued to be the capital of all Rus’ (“był i jest głową i głównem miastem Ruskiej ziemie” or “caput terrarum Russiae, Podoliae et Voliniae”) became an important component of the restitution theory, which was used to justify the “reintegration” of the Rus’ palatinates of Lithuania with Crown Poland in 1569.<sup>5</sup> The theory itself was created as the antithesis to similar claims by the Muscovite rulers, who had energetically insisted since the late fifteenth century on their right to rule freely throughout their Rus’ “patrimony.”

It should be noted that this patrimonial conception (the genesis of which has been thoroughly investigated in the specialized literature) could have appeared

*Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 18(3/4) December 1994: 175–90.

only in the absence in southern Rus' of elite groups that would have proclaimed their descent from the ancient Kyiv Riurykide dynasty and would have maintained political and dynastic continuity.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, Muscovite ideologists took into account the Kyiv region's own tradition of princely rule even when this tradition was interrupted. It is significant that Muscovy's first concrete step toward the "return" of the southern Rus' lands was the conclusion of an alliance in 1490 with Caesar Maximilian according to which he was to support Ivan III in his struggle for the "Kyiv principality, which is held by the Polish king Casimir and his children."<sup>7</sup> The terminology used by the Polish side was similar: in 1569 the Kyiv region was united to the Crown as the "Kyiv land and principality."<sup>8</sup>

In analyzing these facts we should, of course, take into account the inertia of social thought and the continued use of anachronistic names for administrative and territorial units.<sup>9</sup> Yet ideas of Kyiv as the bearer of the princely tradition, ideas shaped both by historical memories of Old Rus' and by the political practice of the fourteenth-fifteenth centuries, when this tradition was implemented in other ways, also left their mark.<sup>10</sup> The paradox is that because of the interruption in chronicle writing in the region and the disturbance of dynastic relations with those Eastern Slavic lands where chronicle writing was continued we possess far less information about the tradition of the fourteenth-sixteenth centuries than about the Old Rus' tradition and thus have only a superficial and schematic understanding, even of individual personalities.<sup>11</sup> The subject requires serious professional elaboration, including both purely historical and archeological, numismatic, and epigraphic evidence. This study, which summarizes the author's observations in this field and defines the questions that should draw scholarly attention, is a step in that direction.

One of the most important of these questions is the transformation of the princely tradition in the Kyiv region during the Tatar period (1340s–1450s). In our view, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi was right when he hypothesized that the region's loss of its princes after Batu Khan's invasion was directly connected with the absence of a local dynasty and Kyiv's specific status as the common patrimony of the Riurykide dynasty, to which all its branches had equal claims.<sup>12</sup> The traditional mechanisms that ensured the functioning of princely rule in Kyiv broke down because of the particularization of the political ambitions of the Rus' princes, which became especially evident in the 1340s, when both Danylo Romanovych and Iaroslav Vsevolodovych took the Kyiv throne with the assistance of their deputies. Their successor, Oleksandr Iaroslavych, also did not appear in Kyiv: having received from the Tatars after the death of his father "Kyiv and the entire Rus' land," he returned from Karakorum to Novgorod and did not settle down until he seized from his brother Andrei the Vladimir principality (1252), after which, in John Fennel's words, "Kiev and the south had as it were slipped from the hands of the rulers of north-east [Rus'] . . ." <sup>13</sup>

The attempt to prolong the existence of the institution of princely rule and hence of Kyivan Rus' as a viable political organism by citing "the firm chronicle tradition according to which Kyiv continued to remain in the hands of northern princes," can hardly be considered successful.<sup>14</sup> After all, it is only a matter of the late, seventeenth-century *Hustynia Chronicle* in which Oleksandr Iaroslavych and his brother and successor on the Vladimir throne Iaroslav Iaroslavych are called, accordingly, "Muscovite and Kyiv" and "Lithuanian and Kyiv" princes.<sup>15</sup> The absurdity of the first predicates clearly testifies against the latter. Even more doubtful is the reference in the same chronicle under the year 1305 to the beginning of Ivan Kalita's rule in Kyiv.<sup>16</sup> It is true that the nature of this reference does not keep researchers from tracing it back to a hypothetical chronicle by Volodymyr Ol'herdovych and synchronizing it with a supposed expedition by Gediminas against Kyiv in 1324.<sup>17</sup> So this question clearly cannot be answered without a thorough textual analysis of the *Hustynia Chronicle*. And yet it is symptomatic that such a thoughtful scholar as Hrushevs'kyi, who at first saw in it "certain hints" to Kyiv chronicle writing in the second half of the fourteenth century, later completely changed his mind and wrote: "The editor of the compilation of these events did not have at his disposal any source that we do not know of, and his reports are obviously only his own surmises and as such worthless."<sup>18</sup>

We believe that the Kyiv throne, which was vacant after the early 1250s, could hardly have been filled using the resources of the region, that is, by recruitment of rulers from among the local boyars. This possibility was not contradicted by A. B. Presniakov, who emphasized that "the Tatars offered to the boyar Fedir, who was tortured to death in the Horde together with Prince Mykhailo of Chernihiv, the reign of the latter if he made concessions to their demands."<sup>19</sup> But the account of Mykhailo's death that he quotes is, despite a number of documentary details, a literary creation intended to glorify Mykhailo and Fedir as martyrs and so can hardly be relied upon in this case.<sup>20</sup> In addition, such a procedure was impossible from the point of view of the mentality of both the Old Rus' period and later ages.<sup>21</sup> It suffices to recall the events that occurred in Kyiv after the death of Semen Olel'kovych in 1470: the people of Kyiv refused to recognize Martin Gasztold as their ruler because he was not of princely descent and demanded that Casimir set up Mykhailo Olel'kovych or any other prince regardless of his religion.

