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The subject of this thesis is the Ruthenian family of the Slupica representing the upper gentry group of lords and their Kuna estate in Eastern Podolia (Bratslavshchyna). So far both the area itself, as well as, the Ruthenian nobility did not attract much scholarly attention, mainly due to the opinion that source material was scarce. The main goal of this thesis is to discuss, based on new sources, the history of the Bratslav area from the late medieval period until the mid-17th century focusing primarily on the Ruthenian lord group. Due to the source material, mainly of judicial character, the thesis is divided into two parts. The first one discusses the nature of the sources used, secondary literature and legal issues. A brief introduction to the area and its social and political history is given focusing on the Slupicas and their engagement in political, military and public activities, as they took part in many of the important events in the Bratslav territory. Special attention is also paid to the Tartar and Cossack factor in the developments of both the area and the Slupica family.

The second part focuses primarily on the family and its estate. It examines the way the Slupicas acquired their first endowments, how they enlarged their estates, and their struggles to maintain their inheritance. Finally the efforts of the direct successors to keep the estate’s integrity and their loss of
a large part of inherited lands, is examined. This part also endeavours to
reconstruct the range of economic activities of the Słupica estate. An
Abbreviation list, bibliography, glossary and appendixes of the family
genealogical tree and documents, maps of the area, accompany the text.

Keywords: Eastern Podolia, Bratslavshchyna, Bratslav and Vinnytsia,
Ruthenian nobility, lords, the Słupicas, the Kuna estate.
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INTRODUCTION

It is somewhat surprising that while in Western Europe and the United States there have been more and more studies in recent years, on the history of borderlands, their regions and peoples in a broad context (of the sociological, ethnic and ethnological, linguistic, legal and political, military, religious, and cultural aspects of the problem), very little has been done so far to examine the eastern territories of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; Pol. Rzeczpospolita or Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów) from this point of view. Although particular aspects of the affairs of the Polish-Lithuanian borderlands have been studied in several papers, nevertheless there has been no attempt at a comprehensive approach embracing the wide spectrum of source materials accessible in the archives of Poland and (since the 1990’s) the Ukraine and Russia.


For the history of Eastern Europe in the 14th to 18th centuries, Eastern Podolia, seems to be an ideal topic of borderland research. The Bratslav territory, and the Voivodeship of Bratslav created in 1566 offer a model case study. From the 14th century onwards these lands belonged to the Lithuanian political and cultural sphere of influence. Earlier the predominant powers in the region had been Kyivan Rus' (10th-13th century); the Mongol/Tartar tribes (13th-14th century); and the Kingdom of Hungary (close of the 14th century). This territory found itself within the political and cultural sphere of influence of Western Europe (via the Kingdom of Poland) from the 15th century onwards, finally as a result of the 1569 Act of Union of Lublin between Poland and Lithuania.

Hence the Voivodeship of Bratslav featured many of the elements typical of a borderland, or taking into consideration its history of "rotating borderland." It bordered directly on Moldavia and steppe-lands in the domain of the Tartar hordes (especially the Budziak and Crimean Hordes), and the Ottoman Empire, the de facto suzerain controlling Danubian principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia) and the Tartar steppes, and (later on in the 18th – 19th centuries) Russia. Situated at a large distance from the major centres of power in Poland-Lithuania, it was inhabited by a variety of ethnic, religious, and cultural groups and communities:


3 I should mention here also the origin of the name Ukraine. In the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 14th-15th centuries as “ukraine” (ukraina = border) were understood all border regions and countries, thus slowly this name started to be applied to a country on both banks of the Dnipro. In the course of the 16th century Ukraine became a common name for the country on the Dnipro encompassing the future Kyiv and Bratslav Voivodeships.

dominating Ruthenians, than Poles, Jews, Armenians, Tartars and others; Eastern Orthodox Christians, Catholics worshipping in the Latin and many local Uniate rites, Muslims, Karaites etc. All of them regarding themselves as borderland people, thus characterised by an extrovert, open attitude to the world at large, a love of freedom, and (in some of them, e.g. the Cossacks) a tendency to disregard formalities. These lands were more or less permanently at risk from external dangers, such as Tartar raids and military campaigns, which from the very origins of their history had endowed their inhabitants with a martial attitude and mentality of soldiers encamped in a "society organised for war".

It is certainly not my ambition to adopt such a broad perspective on the issues involved in the borderland and its inhabitants. However, I shall try to establish whether – contrary to the ambient opinion – it is possible to reproduce the history of one particular family and its real estates for the Bratslav territory, placing this family whenever possible in a border context of local history. Especially, my study concentrates on one of the most ancient local families with Ruthenian ethnic roots, only becoming extinct – like the majority of the Ruthenian noble families in the region – in the first quarter of the 17th century. There were more then ten such families in the Bratslav territory. They were originally a community of settlers, well established in the region at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, mostly thanks to the Grand Duke Vitold endowments from ca. 1411-30, and formed the area's political, economic and cultural elite, right until the end of the 16th century, as they belonged to the group of lords (upper gentry). Such an


6 For general information on lords and the related issues, especially the definition difficulties see Iakovenko (1993. Ukrain's'ka shliakhta z kintsia XVI do seredyny XVII st. (Volyn' i Tsentral'na Ukraina) <iaksenkoShliakhta>. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka; here chapter 3 "Pany" [Lords]: 121-219). The author is of the opinion that the term pan (pl. panowie) (lord, lords) came to Ukraine directly form Czech chancellery in the period of Venceslas II in the end of the 13th century, when there were close relations between the Czech Kingdom and the Halych-Volodymyr Principality, especially when ruled by Prince Lev I Danilovych (ibidem, 122-23). It became more common under Svidrygilio, when not only members of the princely Privy Council or the lords able man their own colours were to enjoy the title of lord. In general Iakovenko states that apart form the material status
endeavour could prove to be fruitful, especially as none of the families constituting
this group, termed by Jablonowski as the “nested gentry” (Pol. *szlachta
gniazdowa*) has received much attention from scholars. Although draft studies
have been compiled for some of them as part of the early historical and
genealogical literature, chiefly in the armorials.\(^7\) Most of the work done on the
Ruthenian nobility has concentrated on the princely (prince: Pol. *kniaź*, Ruth.
*knez*) houses of Lithuania and Volhynia.\(^8\) There has been no particular interest in
families of a slightly lower social status, for various reasons, one of which seems
to be unavailability of source material.

The prevailing conviction among both Polish and Ukrainian historians was
that since virtually all the fundamental source material, court registers and family
archives, have been destroyed, such a study for the Bratslav territory, and its
inhabitants would not have been possible. Thus, contemporary historians from both
countries showed limited interest in Eastern Podolia, while at the same time the
number of publications (general and detailed) on Western Podolia (the part
belonging to the Kingdom of Poland, the so-called Crown Podolia) is growing.\(^9\) An

---

\(^7\) For example: Pułaski, Kazimierz. 1911. *Kronika polskich rodów szlacheckich Podola, Wołynia i
1: 49-54 (the Czeczels), 2: 1-5 (the Baybuzas), 132-63 (the Piaseczyńskis). See also below note
11/III, p. 27.

\(^8\) Especially see: Boniecki, Adam. 1887. *Poczet rodów w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVI i
Luba, Zygmunt, and Waclaw Rulikowski. 1880. *Kniażowie i szlachta między Sanem, Wieprzem,
Bugiem, Prypecem, Sniuczym, Doniem i północnymi stokami Karpat osiedleni. Opowiadania
historyczne, heraldyczno-genealogiczne i obyczajowe...* Cracow: n.p.

\(^9\) The history of Podolia (general, and Western in particular) is outlined e.g. in the below listed
additional hurdle stems from the complexity of the history of Podolia, methodological problems due to working on heterogeneous and dispersed archival materials, and the need to access Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian secondary literature, which is not always an easy task.