In the second half of the thirteenth century the Kyiv region was, in the words of Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, "under the direct rule of the Tatars."<sup>22</sup> It was only at the end of the thirteenth century that a princely dynasty, of Putyvl' descent, was established here. Information about it, which has been called "a bright ray cast into the impenetrable gloom of Kyiv history after Batu Khan's invasion," was contained in a now lost synodal book from the Novhorod-Siverskyi Transfiguration Monastery in which were listed the names of princes Ioann of Putyvl', his son Ioann-Volodymyr Ioannovych of Kyiv, Andrii of Ovruch, and his son Vasyvl', killed at Putyvl'.<sup>23</sup> Having established themselves

on the Kyiv throne, the princes of Putyvl' maintained extremely close ties with their patrimony (where younger representatives of the dynasty were possibly in power). Traces of these ties are recorded at a later age (the late fourteenth century) in the form of the administrative subordination of Putyvl' to Kyiv.<sup>24</sup> Scholarly literature correctly pointed out that this union "from the geographic point of view . . . was rather artificial: the Putyvl' region did not have a direct connection with Kyiv."<sup>25</sup> So the proposed explanation of this phenomenon strikes us as the most likely one.

It is true that the entries in the Novhorod-Siverskyi synodal book are not dated, which allowed P. G. Klepatskii, despite the opinions of R. V. Zotov, Hrushevskyyi, and other scholars, to attribute the rule of Ioann-Volodymyr Ioannovych of Kyiv to the early fifteenth century.<sup>26</sup> Yet this dating is contradicted by the prince's double name: as Andrzej Poppe has observed, "the last known prince Volodymyr who was given a separate baptismal name was Volodymyr-Ioann Vasylykovich, nephew of Danylo of Halych, who was born about 1249 . . . in the 1320s–1340s the princely name Volodymyr became a baptismal name in five princely families. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the name of St. Volodimer was used in baptisms in boyar and merchant families (the first to be mentioned was the Muscovite voivode Vladimir Vsevolodovich, born close to 1340)."<sup>27</sup> As for the genealogical constructions of Klepatskii, who identified Ioann-Volodymyr as the grandson of Koryhailo Ol'herdovych, their groundlessness was convincingly established by A. Prochaska.<sup>28</sup>

It is difficult to determine how the princes of Putyvl' were established in Kyiv. The most likely explanation is that the leading role was played by the support of the Tatar feudals who settled in the Seim River region, which in the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries was a zone of active Turko-Slavic contacts.<sup>29</sup> And yet it would be premature to ignore completely the Galician-Volhynian factor. The possibility of identifying Prince Andrii of Ovruch, by origin from Putyvl', with Andrii Putyvl'ych (or Putyvlets') from Lev Danylovych's entourage appears quite attractive.<sup>30</sup> And yet this assumption is no more than a hypothesis.<sup>31</sup>

No less problematic is the question whether Prince Fedir of Kyiv, known for his robbery of the Novgorod archbishop Vasilii in 1331, belonged to the Putyvl' dynasty.<sup>32</sup> Zotov confidently described him as a relative of Ioann-Volodymyr of Kyiv and Andrii of Ovruch, but this can be explained as an erroneous reading of the Kyiv synodal book published by Filaret.<sup>33</sup> In our view, this prince can be more likely identified as the "great prince Feodor" mentioned in the *pom'ianyky* from the Kyiv Caves Monastery.<sup>34</sup> Although this does not shed light on his origin, it does once again show how important it is, as Hrushevskyyi himself insisted, to locate, publish, and study all the princely synodal books from the Kyiv and Chernihiv regions.<sup>35</sup>

On the other hand, it is now possible, we think, to reject completely the idea of family ties between Fedir of Kyiv and Gediminas, which gained currency in

historiography through the publication in V. N. Beneshevich's "Excerpts from the History of the Rus' Church in the Fourteenth Century" of brief notes written in Greek and contained in a fourteenth-century Greek collection at the Vatican.<sup>36</sup> Fasmer and Priselkov's "first attempt to translate and explain . . . this interesting but complicated source for the history of the Rus' Church" is in our view unsuccessful: in interpreting the data they made a number of mistakes, arbitrary assumptions, and distortions.<sup>37</sup> This makes it impossible to agree with Priselkov's attribution of the excerpts to the chancellor of Metropolitan Theognost: some of the entries more probably concern Metropolitan Maxim, who died in 1305, and his successor Peter. In the reference to "Fedor, brother of Gediminas," Fasmer's reading of the second anthroponym is hypothetical, and the absence of a princely title with both names, as well as the absence of such information in the sources, makes such an identification improbable.<sup>38</sup> Based on such a shaky foundation in the sources, the revival in recent decades of the belief that Gediminas's expedition to Kyiv was a historical reality, which was rejected by historiography at the turn of the century, is now, in the final analysis, groundless.<sup>39</sup> His imaginary brother cannot be identified without sufficient arguments with Fedir of Kyiv: the only undisputed element in the chronicle account of the events of 1331 is the presence in Kyiv, along with the local prince, of a representative of the Tatar administration. Obviously the territorial limits of their competence were preserved: the borders of the Kyiv *t'ma* were simultaneously the borders of the Kyiv principality.<sup>40</sup>

This situation could have also existed in the second half of the fourteenth century, when Olherd, who "took" Kyiv under the local prince, placed his son Volodymyr here: during the reign of the latter the dependence of his realms on the Golden Horde had not been abolished.<sup>41</sup> As well, there is a good bit of misunderstanding concerning the definition of the borders of Volodymyr Olherdovych's "state." On the one hand, data from reliable, even though chronologically later, sources are not always taken into account. Klepatskii, in particular, made chronological calculations to prove that the Mozyr region belonged to the Kyiv Olherdovyches.<sup>42</sup> Yet a deed to lands in the western Mozyr region made by Volodymyr Olherdovych and copied by Peter Mohyla, whose authenticity is beyond doubt, has been known since the 1870s.<sup>43</sup> The presence of Volodymyr's deputy Kalenyk Myshkovych in Putyvl', which was established by B. Koialovich, is in complete accord with contemporary genealogical schemes and refutes O. Andriiashev's opinion that the Putyvl' region was brought under Kyiv's rule only in the fifteenth century.<sup>44</sup>

On the other hand, in recent decades scholars have uncritically accepted the data of a synchronous but extremely specific source, a chronicle register titled "А се имена всем градом руским, далним і близгним," in which under the heading "А се киевський гроды" seventy-one cities are mentioned, which a number of scholars believe to have been "united in practice in Volodymyr Olherdovych's state in the late fourteenth century."<sup>45</sup>

In analyzing this information it is important to stress that pre-Soviet historiography was skeptical about the list as a historical source. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century literature pointed out on numerous occasions that the text contained strata from various periods, and use of the list in scholarly works was considered unacceptable.<sup>46</sup> In the 1950s, however, Mikhail Tikhomirov studied the document and concluded that it was a “work from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century that was intended to provide a brief list of the Rus’ cities of that time.”<sup>47</sup> Although scholars later frequently turned to the list (L. V. Cherepnin, B. O. Rybakov, I. B. Grekov, Ie. P. Naumov, O. V. Podosinov, and others), the view that it was a reliable source for the historical and geographic realia of the late fourteenth–early fifteenth centuries has not changed.

The one exception, apparently, is Poppe, who has analyzed the Volhynian part of the list and offered evidence that the author used sources from various times.<sup>48</sup> In this light it does not appear accidental that Korets’ (Korches’k) appears in the list as a Kyiv city. Like the entire Horyn’ River region, it had become part of the Volhynian land in the mid-twelfth century and remained as such in the 1480s–1490s as the property of the Ostrozkyi family.<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, both Volhynian and Galician cities (L’viv, Kholm, Halych, etc.) are called “Volhynian,” a phenomenon that makes no sense in the light of late fourteenth-century political geography and whose explanation must be sought in sources from the period of the Galician-Volhynian state.

Perpetuation of anachronistic ideas is also the explanation for the unification in the Kyiv register of cities from the Kyiv, Chernihiv, and Pereiaslav regions, all of which had been jointly called Rus’ (in the strict sense of the word) in twelfth- and thirteenth-century chronicles and constituted the territorial and political core of Old Rus’.<sup>50</sup> And yet this may be a copying of the structure of Tatar edicts (known to us from fifteenth- and sixteenth-century confirmations), in which Chernihiv, Ryl’s’k, Kurs’k, Putyvl’, and other cities are listed under the heading “Іно почонши от Києва . . .”<sup>51</sup> It is at least obvious that the compiler (or compilers) of the list had at his disposal both types of sources, and this document, in Andriiashev’s apt phrase, “shows more knowledge of Old Rus’ history than precise historical and geographic data.”<sup>52</sup> So it clearly cannot serve as a guide in the reconstruction of the political and geographic realia of Volodymyr’s reign.

It is characteristic that scholars are almost completely unanimous in their interpretation of that reign and of subsequent events: they believe that after ruling for thirty years Volodymyr Ol’herdovych was deprived of his appanage in 1394 as a consequence of Vytautas’s centralizing and the Kyiv land became a vicegerency or palatinate. In 1440, however, the ruling circles of Lithuania were forced to stabilize the internal political situation by renewing the Kyiv principality, which existed for another thirty years first with Oleksandr (Olel’ko) Volodymyrovych and then with Semen Olel’kovych at its head. The confirmation of Martin Gasztold in Kyiv marked the end of the Kyiv principality’s autonomous existence.

This scheme, which has now become canonical, is simplified and faulty in many respects. First, we do not have sufficient grounds to treat the removal of Volodymyr as an effort to abolish the Kyiv region's appanage system.<sup>53</sup> As F. I. Leontovich correctly pointed out, there are no hints in the sources from Vytautas's time that the rights of the independent princes were being systematically limited in the name of a clear principle of autocracy: the majority of local dynasts did not lose their realms and were not downgraded to "service" princes.<sup>54</sup> As for Volodymyr Ol'herdovych, his removal was determined primarily by the internal political situation in the 1390s: the agreement between Władysław II Jagiełło and Vytautas to restore to the latter his father's realms and consequently the need to compensate Skirgaila for the loss of Troki. Volodymyr's deposition from the appanage was caused both by the prestige of the Kyiv principality and by his strained relations with Vytautas. The confirmation of Skirgaila Ol'herdovych in Kyiv naturally did not change the status of the Kyiv region as an independent principality.

After the death of Skirgaila in 1396, according to the western Rus' chronicles, "Grand Duke Vytautas sent Prince Ioann Olkgimontovych [Hol'shans'kyi] to Kyiv."<sup>55</sup> This information is contradicted by another chronicle reference: that Ivan Borysovych of Kyiv, whose identity cannot be established and who cannot be identified as Ivan Hol'shans'kyi (who was alive in 1401 and whose father had the Christian name Mykhailo), was killed at the battle on the Vorskla in 1399 along with other Lithuanian and Rus' princes.<sup>56</sup> Unable to reconcile these two reports, scholars usually gave preference to the former. Klepatskii stood alone in defending the historicity of Ivan Borysovych of Kyiv and in identifying him as the son of Koryhailo Ol'herdovych, who could have had the ecclesiastical name Borys. But, as I have noted, he failed to find convincing arguments for his hypothesis.