1. The literature of the Subject and Source Materials: an Outline.

As mentioned before, there has been no comprehensive study of the Bratslav territory and the Voivodeship of Bratslav. Its „boundary position“ has received a marginal and rather accidental amount of notice in the historical literature. Most of the mentions of Bratslav are encyclopaedic or subsidiary in character, and were written before the World War I.\(^{10}\) The editions of sources and studies based on

them written by Polish authors, like Aleksander Jabłonowski, Franciszek Rawita Gawroński, Kazimierz Pułaski, Antoni Józef Rolle, and Edward Rulikowski, and the Ukrainian Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, are the most noteworthy of the work published in this period and still of value today. An indirect albeit significant


contribution, in view of the complexity of the subject and their new approach at the socio-political history of the eastern marches of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, has come from books in which the affairs of the Bratslav territory are presented in terms of a confrontation of the Polish and Ukrainian point of view. These include the works of Henryk Litwin, Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel, Marek Plewczyński, and Natalia M. Iakovenko, and they encourage other researchers to review the hitherto ambient notions on some issues. Their synthetic, cross-section approach throws new light on certain transformation processes typical of multi-ethnic regions, involving the aspects of ethnicity and nationality, social problems, culture, religion, and military questions. In general, however, the recent Polish publications have focused on Ukraine proper (Kyivan territories) and part of


Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland; only rarely has any direct attention been devoted to Eastern Podolia, although there have been noteworthy exceptions.\textsuperscript{13}

In the Ukrainian literature prior to the Second World War the scholar who virtually monopolised the subject was Valentyn D. Otamanov's'kyi, who researched on Vinnytsia (Pol. Winnica) and its Powiat District (former voivost', Pol. powiat territorial and administrative unit).\textsuperscript{14} In recent years two historians, Mykola Krykun and Oleksandr Petrenko, specialising in subjects connected with the Bratslav territory have contributed significant work. The former has written an important study of the legal and administrative system in Right-Bank Ukraine, and has devoted many years of research on the social and political history of the Voivodeship of Bratslav in the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries. His interest focuses on judicial matters based on archival material reated to the Piaseczyński family of Lis arms of Lipowiec.\textsuperscript{15} Petrenko has concentrated on the Vinnytsia archives, recently


\textsuperscript{15} See note 9, p. 25, especially KrykunAdministratywno-terytorial'nyi; idem. 1991. "Dynamika kil'kosti poselen' Brastlavskoho vovodstva v XVI-XVII st." In Problemy istorychnoi heohrafii Ukrainy: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'. Kyiv: Akademia Nauk Ukrainy RSR, Instytut istorychnyky Ukrainy. 33-42; idem. 1996. "Instruktsiia seimyku Volyns'koho vovodstva 1595 roku," Zapysky Naukovo-Vorotyntsi im. T. Shevchenka 231: 415-36. The listed below publications by Krykun himself or in collaboration with Piddubniak have been prepared on the basis of the so-called Lipowieckie archives of the Piaseczyński family. In major part these archives are preserved and housed in the depots of L'viv's'ka biblioteka im. V. Stefanyka NAN Ukrainy <BStefanyka> in L'viv: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolinski], spr. III/4102, spr. III/4105, spr. III/4106, spr. III/4108. Part of this collection is known as the Lipowieckie archives of the Rościsławski family. Here fragments of the house archives of the Piaseczyński's from the period 1578-1644 and up to 1773: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolinski]). In smaller fragments this collection is being kept in Biblioteka im. Ossolinskih in Wroclaw (Poland): sig. 4158/II <Collection of the private letters of the Piaseczyński's and to the Piaseczyński's', 17th-19\textsuperscript{th} century; pp. 1-166>, sig. 4159/II, sig. 4160/II, sig. 4161/III <Fragments of the house archives of the Piaseczyński family>. Some parts selected in the 19th century by
turning his attention to legal and constitutional matters in the Bratslav area in the
18th and 19th centuries. Other researchers have only occasionally treated the
subject in relation to their respective studies. This overview of the literature is of

Konstanty Świdziński have been kept in Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasinski in Warsaw and were
zbrodništwa Holokaustu" in their respective studies. In Materiały mizhnarodnoi naukovo-

16 For the information on the resources of the Vinnytsia district archives, which form the basis of
istorii Bratslavskogo starostva: Meshchane i seliane Bratslavskogo starostva v bor'be s pol'skoi
NeimanKoszkowie," Kievskaya starina 25 (5/6): 532-47; Orlovskii, M. 1863. "Istoriko-

sejmik wojewodztwa bracławskiego. Ze wspolczesnego regionu doswiatu przepisal Piotr Jaxa

18Recently: Boriak, Henadyi V. 1985. "Terytoriia i zalyudnenist' Bratslavshchyny v pershii polovyni

(Dzhereloznavche znacheimia)." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia na Ukraini.

20Zbyrnik nauk.[ovykh] prats'. Kyiv 13-17, 20-21; Hrabovets'kyy, V. V. 1914. O granitsakh byvshei
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

21Vinnytsia: n.p.; Yurkevych, Viktor. 1927. "Zvinohrodshchina v XV-XVI vv." In Istorychno-

22Vinnytsia: n.p.; Zabolotnaia, T. 1889. "Braclavskoe krutoe vremya i Bratslavskyi ottom." In

23Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

24Shipovich, Viktor. 1927. "Zvinohrodshchina v XV-XVI vv." In Istorychno-


26Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

27Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

28Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

29Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.

30Dobrokhodov, M. 1903. "O pradkovskoi Bratslavshchyny." In Istorychno-geohrafiichni doslidzhennia
Bratslavshchyny, istoricheskoi zhizni v nei i otnosheni Bratslavshchiny k Podolii.<ShipovichOgranitsakh>.
course, brief and by no means exhaustive. Some of the publications touching key problems in Bratslav history, I will mention in detail when discussing Podolia in general, and the Crown/Western Podolia in particular. I have also omitted the work of the Ukrainian émigré historians, since although interested in the history of the eastern marches of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, they had very little to say on the subject of this thesis due to their lack of interest in the very matter of this dissertation.

In any study of a historical subject so “fluid” in the geopolitical sense, one cannot underestimate the value of cartography. One of the most useful sources in this respect is still Guillaume le Vasseur de Beauplan’s *La description de l’Ukranie* and its appended maps in the various editions as well as a historical atlas of the Ruthenian lands compiled by Jabłonowski. Also lexicographical and
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genealogical publications are of great importance, although Podolia as a whole, and Bratslav in particular, holds a relatively minor place in them.\textsuperscript{21}

One of the reasons, if not the principal one, for the low level of research interest in Eastern Podolia borderland society, is the depletion and substantial dispersion of the source material. The current condition of sources is a reflection of the region’s nature as a borderland. Whereas for the vicinal provinces (Western Podolia, Volhynia and Ukraine) and their respective voivodeships (of Podolia, Volhynia and Kyiv) there are full or almost complete sets of extant court registers, for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, all that is available are just eight (or effectively five) registers.\textsuperscript{22} For example, as far back as 1780, a report dated 6 March of that year, drawn up by order of Stanislaw Potocki, Grand Standard-Bearer of Poland


\textsuperscript{22} Currently all of them have been kept in Tsentral’nyi derzhavnyi istorichnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv <CDIAUK> in Kyiv. See below in the text.
(Pol. chórąży wielki koronny), on the state of the registers of the castle court of Vinnytsia and the district court of Bratslav, observed that the collections were very far from complete, with full records available only for the period 1774-80. Thus, there is a need to refer to supplementary registers, like the metrical registers (of the Lithuanian Metrica, of the Volhynian or Ruthenian Metrica, and of the Crown Metrica series of entries books), as well as to the court registers for other voivodeships; to the records of the Crown Tribunal at Lublin; and to embark on an extensive search in the dispersed and more often than not fragmentary family collections scattered throughout the archives of Poland, Ukraine, and Russia.24

23 APKr.: ASang., t. 135/14. According to this source in the castle (Pol. gród) archives of Vinnytsia only the books from the following years were to be found: 1643, 1644, 1645 (incomplete), 1647, 1652, 1700, 1701, 1702, 1703, 1704, and a full set from 1714 to 1780. The books for the period from 1704 to 1714 were already missing. While for the territorial court of Bratslav the following books were to be in existence: 1720, 1721, 1722, 1725, 1745, 1746, 1747, and a complete set from 1774 to 1780. There were though, two more similar reviews, on 1 October 1777 and 27 July 1778. Unfortunately, I have not managed to access the original records made at the time.

Tracing disperse source material is only one of the necessary parameters of research. Proficiency in deciphering 16th-17th-century Ruthenian manuscripts creates an additional hurdle for the researcher.