We should note that in analyzing the report on Prince Ivan Borysovych we must keep in mind that the chronicle list of those were killed on the Vorskla in 1399 cannot always be treated as a reliable source: for example, Prince Fedor Patrikiovich, who is mentioned in the list, went into the service of the grand prince of Muscovy in 1408 and in 1420 was still his deputy in Velikii Novgorod.<sup>57</sup>

On the other hand, the presence of Ivan Hol'shans'kyi (who was listed, along with Skirgaila, in the princely *pom'ianyky* of the Liubets'k synodal book) in Kyiv is beyond doubt.<sup>58</sup> However, he is treated in the scholarly literature only as a vicegerent of the grand prince, even though there is not a single known source for this assertion. At the same time the hereditary nature of princely rule in Kyiv in the first third of the fifteenth century draws attention to itself. Ivan Hol'shans'kyi's successors were his sons Andrii (known as the "Kyiv prince") and Mykhailo (the Kyiv "capiteneus"). The high social status of the former is indicated by the fact that two of his daughters were married to Władysław II Jagiełło and the Moldovan *hospodar* Illia.

The Hol'shans'kyi family then left the political scene in the Kyiv land until the early sixteenth century (we overlook Ivan Iuriovych Hol'shans'kyi's par-

ticipation in the “conspiracy of the princes,” which had more far-reaching plans than the renewal of the Kyiv principality). Their place was taken by Ivan Volodymyrovych, the son of Volodymyr Ol’herdovych, who is mentioned in western Rus’ chronicles as prince of Kyiv and participant in the battle of Vylkomyra in 1435.<sup>59</sup> The path to this reign was probably paved by his marriage to Vasylysa, the third daughter of Andrii Hol’shans’kyi. (Compare the later fact of the confirmation of Martin Gasztold, the brother-in-law of Semen Olel’kovych.) Yet the reign in Kyiv was only a brief episode in Ivan Volodymyrovych’s life. It is significant, however, that he, and not Olel’ko, was the first of Volodymyr Ol’herdovych’s heirs to take up his father’s throne.<sup>60</sup>

Going back to the Hol’shans’kyi family, it should be stressed that it ruled without interruption in Kyiv in the first third of the fifteenth century. A second Kyiv dynasty of Lithuanian origin was also established at this time. It is significant that both the Hol’shans’kyi family and the heirs of Volodymyr Ol’herdovych are listed in the Kyiv Caves Monastery *pom’ianyky* under the heading “Pom’iany, Hospody, kniazi nashikh velikykh.”<sup>61</sup> Both are called Kyiv “patrimones” in a Lithuanian account of the events of 1481.<sup>62</sup>

The appearance of the Hol’shans’kyis as palatines in Kyiv in the sixteenth century was only a faint echo of their former grandeur. Hence the attempt to raise their status by creating a genealogical legend in which their ancestors were princes of Kyiv since the establishment of Lithuanian rule. We have in mind the story of Gediminas’s raid on Kyiv contained in the extended versions of western Rus’ chronicles that were compiled in circles directly connected with the Hol’shans’kyi family.<sup>63</sup>

It is now time to give up both the interpretation of the Kyiv principality of the 1440s–1470s as “intermediary” and the mythologizing of it as a “second Ukrainian kingdom,” which is based on a later literary tradition and not on contemporary sources.<sup>64</sup> And yet this tradition itself can also be investigated to the extent that documents from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries record reminiscences by Kyiv inhabitants. And although Maciej Strykowski distorted the facts when he ascribed to Mykhailo Hlyns’kyi a desire to reestablish the Kyiv principality, the idea of its reestablishment characterizes the mental context of the later sixteenth century and its idea of rebuilding ancient (upper) Kyiv (Iosyf Vereshchyns’kyi), which was implemented in the undertakings of Peter Mohyla.<sup>65</sup>

*Institute of the History of Ukraine,  
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*

*Translated from the Ukrainian by Marco Carynnyk*

## NOTES

1. *Sinopsis, ili kratkoe sobranie ot razlichnykh letopistsev* (Kyiv, 1680), fol. 110v.
2. Kyiv was thus described in the mid-sixteenth century by Michalon Lithuanus (*Memuary, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi Rusi* [Kyiv, 1890], issue 1, p. 48). It may be noted that the mystical image of “golden-domed Kyiv” survived in Ukrainian culture until the twentieth century. See Omeljan Pritsak, “Kiev and All of Rus’: The Fate of a Sacral Idea,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10(3/4) December 1986: 279–300.
3. Imperatorskaia Arkheograficheskaia komissiiia, *Ruskaia istoricheskaia biblioteka* (St. Petersburg, 1908), vol. 6, appendix 30, p. 180. *Kniga khozhenii: Zapiski russkikh puteshestvennikov XI-XV vv.* (Moscow, 1984), p. 120. *Codex epistolaris Vitoldi, magni ducis Lithuaniae. In Monumenta mediae aevi historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia*, vol. 6 (Cracow, 1992), p. 780. *Letopisi belorussko-litovskie*. In *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (hereafter PSRL) 35 (1980): 125. Vremennaia komissiiia dlia razbora drevnikh aktov, *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Kyiv, 1859), pt. 1, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 2. As for the dating of this document, which is frequently considered to be authentic, see “Kievo-Pecherskaia Lavra v ee proshedshem i nyneshnem sostoianii,” *Kievskaia starina* 1886 (10): 252–53; no. 11: 512.
4. Sebastian Kl’onovych, *Roksolaniia* (Kyiv, 1987), p. 71.
5. S. Kutrzeba and W. Semkowicz, *Akta unji Polski z Litwą, 1385–1791* (Cracow, 1932), no. 138, pp. 310, 312. (Polish and Latin versions of the Kyiv restitution privilege.) See also Jaroslaw Pelenski, “The Incorporation of the Ukrainian Lands of Old Rus’ into Crown Poland (1569): Socio-material Interest and Ideology—A Reexamination,” in *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists* (The Hague, 1973), vol. 3, pp. 19–52.
6. It is significant that at the Diet of Lublin Lithuanian representatives defended their rights to Volhynia by arguing that “the Volhynian land is inhabited only by Lithuanian and Rus’ people and the princes Olel’kovyches, Narymuntovyches, and Korybutovyches.” A. T. Działyński, ed., “Diariusz Lubelskiego sejmuni. Rok 1569,” *Zródłopisma do dziejów unii Korony Polskiej i W. X. Litewskiego*, vol. 3 (Poznań, 1856), p. 133.
7. *Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshenii drevnei Rossii s derzhavami inostrannymi*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1851), p. 37.
8. *Akta unji*, no. 138, p. 313.
9. The term “Kyiv land” is used in the documents until the early seventeenth century, and “Kyiv palatinate” is first recorded only in 1533. G. V.

Boriak, "Administrativno-territorial'noe ustroistvo ukrainskikh zemel' v kontse XV—seredine XVI v.: Analiz dokumental'nykh istochnikov." Unpublished candidate (Ph.D.) dissertation (Kyiv, 1987), p. 79.

10. In this context Matthias Gruneweg's [Hruneveh] observation is worthy of attention. Having visited Kyiv in 1584, he noted in his memoirs: "The Rusyns know what a powerful city Kyiv was and that it was the capital of their princes." See Ia. D. Isaievych, "Nove dzherelo pro istorychnu topohrafiu ta arkhitekturni pam'iatky starodavn'oho Kyieva," in *Kyivs'ka Rus': Kul'tura, tradytsii* (Kyiv, 1982), p. 118.
11. See, for example, V. T. Pashuto, B. N. Floria, and A. L. Khoroshkevich, *Drevnerusskoe nasledie i istoricheskie sud'by vostochnogo slavianstva* (Moscow, 1982), p. 71n5 (Roman-Olizar Volchkevych, the Kyiv palatine in the mid-fifteenth century, is examined as a representative of the princely tradition); N. M. Iakovenko, *Ukrains'ka shliakhta z kintsia XIV do seredyny XVII st. (Volyn' i Tsentral'na Ukraina)* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 322, 324 (Ol'hymunt Hol'shans'kyi, the supposed Kyiv deputy in the 1420s, despite the evidence of the Kyiv Caves Monastery *pom'iany*k, appears as Borys, an identification based on an incorrect identification of his son Ivan with Prince Ivan Borysovykh of Kyiv).
12. M. S. Hrushevs'kyi [Grushevskii], *Ocherk istorii Kievskoi zemli ot smerti Iaroslava do kontsa XIV stoletia* (Kyiv, 1891), pp. 442, 445–48. See also his *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 3 (Lviv, 1905). Before 1340, pp. 167–71, 176. The Muscovite rulers' patrimonial theory was based on precisely such notions. It is strange that the specialist literature has still not drawn attention to the textual dependence of Ivan III's territorial claims ("Вся Русская земля, Киев, и Смоленск, и иные города, которые он [Oleksandr Kazymurovych] за собою держи к Литовской земле, з Божьею волею, из старины, от наших прародителии наша отчина"; "а их отчина—Лятская земля да Литовская" (1504) *Sbornik imperatorskogo Russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva*, St. Petersburg, 1892, 35: 460; cf. *ibid.*, St. Petersburg, 1884, 41: 457) on the chronicle account of the conflict between the Smolensk Rostislavovichii (descendants, along with the Muscovite princes, of Volodymyr Monomakh) and the Chernihiv Ol'hovyches, in which the former demanded that the latter "не искати отчини нашае Киева и Смоленска под нами, и под нашими детми, и подо всем нашим Володимирим племенем," while the latter defended Kyiv's traditional status as the common patrimony and insisted that they were "не сугре, ни ляхове, но единого деда есми внуци" (1195) *Ipat'ievskaiia letopis'*, PSRL, Moscow, 1962, 2: 688–89. Cf. p. 578 ("Я не оугрин, ни лях, но единого деда есми внуци, а колко тебе до него [Kyiv], только и мне") *Lavrent'ievskaiia letopis'*, PSRL (Moscow, 1962), 1: 329 ("Мне отчини нету в Вугрех, ни в Лясе[х], токмо в Русстеи земли"). This point

- should be taken into account in deciding how innovative Muscovite foreign policy in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was. Cf. K. V. Bazilevich, *Vneshnaia politika Russkogo tsentralizovanogo gosudarstva: Vtoraia polovina XV veka* (Moscow, 1952), pp. 509, 540–41; B. N. Floria, *Russko-pol'skie otnosheniia i politicheskoe razvitie Vostochnoi Evropy vo vtoroi polovine XVI–nachale XVII v.* (Moscow, 1978), pp. 17–18.
13. John Fennell, *The Crisis of Medieval Russia, 1200–1304* (London and New York, 1983), p. 109.
  14. O. P. Tolochko, “Koly perestala isnuvaty ‘Kyivs’ka Rus’?: Istoriohrafichna dolia odnogo terminu i poniattia,” *Kyivs’ka starovyna* 1992 (6): 15. See also G. Iu. Ivakin, *Kiev v XIII–XV vekakh* (Kyiv, 1982), p. 19.
  15. *Gustinskaia letopis'*, PSRL 2 (1843): 343, 344.
  16. *Ibid.*, p. 348.
  17. V. I. Staviskii, “‘Kievskoe kniazhenie’ v politike Zolotoi Ordy (pervaia chetvert' XIV v.),” in *Vneshnaia politika Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow, 1988), p. 99.
  18. Hrushevskyyi, *Ocherk*, p. 441; *idem*, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, p. 167.
  19. A. B. Presniakov, *Lektsii po russkoi istorii*, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1939), issue 1: *Zapadnaia Rus' i Litovsko-Russkoe gosudarstva*, p. 20.
  20. Published in *Pamiatniki literatury Drevnei Rusi: XIII vek* (Moscow, 1981), pp. 228–35. The reign of Ivan Shain, who was “established by Batu Khan as sovereign in Chernihiv” and in 1257 went into the service of Oleg Ingvarovich of Riazan, can be seen as an analogy to this sad fact. However, the letters patent of the latter, in which this is discussed, are preserved only in a confirmation by Ivan IV in an eighteenth-century copy published in *Akty sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIV–nachala XVI v.* (Moscow, 1964), 3: no. 347, p. 373, and are now not considered authentic by specialists. See V. B. Kobrin, *Vlast' i sobstvennost' v srednevekovoi Rossii XV–XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1985), pp. 220–22; A. A. Zimin, *Formirovanie boiarskoi aristokratii v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XV–pervoi treti XVI v.* (Moscow, 1988), pp. 267, 279–80.
  21. A. P. Tolochko, *Kniaz' v Drevnei Rusi: Vlast', sobstvennost', ideologiia* (Kyiv, 1992), pp. 77–78.
  22. *Puteshestviia v vostochnye strany Plano Karpini i Rubruka* (Moscow, 1957), pp. 67–68.
  23. N. D. Kvashnin-Samarin, “Po povodu Liubetskogo sinodika,” in *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* 1873(4): 222. It should be noted that Kvashnin-Samarin was the first researcher