This thesis by no means aspires to offer a detailed analysis of the Ruthenian, Lithuanian and Polish legal systems and judicial procedures. However, as the majority of the source material to be discussed here is of judicial nature it seems necessary to offer some guidelines for better understanding the background and implications of these sources in their legal and judicial aspect.
Hierarchy of officials and administration of Podolia under the Koriatovychs was typical of Ruthenian provinces. The authority rested on castle voivodes, i.e. officials commanding regiments and exercising judicial and administrative power in the adjacent castle district (Ruth. volost', Pol. wołość). The administrative pattern undoubtedly reflected the organization of the starost’s office in the neighbouring Red Rus’, introduced by Casimir III the Great (1333-70) before 1351 (probably in 1349). During the second half of the 15th century the administrative structures, which had existed in Podolia since the 14th century and were based on castle districts (Ruth. volost’, Pol. wołość/powiat, Lat. districtus) underwent the process of evolution. In 1434, the lands of Red Rus’ and Podolia belonging to the

---

25 This hierarchy can be partly demonstrated on the basis of witnesses registered in a few extant documents of these dukes: the privilege of the Magdeburg law for Kamenets’ (1374), confirmation of the endowment for the church in Smotrych (1375), endowments for Niemira (1388) and Berdysshko (Pol. Bedryszko/Biedrzych, 1392), confirmation of the endowment from 1388 for Hrynko (1391), and some incidental mentions in other sources. For bibliographic data regarding these documents see Chapter 2/A/1: 73-75 (1388), 75-76 (1391), 76 (1392). For the complete list of magistracies being in existence in the Bratslav territory see Appendix 2: Hierarchy of Magistracies in the Bratslav Voivodeship (Bratslav, Vinnytsia, Zvinogrod).

26 Presumably, their competence extended to supervising common warriors who had settled in the district and were frequently obliged to provide service to the castle. The castle voivodes were probably fairly similar to contemporary Polish starosts and were quite different from voivodes in the Kingdom of Poland. It is not clear whether the origin of this office dates back to the time prior to the Mongol conquest (though castle districts most probably had a longer history), or whether it assumed its final shape under Mongol rule. For castle voivodes in Rus’, see Pietruski, Oskar and Xawery Liske, Wstęp (Introduction). In Akta grodzień i ziemię z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tzw. Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie <AGZ>. Pietruski, Oktaw, Xawery Liske, Wstęp (Introduction). In Akta grodzień i ziemię z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tzw. Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie <AGZ>. Pietruski, Oktaw, Xawery Liske, Wstęp (Introduction). See also <Zródła do dziejów polskich>. Grabowski, Michal, and Aleksander Przedzęciak, eds. 1843. (2 vols.) Vilnius: n.p. 139-40 = Akty otnosiashchesia k istorii zapadnoi Rossii sobrannye i izdannye Archeograjicheskoiu Kommissieiu <AZR>. Grigorovich I. I., ed. 1846-53. (5 vols.) St. Petersburg; n.p., here: no. 1: no. 4 = Ukrain’sky hramoty <RozovHramoty>. Rozov, Volodymyr, ed. 1928. (Vol. 1) Kyiv: n.p., here no. 10. Most probably the reorganization of the starost’s office in Podolia ended in failure, because in the years that follow there are no mentions of the starost.


28 Lewicki, Anatol. 1892. Powstanie Świdrygiełły. Ustęp z dziejów unii Litwy z Koroną <LewickiPowstanie>. Kraków: n.p. 276-79; Halecki, Oskar. 1915. Ostatnie lata Świdrygiełły i sprawy wołyńska za Kazimierzę Jagiellończyka <HaleckiOstatnie lata>. Kraków: n.p. 6-10. The new voivodeships undoubtedly came into existence when Jagiello was still alive. New voivodeships in Red Rus’ and in western part of Podolia must have been created on the basis of his decision. On
Kingdom of Poland (= Western Podolia) were endowed with an administrative and juridictive status equal to the other territories in the kingdom. They also received the same structure of offices (Pol. urzêdy, Lat. officies) and the legislative code for property as applied throughout the Kingdom of Poland. This way the equal to the Polish Crown comprehension of offices and their competences (among which that of the starost) was acknowledged. Thus, the starosts' authority and responsibilities in eastern Podolian territories evolved gradually from the princely (as it was under Svidrygiello [Pol. Šwidrygiel] until 1437) delegates exercising the prince’s administrative and judicial authority within their areas to the one reflecting more and more the Polish model.

Ties with the Crown were sealed on 4 March 1430 (i.e. before the death of Vitold), when Podolia and Red Rus' were included in the Privilege of Jedlno (along with a confirmation of the other immunities the Polish nobility had enjoyed hitherto) granted by Vladislas Jagiełlo (1386-1434) to the gentry. These

13 December 1433 the first Voivode of Rus' – Jan Mężyk of Dąbrowa is confirmed (U III/3: 16, and note 46), and on 2 April 1434 the first Voivode of Podolia – Piotr Odrożew of Sprowa is in office (U III/3: 139, no. 620). For district court see U III/3: 16-17. See also Małecki, Karol. 1938. Uczestnicy grodzcy i ziemscy w latach 1352-1783. L'viv n.p. They were the Districts (Pol. wołost, with time called powiat) of: Kamenets', Czerwonogród, Bakota, Snotrych, Skała, Khmelnik and Latychow. For details see KurtykaPodole, 2000: 49-50, and note 139.

29 The first magistracies to be traced in Crown Podolia after 1434 were those of voivode (1434), sub-chamberlain (Pol. podkomorzy, Lat. subcamerarius) in 1436, and castellan in 1438. The district (Pol. ziemski) court was operating most probably since 1437.

30 The evolution of starosties based on the earlier wołost' divisions may be observed in Podolia since 1431. After 1434, centres of most of these areas/districts became centres of starosties (leased royal property, Pol. tenuta). The awareness of territoriality of the former wołost' districts, referred to as the powiat districts, existed until the 16th century (see below on the Powiat reform). It included then an area larger than the modern starosty (Pol. tenuta) of the same name. See KrykunPovitovyi ustry, 1992: 162-71. Holders of the starosties took over powers of judicial authority (on behalf of the king or duke) over numerous Ruthenian gentry in the district (in the 16th century still obliged to render services to the castle-centre of the wołost'), with time these powers became more and more symbolic. This was intensified due to the process of reception of Polish law. There can be no doubt however that, at least until the close of the 16th century, despite the gradual curbing of their powers, due to successive rights conceded to the gentry and nobility, and the evolution of a hierarchy of magistrates, starosts were the highest administrative and judicial authority in the Lithuanian and Ruthenian territories, de facto viceroys for their region. See Kurtyka, Janusz. 2000. „Z dziejów walki szlachty ruskiej o równouprawnienie: represje lat 1426-1427 i sejmiki roku 1439 <KurtykaZ dziejów walki>,” Roczniki Historyczne 66: 83-120, here 84-85.

provinces were included in the aforementioned privilege in an effort to equalize their administrative and judicial status to that of the Kingdom of Poland. The formal introduction of Polish law and hierarchy of officials was also among the aims of the privilege. However, it was after the privilege of Cracow of 9 January 1433, confirming the Jedlino charter that the application of the new system in Red Rus' and Podolia came into effect. It should be noted, nevertheless, that after 1437 (the defeat of Svidrygiello) Eastern Podolia remained within Lithuania, and did not enjoy the abovementioned privileges. It was not until after Svidrygiello’s death in 1452 and the incorporation of his entire domain into Lithuania, that the starosts’ powers in Eastern Podolia, including the Bratslav territory, were defined.

privilege of Cracow that confirmed the Jedlino Act); ProchaskaPodole lennem, 1895: 276; Kutrzejba, Stanisław. 1911. „Przywilej jedlinski z 1430 i nadanie prawa polskiego Rusi.” In Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Bolesława Ulanowskiego. Kraków: n.p. 271-301 and offprint 1911. Kraków; AGZ, 5: no. 54 (1430). For information on the editions of this privilege and following ones, see KurtykaZ dziejów walki, 2000: 102-05. Most probably, the implementation of the Polish legal and judicial system, along with the Polish structure of magistrates, started in Rus’ and Podolia after the issue of the Privilege of Cracow of 9 January 1433, which endorsed the Privilege of Jedlino. The territories of Red Rus’ and Podolia were embraced in the Privilege of Berest (Pol. Brzesc) in 1425 (Codex epistolarius, 2: no. 149), which was not implemented, but became the basis for the Privilege of Jedlino. The privilege was the price for the simultaneous recognition (in that same act) by the dignitaries of the Kingdom of one of Jagiełło’s sons as successor to the throne. Following the Jedlino Act, the obligations of Ruthenian nobles (14 April 1439, at Mościska) and of Podolian gentry (23 June 1439, at Kamenets’) were drawn up. See Halecki, Oskar. 1919. „Z Jana Zamysłowskiego inwentarza Archiwum Koronnego. Materiały do dziejów Rusi i Litwy w XV wieku.” Archiwum Komisji Historycznej, Vol. XII/1. Kraków: n.p., 154-55, 160-62; KurtykaZ dziejów walki, 2000.


33 The aim to secure the newly acquired rights was expressed in the confederacy of western Podolia gentry and nobility (Pol. szlachta) from the Provinces of L’viv, Podolia, Przemyśl, Sanok, Halych, Kholm and Belz. It was formed at an assembly near Wjesnia on 10 July 1436, and stipulated the obligation to attend provincial assemblies of gentry (dieties, Pol. sejmiki). See Codex epistolarius, 3: 550-51, no. 39; Pawiński, Adolf. 1895. Sejmiki ziemskie. Początek ich i rozwój aż do ustalenia się udziału posłów ziemskich w ustawodawstwie sejmu walnego 1374-1505. Warszaw: n.p., here 30-32, LVI-LVII. See also Piekoński, Franciszek. 1907. „Jana Zamoyskiego notaty heraldyczno-sfragistyczne.” In idem, Studia, rozprawy i materiały z dziedziny historyi polskiej i prawa polskiego. (Vol. 7) Kraków: n.p. 7, nos. 158-217, 596-693, 1229-1230.
in the privilege granted to Volhynia.\textsuperscript{34} The privileges issued by Casimir the Jagiellonian (1440/47–92) in 1456 and 1457 are generally regarded as marking the close of the period when the Ruthenian nobility and gentry were enfranchised with the same rights and laws enjoyed by their Polish counterparts.\textsuperscript{35} At the same time, one may observe the emergence of the modern starosty (Pol. \textit{tenuta}). This new starosty was part of the area of former \textit{volost}' starting to be referred to as \textit{powiat}. Thus, it could be the seat of the castle court (Pol. \textit{gród} [castle], \textit{sad grodzki} [castle court], Ruth. \textit{grod}, \textit{grodskyi sud}) subordinate to the starost and of the judicial district which comprised the area of the whole of former \textit{volost}'. The process of fashioning of the judicial \textit{powiat} districts in Podolia came to an end as late as the 17\textsuperscript{th} century (see below on the \textit{Powiat} reform of 1564).\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915: 144-45, and notes 3, 4. The content of this charter is known only from its later confirmations in 1501, 1509, and 1547. The privilege took into account the wishes of the people of Volhynia to keep the \textit{starina} ("oldness") system, viz. the existing offices and customs. The starosts were in authority over the whole of the nobility without exception, including the local princes (Pol. \textit{kniiazowie}), but could serve a subpoena on a prince only after his second failure to appear in court, when summoned. A decision to detain a prince had to be made in consultation with the overlord (the king or grand duke). It was not until the Grand Duke Alexander’s privilege of Mielnik of 1501 that the starost’s judicial authority over princes was curtailed. Henceforth, a starost could not pass judgement on a prince (a lord or nobleman) unless there was an associated judges’ (Pol. \textit{asesorowie}) bench sitting in his court. Thereby, the starost retained unrestricted authority only over the nobles holding crown estates. Jurisdiction over liege subjects (bondmen, peasants) was vested in their lords. The starost could intervene only in cases involving robbery/brigandage, rape, and injury to a nobleman, arson, or the capture of a thief in the act. The 1501 charter protected the nobility against the imposition of unlawful regulations or wilful acts by the starost’s men in the area under his jurisdiction. It also promised the codification of Lithuanian laws. See Zakonodatelnye akty Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo XV-XVI vv. Iakovkin, I. I., ed. 1936. Leningrad: n.p., here no.1; Sobolewski, L., W. Uruszczak. 1900. “Artykuly mielnickie z roku 1501,” Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne 42 (1/2): 51-80.

\textsuperscript{35} In the first of these charters, issued at Wiślica (Lesser Poland) on 22 October 1456, Casimir guaranteed that he would not make any decisions concerning Rus’ and Podolia without the consent of the Ruthenian lords, while limits were put on the starostas’ public and jurisdictional powers in matters relating to the peasants on the gentry’s and nobility’s estates. Only local judges and magistrates were to judge cases brought to the royal courts, while Podolian and Ruthenian dignitaries were to act as judges in appeals in the royal court of appeal. The charter also made the Privileges of Nieszawa of 1454, in their Lesser Polish version, applicable in these territories, confirming the local \textit{sejmik} (dietie) assembly of the nobility and gentry in its right to participate in royal decisions concerning the entire country, and to issue a general levy (call to arms). See Roman, Stanislaw. 1957. \textit{Przywileje nieszawskie}. Wroclaw: n.p. 120-21. The second privilege issued on 5 December 1457 in Piotrków declared that the nobility and gentry of Red Rus’ and Podolia could not be tried by district or parliamentary courts outside the borders of these territories, instances of which had occurred chiefly, due to the threat of Tartar incursions hanging over this region (AGZ, 5: no. 154 [5 December 1457]).

\textsuperscript{36} It was parallel to the gradual decline of some of the old administrative centres or to the transformation of old \textit{volost}' districts into \textit{tenuta} starosties.
As of the 1530’s the basis for legal actions and judicial proceedings in the whole of Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the so-called Lithuanian Statute, a collection of laws, which in its three versions (of 1529, 1566 and 1588) until the 18th century constituted the main legal code of the state. Among other matters, it standardized the principles of the organization and the procedure of courts. These statutes are known from different editions. There is also abundance of secondary literature related to them. The First (I) Statute of 1529 (officially introduced on 29 September) reflected the political system of the period, based on the princely oligarchy. The whole government rested with the Grand Duke and limited group of ducal court council consisting of princely family members. It consisted of 244 articles divided into 13 chapters and encompassed different legal norms of public law (state system, society organization) and jurisdiction (private law, penal code and process law). It retained many characteristics of the old legal systems, namely of the Lithuanian and Ruthenian customary laws, especially that of Kyivan Rus’, although Polish and German influences were already visible. For the first time the Statute introduced the landed gentry representatives into the judicial apparatus,
which was the main contribution of the then being crystallized Polish gentry democracy. However, not being satisfied with all provisions in the Statute the gentry soon contested it, and from 1544 onwards voiced the necessity of its "correction" (especially in 1547). Finally, in 1551 it became the task of a specially appointed diet commission. Apart from the changes in the Statute itself the gentry asked also for the creation of the noble courts and the enlargement of the Diet competences (especially in terms of defence decision making).

An idea of this debate was present for example in the King Sigismund Augustus’s letter expedited from Vilnius on 27 November 1551 to Prince Bohusz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. The King instructed him, among others issues, how the starost should behave towards his subjects, especially in regard to his judicial powers. The detailed royal instructions resulted from the long lasting conflict between the Bratslav and Vinnytsia Starosts and the local landed gentry as to the rights and obligations of both sides. This letter offers also a list of judicial dues and fees, worth of our attention to decipher of the costs of court proceedings. This is important since the magnates and gentry seemed to be constantly involved in litigation as seen from the following chapters.

It entered a regulation requiring the attendance of two landed gentlemen of the area in the starost court, which at the time was in the hands of voivodes, starosts or plenipotentiary Starosts, usually representing princely families. In practice this regulation avoided by many officials, was evoked in 1551. See below, the Sigismund Augustus letter to Bohusz Korecki (notes 43, p. 38 and below 44, pp. 40-41).

The issue in question was the election of court judges and notaries by the gentry representation of each Powiat from among themselves. They were to supplement the voivode’s and starost’s court officials and counterbalanced their influence. The noble courts were of importance especially as princes and grand lords were excluded from the general Powiat jurisdiction. Being under the Grand Duke’s jurisdictional power, who in the 16th century usually resided outside of the Grand Duchy, in practice they remained above law. Thus, the introduction of noble jurisdiction based on the Polish example, in which and by which all gentry was equal, disregarding her financial standing became the essential question. Also because of high court fees (see below note 44, pp. 40-41), long duration of proceedings, and lack of legal knowledge among starosts.

41 It entered a regulation requiring the attendance of two landed gentlemen of the area in the starost court, which at the time was in the hands of voivodes, starosts or plenipotentiary Starosts, usually representing princely families. In practice this regulation avoided by many officials, was evoked in 1551. See below, the Sigismund Augustus letter to Bohusz Korecki (notes 43, p. 38 and below 44, pp. 40-41).