- who concluded that “the last [autochronous] princes of Kyiv were Ol’hovyches” (ibid). Filaret, *Istoriko-statisticheskoe opisanie Chernigovskoi eparkhii*, book 5 (Chernihiv, 1874), p. 43n61.
24. M. K. Liubavskii, *Oblastnoe delenie i mestnoe upravlenie Litvosko-Russkogo gosudarstva ko vremeni izdaniia Pervogo Litovskogo Statuta* (Moscow, 1892), pp. 245–46.
  25. F. Petrun’, “Khans’ki iarlyky na ukrains’kii zemli: Do pytannia pro tatars’ku Ukraïnu,” *Skhidnyi svit* 1928 (2): 176.
  26. P. G. Klepatskii, *Ocherki po istorii Kievskoi zemli* (Odesa, 1912), vol. 1: *Litovskii period*, pp. 39–41.
  27. A. Poppe, “Stanovlenie pochitaniiia Vladimira Velikogo,” in *Spornye voprosy otechestvennoi istorii XI–XVIII vekov: Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii Pervykh chtenii, posviashchennykh pamiati A. A. Zimina* (Moscow, 1990), pp. 230–31.
  28. Klepatskii, *Ocherki*, pp. 34–39. A. Prochaska, “Czy możliwà jest identyczność kniazów Nieswieskich s Korybutowiczami?” *Miesięcznik Heraldyczny* 1912 (5): 92n1.
  29. See also O. V. Rusyna, “Do pytannia pro kyïvs’kykh kniaziv tatars’koi doby,” *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka*, 225 (1993): 200–202.
  30. *Ipat’evskaia letopis’*, p. 870.
  31. It is worth mentioning that Hrushevs’kyi “in theory” did not exclude the possibility that Kyiv was dependent on the principality of Galicia-Volhynia in the first half of the fourteenth century, although he did observe that “there are no grounds [in the sources] for this, and the entire Galician-Volhynian policy of that time, to the extent that we can have an idea of it, was directed to the West” (*Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, p. 168). Compare Staviskii, “Kievskoe kniazhenie,” pp. 97–98.
  32. *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis’ starshego i mladshego izvodov* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950), p. 344; *Novgorodskaia chetvertaia letopis’*, PSRL 4 (1848): 52; *Sofiiskaia pervaiia letopis’*, PSRL 5 (1851): 219; *Moskovskii letopisnyi svod kontsa XV veka*, PSRL 25 (1949): 170.
  33. R. V. Zotov, *O chernigovskikh kniaz’iakh po Liubetskomy sinodiku i o Chernigovskom kniazhestve v tatarskoe vremia* (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 115–16; 118–19. The “Ioann and Mariia” in the Kyiv synodal book (who so disconcerted Hrushevs’kyi, see his *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, p. 172n2) are Ioann Dmytrovych Pereiaslavskyi and his wife Mariia in the Liubetsk synodal book (no. 48 in Zotov); hence “Andrii, Fedir” are Andrii Vsevolodovych and his son Fedir (no. 49), and “Ioann” is Ioann of Putyvl’ (no. 50).