44 ML Edition 2000 28: 190-91, no.149. Thus, in 1551 the King Sigismund Augustus informed Korecki that the last Sejm (Diet) of Vilnius issued a regulation regarding the judicial dues and fees (Ruth, peresudy) to be collected by voivodes and starosts for the court proceedings in their respective courts (= the castle and territorial courts). The regulation abolished the so-far over all
In the years between 1563 and 1566 the Grand Duchy witnessed an apogee of state reforms, accompanied since 1557 with the introduction of the so-called „drag measurement” reform (Pol. pomiara włóczenia) by the deep economic changes.\(^{45}\) Their main aim was to prepare the Duchy’s social and economic structure for the planned unification with the Polish Crown, accomplished finally in 1569, as the state union of Lubin. The state reforms can be divided into three sectors – judicial reform (1564-66), new administrative division (1556-66), and Diet and dieties reform (1564-66). An inspiration for them can be traced in the

existing payment of 1 grosz out of 10 groszs, in favour of a new one which was to be “a half”, meaning half grosz out of 10 groszs; 1 grosz out of 3 kopas; 5 groszs out of 1 Rubel; half of kopa of groszs out of 10 kopas; and 5 kopas of groszs out of 100 kopas (ibidem, 190). In the mid-16th century 1 kopa of Lithuanian groszs was equal to 2,5 of Polish Zloty. When it comes to the taxes for judicial activities performed by court magistrates the royal letter stated that the so-called “memorable” (Ruth. pametne) was to be in the amount of 4 groszs. The court beadles of both castle and territorial courts in the whole of the Grand Duchy (including Volhynia) were to be paid for their work and travel, 1 grosz per 1 mile. The servant of Voivode or starost travelling because of judicial affair, was to receive at place of destination 6 groszs, while the servant of plenipotentiary starost was to get 3 groszs for the same duties. Finally, the letter mentioned judicial fines. In case of a thief, who had stolen less than 10 kopas of groszs, the fine paid in the court for his liberation was 12 groszs, for the one who had stolen more then 100 kopas of groszs, it was to be poltina \[^{45}\] of groszs (ibidem, 191).

It is commonly acknowledged that the initiative for the “drag” reform (Pol. pomiara włóczenia) came from Queen Bona in 1533. She was deeply interested in securing huge private estates of the royal family, which she had to manage to collect on the territory of the Grand Duchy. The reform was over in 1556, the year in which Bona left Poland for good. In 1547 she obtained her son’s Sigismund Augustus formal consent to continue it by the “Regulation concerning Ours castles, tenancies and manors” issued for two Powiats in the Lithuania proper, followed by the general “Regulation on drags.” However, the formal introduction of this reform came with the “Drag regulation” issued on 20 October 1557 and supplemented on 20 May and 20 June 1558. It was a set of technical, economical and social undertakings, which transformed completely the Duchy’s rural social structure and economy, but also influenced its municipal structure. In technical aspect the following steps have been undertaken: 1) measurement of land according to drags \(1 \text{ drag} (\text{Pol. włoka} \text{ or } \text{lan}) = 21,36 \text{ ha, divided into 30 morgs})\), 2) integration of grounds, 3) the ground cataster, 4) changes in villages structure [introduction of the so-called ulicówka – a street type of village], 5) regular tree-field system and the so-called forced agricultural regime. In social aspect the outcome of this reform was: worsening of peasantry status, growth of villain peasants, abolition of slavery, abolition of country crafts, reduction of servant population, introduction of village government represented by bailiff and assessors. It should be stressed however, when coming to the Ukrainian lands, that the reform has been implemented in 1560’s only in a part of Volhynia, the rest of Ukraine had to wait much longer (Błaszczyk, Grzegorz. 2002. Litwa na przełomie średniowiecza i nowożytności 1492-1569 <BłaszczykLitwa>. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie 89, 95, 129-36). For this reform and its implications see: Dunin-Wąsowicz, Anna. 1994. Pomiar gruntu w Koronie w XVII-XVIII wieku. Warszaw: n.p.; Ochmański, Jerzy. 1986. “Reforma włóczna na Litwie i Białorusi w XVI w.” In idem. Dawna Litwa. Studia historyczne. Olsztyn: n.p. 158-74; Picheta V. 1917. Agrarnaia reforma Sigimunda Avgusta v Litovsko-Russkom gosudarstve. Moscow: n.p. (2nd ed.) 1958. Moscow: n.p.
Polish „executive movement” (Pol. *ruch egzekucyjny*) of the 1540’s and 1550’s inspired by the nobility in order to curtail the magnate power by forcing the real execution of the existing laws. The milestone for these changes proved to be the Sigismund Augustus privilege issued on 7 June 1563, which guaranteed equal rights of Catholics and Orthodoxs, Lithuanians and Ruthenians respectively. Apart from the religious aspect, it abolished the ban imposed on Orthodox gentry on holding the highest state magistracies. The main aim of the judicial reform was to abolish the diverse courts operating until then, and to introduce a standardized judicial system based on the *Powiat* structure, which would encompass all the gentry, including princes and lords. The first step was made on 1 July 1564 at Bielsk in the privilege introducing the *Powiat* courts. The next was Sigismund Augustus’s answer (Ruth. *otkaz*) of 21 December 1565 on the noblemen request regarding the implementation of the Second (II) Statute, and the final one the royal privilege issued on 30 December 1565 allowing the functioning of local dieties.

In the second redaction of the Statute many Polish features in terms both of general administration and the enforcement of local justice had been introduced. The statute was to be introduced much earlier (on 11 November 1564) but the “correction” works went until the end of 1565. Thus, instead of becoming valid in 26 January 1566, it was finally put in force 1 of March 1566. In comparison to the previous redaction, it had 14 chapters and 366 articles. It was in general more systematic and precise in terms of legal terminology. As before, it evoked a lot of customary laws and judicial practice after 1529. It was, however, much more influenced by legal traditions new for Lithuania, like the Roman and Greco-Byzantine laws, canonical law, German Magdeburg law, but primarily Polish law. The main change was that the statute reflected the political system of the gentry.

---


47 According to this act voivodes, starosts and plenipotentiary starosts declared of their own will to resign their rights connected to the justice administration as well as incomes they got out of court proceedings. All those granted judicial privileges by the Grand Duke, resigned of their rights on behalf of the *Powiat* jurisdiction, accepting thus its authority. Finally they agreed not to contest the introduction of the II Statute.
democracy, witnessing the shift of power from the princely lords into the hands of all the nobility, regarded as equal in their rights and obligations. One of the main changes was the implementation of Powiat court system. In practice it meant also the division of noble courts into the territorial (Powiat, viz. district) and castle (Pol. gród, Ruth. grod) ones, which had already been guaranteed in the first redaction of the II Statute, and the introduction (in the final redaction) of the sub-chamberlain’s courts (Pol. sqd podkomorski). But even after its introduction, it still underwent additional corrections. The most important one was the gentry’s right to free disposal of their lands, meaning in practice freedom to alienate hereditary estates (1566). The second change regarded the function of local deities and the Diet (1567).

The Act of Union of Lublin (1569) despite sanctioning the agreed changes left many features of starina („oldness“) - custom undisturbed. It recognized the Ruthenian language as official in courts and in formal communication with the royal chancery; allowed existing laws (including the II Lithuanian Statute of 1566) remain in force; and created a separate court of appeal for the Ruthenian lands at Lutsk in Volhynia (1567). Nevertheless, these provisions did not remained

48 Of these courts, operating in all Powiats, the most important were the territorial ones, as in their competence were all kinds of cases. To the summons issued by a territorial court was to be answered by all the landed gentry of a given area. The exemption were cases reserved for the castle court and the King. As to the castle courts their competence was to judge cases encompassed by the so-called four articles. They referred to the most dangerous crimes such as inflammation, an attack on private house (= foray as well), robbery on a public road and rape. In Lithuania these articles were widened of thievery, forgery and homicide. As to the sub-chamberlain court, its solely preoccupation were boundary cases in terms of properties delimitation. The territorial court consisted of three members: judge, sub-judge and notary. All of them have been selected out of four candidates chosen by the local landed gentry and introduced to the king. As for the castle judges, they were at the beginning appointed by voivodes and starosts of the appropriate Powiat but in time the make-up and selection of castle magistrates became similar to the territorial one. In general, the whole reform of judicial system came to its end with the implementation of the III Statute.

49 The fiefs from the royal demesne endowed before 1504 were recognized as hereditary property in the Sejm (Diet) regulations of 1562, 1576 and 1588.

50 The Court of Appeal at Lutsk for the Ruthenian lands of the Grand Duchy was most probably organized imitating the principles according to which in the Polish Crown the voivodeships’ appeal courts were created by the Diet regulation of 1563 (Volumina Legum. Prawa, konstytucje i przywileje Królestwa Polskiego i Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego i wszystkich prowincji należących nawalnych sejmach koronnych. Przedruk zbioru praw, staraniem XX. Pijarow w Warszawie od 1732 do 1782 r. Wydanego <VL>. Ohryzko, Jozafat, and Zdzislaw Kaczmarczyk, eds. 1859-60, 1952. (10 vols.) St. Petersburg: n.p., Poznahn: n.p., here 1859 2: 21-24; see also Bardach, Juliusz.
unchanged due to the growing Polish influence.\textsuperscript{51} Such changes are apparent for example, in 1576 protest of the Ruthenian gentry regarding the abuse of the Ruthenian language in court and official correspondence, or in the transfer in of the seat of the court of appeal for the Kyiv, Volhynia and Bratslav Voivodeships from Lutsk to Lublin.\textsuperscript{52} The final redaction of the Grand Duchy legal code, being incorporated into the Polish Crown and forming together the Commonwealth came into existence in 1588. It summarized the long lasting process of state level reforms taking into account all “corrections” voiced by the gentry society since 1566. The III Statute efficiency has been proved by the fact that, practically without changes, it constituted the core of the Duchy’s legal system and jurisdiction until the 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

The standard procedure each party had to undergo while initiating the judicial proceedings was first to seek the hearing of the case in the castle or territorial court (depending on the nature of the case) of the respective Powiat (exemptions were allowed in the event of war, natural calamity or suspension of proceedings of local courts). Then, if necessary, the case was transferred to the Tribunal of Lublin, which from 1590 functioned as the court of appeal, also for the Ruthenian lands. In limited cases, there was a possibility to appeal to the royal and later Sejm assessors’ court. Nevertheless, it is worth of notice, that the majority of cases regarding property or ownership rights, boundary delimitations and fugitive subjects have been finally settled (even after all courts have been engaged) out-of-

---

\textsuperscript{51} Beginning from 1569, the Poles were finally allowed to hold offices/magistracies as well as own large estates in the Ruthenian Voivodeships.

\textsuperscript{52} For the Tribunal of Lublin see: Balzer, Oswald. 1886. \textit{Geneza Trybunala Koronnego}. Warsaw: n.p.
court by the intermediary of arbitrators. Numerous examples of these "friendly" agreements are to be found in the following chapters.

3. Court Registers, a Fundamental Type of Source Material: Characteristics, History, and Present State.

Having put questions to some of their most learned men, I was informed only that the uninterrupted great wars that had ravaged their country from one end to the other had not spared their libraries, which, from the very beginning, had been put to the torch.

The chanceries of the courts in the Bratslav territory kept two series of registers (or two sets of entries). The first was a series of records for the cases heard and the verdicts issued, and was called the book of decrees (Pol. księga dekretowa). The second, known as the general book of records (Pol. księga potoczno-wpisowa), contained entries of statements and testimonials, protests and complaints, summonses and writs, oral statements, and documents submitted to the court by parties. Official transcripts of the relevant entries would be issued from both series to interested parties. Unlike the courts of Western Podolia (Kamenets' <Pol. Kamieniec Podolski> and Latychov <Pol. Latyczów>), where the languages used were Polish and Latin, in the castle and district courts of Volhynia and the Bratslav territory the official language until the 1660's was Ruthenian, a predecessor of modern Ukrainian and Byelorussian. The charter issued by

---

53 The basis for the boundary commissions (also arbitrary ones) was granted in the Diet regulations of 1588 and 1601 (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamosc], spr. 108, f. 56v.). Earlier the ground for arbitrary agreements had been laid in the II Lithuanian Statute (Statut 1566 Edition 2003: 188 – Chapter 4 "O sud’iakh i o sudekh" [On courts and judges], article 60 "O polyubovnom sude" [On the arbitrators court]. Recently Starchenko published an article dedicated to these arbitrary courts and their operation. The author based her conclusions on the Lutsk and Vlodymyr castle court registers (Starchenko, Nataliia. 2004. "Polyubovni sudy na Volyhi v ostatniy tertyni XVI stolittia." In Do dererel. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats’ na poshanu Oleha Kupchyna ko ho z nahodu toho 70- richchta. (Vol. 1) Kyiv-L’viv: n.p. 207-28).

54 Beauplan, 1999: 16.

55 On the principles of chancery functioning in the period of legal sessions and between them, as well as on the personal composition of chancery staff see: Krykun/Piddubniak, 1999: 144-45.

56 Other relevant details concerning the operations of the castle and district courts in the Bratslav territory, on the basis of source materials, are to be found in papers by Krykun, Piddubniak, and Petrenko. See notes 9, p. 24, 15, pp. 29-30 (Krykun), 16, p. 30 (Petrenko) and 17, p. 31 (Piddubniak).
Sigismund Augustus on 26 May 1569 guaranteed the inhabitants of the Voivodeships of Bratslav, alongside the right to use the provisions of the Lithuanian Statute (in its versions of 1529 and 1566), also the right to use Ruthenian as the official language to be used by the Royal Chancery for documents issued for the people of these Voivodeships, and in the regional courts. The exceptions to this rule were the municipal courts, where the official language had always been Polish.

The earliest transcripts from the court registers extant in the Polish and Ukrainian archives date back to the 1570’s and 1580’s, although, they are mostly preserved in form of 18th-century copies. The transcripts for the 1580’s and 1590’s, in their majority, are notifications of loss of documents or confirmation of endowment of property, undoubtedly the outcome of the fire that gutted Vinnytsia Castle and town on 8 October 1580, as well as of others calamities. The Volhynian (Ruthenian) Metrica contains an abundance of material on this issue, worthy of a separate study. Hence, we may assume that the systematic keeping of court registers for the Bratslav territory was associated with the reforms of the 1560’s and the creation of the Voivodeship in 1566. In 1594-95 the registers of the castle court fell into the hands of rioters in Bratslav and Seweryn Nalewajko’s Cossacks. The vestigial document and Krykun’s research show that the courts suspended operations in Bratslav from the middle of September 1594 until the turn of May and June 1595. The transfer of administrative powers to Vinnytsia in 1598 had among others to secure judicial archives from further destruction. A resolution passed by the Sejm (the lower house of the Polish Parliament and Parliament as

57 Balinski/Lipiński, 1844 2: 1336-37. Large fragments of the King Sigismund Augustus’ privilege have been quoted here. It is interesting to note that in the texts in Ruthenian script Latin words or phrases written in the Cyrillic alphabet are frequently found. Most often these are legal terms or longer quotations from the legal literature and judicial texts. An interesting study on the linguistic aspects of the court registers of Right-Bank Ukraine has been published by Iakovenko (Iakovenko, Natalia M. 1983. "O iazykovom sostave hrodskykh i ziemskykh knyh Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy na protiazhenii XVII vieka." In: Istoriobrafycheske i istochnykovudcheske problemy otychestvennoi istorii: Istoriyki po sotialno-ekonomicheskoi istorii Rossi i Ukrainy XVII-XX viekov. Mezhvuzovskiy sbornyk nauchnyh trudov. Dnipropetrovsk: n.p. 64-72).

58 HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 509.

referred to in general/Diet) in 1616 mentions the chaos in the Vinnytsia archives (perhaps in connection with the Tartar raids of 1613-16), and the need for a review of the court registers there. In 1641 Sejm adopted another resolution, ordering the sejmik (dietie; regional assembly of nobility, usually preceding the Sejm) of the Voivodeship of Bratslav to appoint reviewers to the make of copies of the registers of the district and castle courts, and of the sub-chamberlain's records (Pol. księgi podkomorskie).

After 1571, on the request of the Voivodeship’s parliamentary deputies, the court archives with the district and castle registers were accommodated in the Vinnytsia Castle, following its latest restoration. In the II Lithuanian Statute (1566) special premises were assigned “in the castle or manor house“ of the Starost (Lat. capitaneus), where judicial proceedings were conducted. The III Lithuanian Statute (1588) retained the regulation, permitting the construction of a separate building near the castle or starost’s manor house “to house the district court.” A resolution passed by the Sejm in 1590 on the courts of Bratslav ordered the designation of “a courthouse and premises for the keeping of the registers” in Bratslav, stating that provisionally the courts should hold sessions in the Bratslav Castle. The act was never implemented, at least until 1594, and perhaps until 1598, and the registers continued to be stored in the Castle. After their move to Vinnytsia in 1598 the registers of the Bratslav court were put under the supervision of the starost of Vinnytsia, in whose castle they were to be kept. In 1601 the Diet passed yet another act permitting annual sessions of the courts (Pol. roczki sądowe) to be held in premises other than the starost’s castle; the district court was to choose a venue for its sessions. We do not know though either when or where the building was erected. The earliest entry of a “district courthouse in Vinnytsia”

---

60 VL, 3: 141. One of the auditors responsible of the revision procedure of the castle court records appointed was Hrehory Bajbuza. The same role was played by Ivan Kordysz for the podkomorskie (sub-chamberlain’s court) series of Vinnytsia territorial books (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 74).
61 VL, 4: 20.
63 VL, 1859 2: 395.
dates back to 29 June 1629, and the next one to 6 June 1635.\(^4\) A new location for the castle court was not established until around 1613/14, when Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, erected a new castle. By then though, only part of the registers survived making it difficult to establish exact starting date.