34. S. T. Golubev, "Drevnii pomiannik Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry (kontsa XV i nachala XVI stoletiiia)," *Chteniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa* 6(3) 1892: 6.
35. M. S. Hrushevs'kyi, review of *O chernigovskikh kniaz'iaakh*, by R. V. Zotov, *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 5(1) 1895: bibliography, pp. 13–15; Hrushevs'kyi, *Ocherk*, p. 449n3; idem, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, 172n2.
36. M. D. Priselkov and M. R. Fasmer, "Otryvki V. N. Beneshevicha po istorii russkoi tserkvi XIV veka," *Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi Akademii nauk. 1916 g.* 21(1) 1916: 48–70.
37. See Olena V. Rusyna, "Hedyminiv pokhid na Kyïvs'ku zemliu: Povertaiuchys' do problemy," forthcoming in *Seredn'ovichna Ukraïna*.
38. Cf., for example, *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis'*, p. 98 ("brat Gediminov, kniazia litov'skoho, Voïni, polotskyi kniaz").
39. A. I. Rogov, *Russko-pol'skie kul'turnye sviazi v epokhu Vozrozhdeniia: Strykovskii i ego khronika* (Moscow, 1966), p. 156; R. K. Batura, *Bor'ba Litovskogo velikogo kniazhestva protiv Zolotoi Ordy: Ot nashestviia polchishch Batu do bitvy u Sinikh Vod*, pp. 20–21; idem, *Lietuva tautu kovoje prieš Aukso Ordą: Nuo Batu antpludžio iki mušio prie Mėlynuju Vandenu* (Vilnius, 1975), pp. 176, 210, 378; Okhman'skii, "Gediminovichii—'pravniki Skolomendovy,'" in *Pol'sha i Rus': Cherty obshchnosti i svoeobraziiia v istoricheskoi razvitii Rusi i Pol'shi XII–XIV vv. Sbornik statei*, ed. B. A. Rybakov (Moscow, 1974), pp. 358, 362, 363; F. M. Shabul'do, "Vkliuchennia Kyïvs'koho kniazivstva do skladu Lytovs'koï derzhavy u druhii polovyni XIV st.," *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1973 (6): 82; idem, "Administratyvno-pravove stanovyshe Kyieva XIII–XV st.," in *Kataloh dokumentiv z istorii Kyieva XV–XIX st.* (Kyiv, 1982), 26–27; idem, "Pro pochatok pryiednannia Velykym kniazivstvom Lytovs'kym zemel' Pivdenno-Zakhidnoi Rusi," *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1984 (6): 44–46; idem, *Zemli Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi v sostave Velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo* (Kyiv, 1987), pp. 26–31; L. L. Murav'eva, *Letopisanie Severo-Vostochnoi Rusi kontsa XIII–nachala XV veka* (Moscow, 1983), pp. 243–44; T. M. Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki na ziemiach ruskich Korony i Litwy za panowania Władysława II Jagiełły (1386–1434)*, vol. 1 (Wrocław, 1983), p. 40; E. Gudavichius, *Feodalizm v Baltiiskom regione* (Riga, 1985), p. 39; V. I. Staviskii, "'Kievskoe kniazhenie' v politike Zolotoi Ordy (pervaiia chetvert' XIV veka)," in *Vneshnaia politika Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow, 1988), pp. 98–99; J. Tyszkiewicz, *Tatarzy na Litwie i w Polsce: Studia z dziejów XIII–XVIII w.* (Warsaw, 1989), p. 113; A. P. Nikzhentaitis, "Legenda XIV v. o muchenichestve 14 frantiskantsev v Vilniuse i istoricheskaia istina," in

- Vspomogatel'nye istoricheskie distsipliny* (Leningrad) 21 (1990): 258; Iakovenko, *Ukrains'ka shliakhta*, p. 84.
40. It is also obvious that the separation of Kyiv into a separate fiscal and administrative district (*t'ma*) and the establishment of its own princely dynasty were key moments in the formation of the Kyiv land as a unitary political and administrative unit, as it was in the Lithuanian period. The term "Kyiv land" is also of late origin: it is not recorded in the Old Rus' macrotoponymy (see *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk litopysnykh heohrafichnykh nazv Pivdennoi Rusi* (Kyiv, 1985), p. 80), and even in fourteenth-century sources its appearance is doubtless correlated with the disappearance of the term "Rus' land" in its narrowest senses (as a name for the Middle Dnieper region and for the Kyiv region proper).
  41. He is called Fedir in the Hustynia Chronicle (p. 350), but this is probably yet another arbitrary combination by the compiler.
  42. Klepatskii, *Ocherki*, pp. 171–72.
  43. The most recent publication is *Hramoty XIV st.* (Kyiv, 1974), no. 18, p. 37.
  44. Iakovenko, *Ukrains'ka shliakhta*, p. 166; O. Andriiashev, "Narys istorii kolonizatsii Sivers'koï zemli do pochatku XVI viku," *Zapysky istoryko-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* 20 (1928): 126–27.
  45. For the oldest copy see NPL, pp. 475–76. B. A. Rybakov, "Prosveshchenie," *Ocherki russkoi kul'tury XIII–XV vekov*, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1970), p. 203; idem, *Kievskaiia Rus' i russkie kniazhestva XII–XIII vv.* (Moscow, 1982), p. 60; Beliaeva, *Iuzhno-russkie zemli vo vtoroi polovine XIII–XIV vv.* (Kyiv, 1982), pp. 19, 40; G. Iu. Ivakin, *Kiev v XIII–XV vekakh* (Kyiv, 1982), p. 37; Shabuľdo, *Zemli Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi*, p. 83; N. M. Iakovenko, "Volodymyr Ol'herdovych." In *Istoriia Ukrainy v osobakh: IX–XVIII st.* (Kyiv, 1993), p. 145.
  46. V. B. Antonovich, *Monografii po istorii Zapadnoi i Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, vol. 1 (Kyiv, 1885), p. 55; N. P. Dashkevich, *Zametki po istorii Litovsko-Russkogo gosudarstva* (Kyiv, 1885), p. 49; Hrushevs'kyi, *Ocherk*, pp. 17, 51; Klepatskii, *Ocherki*, pp. 351–52, 401.
  47. M. N. Tikhomirov, "'Spisok russkikh gorodov dal'nikh i blizhnikh,'" *Istoricheskie zapiski* 40 (1952): 214–59. Reprint: M. N. Tikhomirov, *Russkoe letopisanie* (Moscow, 1979), pp. 83–137.
  48. See A. Poppe, "Gród Wołyń," *Studia wczesnoźredniowieczne* 4 (1959).
  49. Liubavskii, *Oblastnoe delenie*, p. 221; Iakovenko, "Volodymyr Ol'herdovych," p. 90.
  50. The attempt to support the hypothesis about the political unity of these lands in the late fourteenth century by reference to the region in which Volodymyr Ol'herdovych's coins circulated is pointless (Beliaeva,

*Iuzhno-russkie*, p. 103). H. A. Kozubovs'kyi's position in this respect is more balanced, although he too has not resisted the temptation to connect the discovery of coins in the southern Chernihiv region with its allegiance to Volodymyr's "state" ("Kyïvs'ke kniazivstvo pry Volodymyri Ol'herdovychi za pam'iatkamy numizmatyky," *Starozhytnosti Pivdennoi Rusi* (Chernihiv, 1993), p. 136.