The Voivodeship archives suffered another setback during the Bohdan Khmel'nits'kyi (Pol. Bohdan Chmielnicki) Rebellion, 1648-52, particularly when Vinnytsia was captured by Ivan Bohun, Cossack Ataman of the Vinnytsia Regiment.\(^5\) The Cossacks devastated the local archives, evidence of which is provided in a declaration submitted by Mikołaj Zeszteliński, the new notary of the castle court (Pol. pisarz grodzki), as soon as normal legal proceedings were resumed. Zeszteliński painted a black picture of the archives and chancery of the castle court.\(^6\) The court registers had been kept in the Vinnytsia Castle until at least 1648. In 1700, the archives were transferred to a safer place, since the Vinnytsia Castle had been left virtually in ruin. According to Petrenko, the new location to which the archives were to be moved for greater security than what the old Castle on an island in the middle of the River Boh could afford, was the “stone fortress” of the Jesuit convent, located in the town center within the walls surrounding the Jesuities and Dominican priory, which was next to them.\(^7\) In the

\(^4\) Krykun/Piddubniak, 1999: 136. In 1631 the Diet ordered the Vinnytsia starost to allot two sites. One of them for the construction of „territorial jury house“ (Pol. ziemski sądowy dom); second one, was a special storage room for judicial books in the Vinnytsia Castle (VL, 3: 335). In the light of the aforementioned it is hard to say, if this resolution has ever been realised.

\(^5\) Ivan Fedorowicz Bohun, who died in 1664, was the commanding office (colonel) of the Cossack Kalnik Regiment in 1648-49, 1650, 1653-55, and 1658. Kalnik was an abode of the regiment in 1648-53, in the period of 1653-67 this role was played by Vinnytsia. See Chapter 2/C/1: 164 and notes 164, p. 164, 165, pp. 164-65.

\(^6\) Heleniusz [Iwanowski, Eustachyj. 1882. Pamiątki polskie z różnych czasów przez Eu...go Heleniusza. (2 vols.) Cracow: n.p., here 2: 133. The author quotes, however, without mentioning the source of this quotation, a complaint by the castle court notary M. Zeszteliński, who claimed that: “in the course of the Cossack rebellions, all the acts publica calamitatis, absumpsit, being mangled hideously by the Cossack licence (Pol. swawola), the different ones [documents] being lost by the same licence”.

\(^7\) PetrenkoZistoriiArkhiwnoi, 1999: 20. Also nowadays the Vinnytsia district archives (Derzhavnyi arkhiv Vinnyts’koi oblasti u Vinnytsii <DAVO>), housing documents from the territory of former Bratslav province (Rus. gubernia), including the Vinnytsia district ones has its seat, in the post Jesuit priory. This judicial documentation stored here covers the period from the end of the 18th century and the first quarter of the 19th century.

48
first quarter of the 18th century a number of resolutions and admonitions were passed by the *sejmik* (regional assembly of nobility) for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, requesting the return of registers to the archives, kept in the hands of people for a variety of reasons. We do not know however, how successful these appeals were, sent to Kyiv (Rus. *Kiev*, Pol. *Kijów*), the Franciscan priory in L’viv (Pol. *Lwów*), and to various individuals.

Despite these measures, the archives were further damaged in 1750 and between 1768 and 1769, as a result of the Hajdamak (Cossack) movement and the Bar Confederacy. It was not until the resolution passed by the Warsaw Confederacy on 30 May 1774 that the chanceries of the territorial courts resumed their activities and were ordered to continue keeping registers in the both the general entry and decree series. After the Third Partition of Poland (1793) the castle court of Vinnytsia was eventually abolished by the Russian authorities, in a decree issued on 30 May 1796. When a Russian Bratslav governorship (Pol.

---

68 The Vinnytsia bourgrave (Pol. *burgrabia*) Gumiński has given back the castle court registers books. He had taken them away from Vinnytsia during the Cossack rebellion of 1702/03. Furthermore, Karol Szandyrowski gave back a territorial book of decrees (Pol. *księga dekretowa ziemskia*). The Vinnytsia territorial jury Stanisław Suchorski gave back another one of territorial books (Krykun/Piddubniak, 1999: 127). See also AYZR, 1910 II/3: 319 (1714), 404 (1715), 487 (1716), 524 (1717): these are official documents of the local dieties (Pol. *sejmiki*) urging different persons for the return of judicial acts; 607 (1718), 620 (1719): the return of judicial books by Gumiński, 774 (1723): by K. Szandyrowski, 823 (1724): by S. Suchorski.

69 Some private persons were: the Bratslav *podstolina* (wife of deputy steward <Pol. *podstoli*, Lat. *subdipifer*>) Mrs. Krasnosie尔斯ka, most probably Anna of Charlež wife of Kazimierz Krasnosie尔斯ki, the Bratslav *podstoli* from 1695, who died ca. 1715; the Sieradz Voivode (in the Crown), who ca. 1716 was Jan Alexander Konicopolski (appointed to Sieradz Voivodeship in 1710, died 1719), the former voivode of Bratslav; Konstuntyn Rybaczevwski, a certain Burzyhski, and a certain Rochański; the successors of the Bratslav cupbearer (Pol. *podczaszy*, Lat. *pocillator*) Michał Kordysz (the books from 1626 and 1640); most probably the Busk (in Red Rus’) castle justice Lentowski; the Vinnytsia burgher Peredyjner together with a few villagers from the Strzyżawka village belonging to the Vinnytsia starosty (Krykun/Piddubniak 127-128). See as well AYZR, 1910 II/3: 336 (1715), 486 (1716), 655 (1720), 735 (1722), 774 (1723): here information on Kyiv, 486 (1716), 773 (1723): on L’viv Franciscan convent, 380 (1715), 486 (1716), 602 (1718), 685 (1720), 773 (1723): the Sieradz Voivode [Konicopolski], p. 486 (1716): K. Rybaczewski and Burzyhski, 521 (1717): Rochański, 773 (1723): the successors of M. Kordysz and Lentowski, 621 (1719), 685 (1720): the Vinnytsia burgher Peredyjner, 620 (1719), 685 (1720): the villagers of Strzyżawka.

70 ShipovichOgranitsakh, 1914: 18. The author writes, that in 1750 a small detachment of haydamaks (Pol. *hajdamacy*), e.g. mutinied peasants and Cossacks, who had havoced earlier the city of *Humah* and robbed *Granow* (both places in the *Powiat* of Vinnytsia), forced its way into the Vinnytsia castle destroying large amount of documentation, in all probability judicial books.

namiestnictwo bractawskie) was set up at Bratslav, in 1796, the archives of the former territorial and castle courts were transferred provisionally to the castle courthouse at Vinnytsia. After the abolition of the governorship office in 1797, the old court archives were moved yet again, this time to the powiat (territorial/district) court in Vinnytsia. In 1852, when the University of St. Volodymyr was founded in Kyiv, the archives of the old papers, including the earliest registers of the Voivodeship of Bratslav (from the 17th and 18th centuries) were brought to Kyiv, where they were stored until 1943. After the World War II the surviving ones were transferred to the CDIAUK, their current storage place.\(^2\)

I have already discussed the condition of the court registers of the Voivodeship of Bratslav and their state of preservation in the 18th century.\(^3\) However, it might be worthwhile mentioning Petrenko’s observation concerning the state of these registers in 1829.\(^4\) In accordance with the archives guidebook and unpublished archival inventories of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia judicial books, nowadays extant are the following ones: two territorial (Pol. ziemskie, Lat. terrestrial) registers books of Bratslav Voivodeship and six books of the Vinnytsia

---

\(^2\) The fate of the Ukrainian archives, at large, deserves special attention. See the studies of Grimsted Kennedy (note 24, pp. 33-34), and the one not mentioned before: Grimsted Kennedy, Patricia. 1979/80. "Lviv Manuscript Collections and Their Fate," In Eucharisterion: Essays Presented to Omeljan Pritsak on His Sixtieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students. A special issue of Harvard Ukrainian Studies 3/4: 348-75.

\(^3\) See notes 68, p. 49 and 69, p. 49.