51. *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Zapadnoi Rossii* vol. 2, pt. 6, p. 4. The parallelisms in the Tatar edicts and the list are even more striking in the case of Podolia, which in our opinion justifies questions about the textual interrelations between these documents. Until now these parallelisms have been studied only in order to crosscheck the historical and geographical information that they contain.
52. Andriiashev, "Narys istoriï kolonizatsiï Pereiaslavs'koï zemli," p. 22. The Old Rus' data in the list, which originate in chronicles, require special analysis, but there is no doubt that some of the toponyms mentioned in it are of bookish origin. We have here, for example, "Rostovets', Uneiatin," which is an incorrect reading of the chronicle fragment "Voevasha polovtsi u Rostovtsa i u Neiatina" (*Ipat'evskaia letopis'*, p. 164).
53. At the same time is hardly correct to view the events of 1394 as a punishment of Volodymyr Ol'herdovych for his supposed alliance with Dmitrii Ivanovich (Donskoi), the Grand Prince of Moscow, in 1379–1380 (F. M. Shabuľ'do, "Kyïvs'ke kniazivstvo Ol'herdovychiv v konteksti ukrains'koï derzhavnosti," *Starozhytnosti* 1994 [1–2]: 7), since the hypothesis that such an alliance existed (see Shabuľ'do, *Zemli Iugo-Zapadnoi Rusi*, p. 129–31) is not grounded in sources or convincing.
54. F. I. Leontovich, *Soslovnyi tip territorial'no-administrativnogo sostava Litovskogo gosudarstva i ego prichiny* (St. Petersburg, 1895), p. 30.
55. *Letopisi belorussko-litovskie*, pp. 65, 72, 102, and others.
56. *Novgorodskaia chetvertaia letopis'*, p. 104; *Sofiiskaia pervaiia letopis'*, p. 251.
57. *Novgorodskaia pervaiia letopis'*, p. 413; Zimin, *Formirovanie boiarskoi aristokratii*, pp. 29–30.
58. Zotov, *O chernigovskikh kniaz'iakh*, pp. 28, 153–54.
59. *Letopisi belorussko-litovskie*, pp. 35, 58, 77, and others.
60. The question whether Oleľko may have reigned briefly in Kyiv before 1440 requires special study. Klepatskii (*Ocherki*, pp. 42–43) cited his deed to St. Nicholas' Dominican nunnery in Kyiv in 1411, known only from an excerpt in the Lviv castle books [*hrods'ki knyhy*] included in Jan-Casimir's privilege on 25 January 1649. This circumstance prevents a thorough analysis of the document, although it does not appear to be a counterfeit. Unfortunately, in recent decades scholars have ignored it to

the extent that even T. Trajdos believes that it was never published (except for a mention in the register of oblates at the Lviv Bernardyn archives. *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, vol. 10 (Lviv, 1984), p. 3n40. See T. M. Trajdos, *Kościół katolicki*, vol. 1, p. 53n79. In fact, the deed was published twice in Latin (Evgenii [Bolkhovitinov], *Opisanie Kievo-Sofiiskogo sobora i kievskoi ierarkhii*, appendix 5 (Kyiv, 1825), pp. 16–17; *Sbornik materialov dlia istoricheskoi topografii Kieva i ego okrestnostei*, pt. 3, no. 1 (Kyiv, 1874), pp. 3–4) and also in a later, sixteenth- or seventeenth-century translation (*Ukraińs'ki hramoty XV st.* (Kyiv, 1965), no. 1, pp. 25–26). After the publication of Trajdos' study J. Ochmański partially published the document, which confirms Volodymyr Ol'herdovych's and Vytautas's grant (J. Ochmański, *Vitoldiana: Codex privilegiorum Vitoldi, magni ducis Lithuaniae, 1386–1430* (Warsaw-Poznań, 1986), no. 15, pp. 21–22).

61. *Drevnii pomiannik*, pp. 6–7.
62. *Sofiiskie letopisi*, PSRL 6 (1853): 233.
63. *Letopisi belorussko-litovskie*, pp. 95–96, 152–53, and others; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, PSRL 32 (1975): 136–37. V. A. Chamiarytski, *Belaruskiia letapisy iak pomniki litaratury* (Minsk, 1969), p. 155; M. A. Iuchas, “Khronika Bykhovtsa,” in *Letopisi i khroniki: 1973* (Moscow, 1974), pp. 225, 230–31; N. N. Ulashchik, *Vvedenie v izuchenie belorussko-litovskogo letopisaniia* (Moscow, 1985), pp. 160–61.
64. The term “intermediary” was suggested by M. V. Dovnar-Zapol'skii in *Ukrainskie starostva v pervoi polovine XVI v.* (Kyiv, 1907), p. 3. M. Iu. Braichevs'kyi, “Konspekt istorii Ukraïny,” *Starozhytnosti*, 1991, no. 10: 10. The distance between them in the context of the Kyiv principality's history is illustrated by the testament of Olel'ko's palatine, Roman Olizarovych Volkevych (published in *Ukraińs'ki hramoty XV st.*, no. 2, pp. 26–29), who was transformed by later copyists into the “*hospodar* of the Kyiv lands.” See N. M. Iakovenko, “Ukraïna arystokratychna,” in *Na perelomi: Druha polovyna XV–persha polovyna XVI st.* (Kyiv, 1994), pp. 340–41.
65. See also M. M. Krom, “Pravoslavnye kniaz'ia v Velikom kniazhestve Litovskom v nachale XVI veka: K voprosu o sotsial'noi base vosstaniia Glinskikh,” *Otechestvennaia istoriia* 1992 (4): 151.