\(^4\) PetrenkoZistorii Arkhivnoi, 1999: 20-22. On 9 March of that year Błażej Dudziński, archivist of the Powiat of Vinnytsia, made a note for a private search being conducted by the Potocki family concerning their property (currently the document is in DAVO: F. 480 op. 1, spr. 79, f. 548-549). It presents a fairly complete picture of the condition of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia court registers, essentially not very different from the 1780 record. The earliest registers in the archives of Vinnytsia were as follows: for castle court of Vinnytsia for 1639-1647 [1664], 1639 and 1641, the registers for the sub-chamberlain’s court (Pol. sądy podkomorskie) for 1643, 1644, 1645, and 1647 (de facto for Kyiv province); and the register for the Vinnytsia castle court for 1652, the latter went missing from the CDIAUK during the World War II. There was also a full set of registers for the Vinnytsia castle court for 1700-05, 1714-59, and 1762-92. No registers were kept for the Vinnytsia castle court in 1760-61; and 1792 marked the official termination of this court’s business. The following registers were available for the Voivodeship of Bratslav territorial court: the „collective” volume for 1720-22, and volumes for 1745 (two registers, one with decrees and general entries, the other for decrees only), 1746, 1747 (two volumes, one joint decrees and general entries, the other general entries only), and for 1774-96. The volumes missing from the territorial court’s registers were for 1700-20, 1722-45, and 1747-74 – the greater part of the 18th century, although no registers were kept from 1768 to 1774.
castle court (Pol. gród, Ruth. Grod). However, this information is somehow misleading. In the case of Bratslav books, the first of them comprises documents from 1639 to 1647 (1666). The second one composes de facto a summary of the judicial cases of the Czeczel family from 1639 to 1779, as in reality only the decree from 1779 pertaining to this family has been mistakenly described under the name of a book.

When it comes to the Vinnytsia books, the book under no. 1, extremely interesting, as it comprises reach material of the fiscal nature from 1543 to 1565 in reality has been artificially composed on the basis of the documents regarding Volhynia and Kyiv provinces exclusively, thus have nothing to do with Vinnytsia and its area. Also the last signature in these series is questionable, and hardly is to be regarded as a book. Seemingly to the aforementioned Bratslav “book” in reality it is a copy of the decree issued by the assessors’ jury on 14 July 1788, the one that closed a long lasting quarrel between the municipality of Vinnytsia and Józef Czosnowski, Vinnytsia Starost. From what was written above it can be easily find out, that the surviving judicial material for the Bratslav voivodeship covers the period of only a dozen or so years: 1639-47, 1767-69 [-1779, -1788], and that in practice one has to do not with eight but with five books.

---

76 F. 43 op. 1, spr. 1 [former signature No. 4598], f. 1-282.
77 F. 43 op. 1, spr. 2, f. 1-65.
78 F. 44 op. 1, spr. 1, f. 1-909.
79 F. 44 op. 1, spr. 6, f. 1-160. The remaining signatures of these series have been formed by the books from the following years: 1645 <12-24 May> (F. 44 op. 1, spr. 2, f. 1-979), 1676 (F. 44, op. 1 spr. 3, k. 1-450), 1768 <2 January – 31 December> (F. 44, op. 1 spr. 4, f. 1-397), and 1769 [1789-1790] (F. 44, op. 1 spr. 5, f. 1-612).
80 Furthermore in the collection of CDIAUK is being preserved one book of the Bratslav Roman-catholic consistory from 1768 <10 September – 7 December>, which makes part of the documents collection of the so-called Seria Nowa [New Series] (F. 221 op. 1, spr. 664, f. 1-548).
The missing judicial books can be to the high degree covered by the research in the family files (especially in the archives of Deputacja Szlachecka (Deputy office for Nobility) for the former Podolia and Kyiv Governorships offices). Most of them house large amounts of copies of documents taken from castle and territorial registers books of Bratslav and Vinnytsia districts, and of the Crown Tribunal of Appeal at Lublin for the Bratslav Voivodeship and neighbouring areas, mostly form the 18th century.

4. The Słupica alias Słupicz Family. Basic Sources and Literature of the Subject.

The basic source for research on the Słupica family are entries in Ruthenian and Polish preserved in the court registers. Most of the corresponding 16th- and 17th-century originals, and 18th-century transcripts, have survived in family collections; the Princes Sanguszko of Sławuta Collection (in the Polish State Archives, Cracow); the Zamoyskis and Potockis Collections and the extant Bratslav and Vinnytsia court registers (in the CDIAUK, Kyiv); and the Piaseczyńskis Collection (part of the Ossoliński Collection), in the Vernads’kyi Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (formerly the Ossolineum) at L’viv. Apart from these, numerous transcripts survived dispersed throughout many other collections.

The bibliography in this thesis and the footnotes to particular chapters give a full list of them. In view of the fragmentary nature of the material, I have also used documents concerning more distant relatives and their families, or those who

81 Registers of these body established in 1802 are also dispersed in a few Ukrainian district archives. In Kyiv and Zhytomir (Pol. Żytoimierz) for the former Kyiv Governorship, and in Khmelnytskyi (Pol. Chmielnicki, formerly Płoskirow) – up to 2002 in Kamenets’ Podil’s’kyi for the former Podolia Governorship. These files cover however in there contents sometimes even the period from the end of the 16th century. For Podolia Governorship deputy office for nobility see recently published Vas’ko, M. (ed.) 2003. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khmel’nyts’koi oblasti. Anotovanyi reestr opysiv. Fondy kolyshn’oho Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’koho khol’skoho arkhivu. Vol. 1: Fondy kolyshn’oho Kam’ianets’-Podil’s’koho khol’skoho arkhivu periodu do 1917 r. Kyiv: n.p. One also has to take under consideration also the books of the so-called Civil-Military committee of the Bratslav voivodeship (Pol. Komisja cywilno-wojskowa woj. bracławskiego) formed in the end of the 18th century, as well as district books from the Bratslav territory from the first quarter of the 19th century.
were neighbours of the Slupica family, and finally those families, inheriting or coming into possession of the Slupicas properties.

There is no extant separate Slupica family archive as such, although the documents used have undoubtedly allowed me to reconstruct it fairly accurate. At least, the basic components of such an archive were preserved at Kuna until 1919, in the archival and library collections of the Jaroszyński family. Prior to 1919 the Jaroszyńskis commissioned the Vilnian archivist Ryszard Mienicki to compile a catalogue and description of the collection. His catalogue focused chiefly on the Jaroszyński papers from 1775 to 1905. Nonetheless, this family had inherited part of the Slupicas archive as well, as it can be deduced from the Mienicki account. The legal and judicial character of these documents related to the Slupicas' real property and estates has determined the structure of this thesis. Remarkably, there is no extant material concerning economic affairs, which made up the core of most family archives, for the landed gentry and nobility of the Eastern Marches of the Commonwealth.

The Slupica family managed to attract the attention of four early researchers, specialists on the history of the Ukraine, particularly of Podolia, who produced four outline histories of the family. Three being published as articles, and one in an unpublished manuscript form. These four papers were compiled on the basis of archival material, some of which is no longer preserved, but was in different extent used by all four writers. It is fairly easy to follow the crossreferencing of these authors, especially, when mistakes are repeated or corrected. The manuscript account along with a family tree was probably compiled by Bronislaw Gorczak while organising the extensive archives of the Princes Sanguszko of Sławuta (now preserved in APKr., Cracow). This is the only source

---

83 In the so-called division „E” of these archives consisting of the legal acts were stored among others, the act on sloboda (“free settlement”) dated at Kuna on 1 May 1590 and 74 documents from the 17th century, also the ones concerning legal cases of the Slupicas against the princely family of Zbaraski and its inheritors Princes Wiśniowieckis (Mienicki, 1927: 216, 217).
of materials Gorczak used. As a result of my research, it is apparent that Gorczak’s errors were due to the fact that he had no other documents available.\textsuperscript{84}

Of the published articles, the earliest is by Edward Rulikowski, published in 1870, titled “Przed kilkuset laty (Bracławszczyzna)” [The Bratslav Territory Several Centuries Ago], in a volume entitled \textit{Kwiaty i owoce} [Flowers and Fruits], edited by Ignacy Trusiewicz and published in Kyiv. Rulikowski’s paper dwells at length on the Slupicas and their relatives like the Kozar, Korotko, Koszka, Krasnosieleski, Meleszko, and Rochoziński families.\textsuperscript{85} In 1886 an article entitled “Starinnyi Yuzhno-russkii dvoriantskii rod Slupits i ikh pomest’e Kuna” appeared in \textit{Kievskaia starina} [Kyivan Antiquity], under the pen-name Podolyanin.\textsuperscript{86} This publication must have been used by Franciszek Rawita Gawroński, in a paper entitled “Z dziejow rodziny Słupiców” [From the Slupica family past]. However, he did not avoid errors, repeating and questioning his predecessors’ work, which was his major source.\textsuperscript{87} In recent times Bohdan, Bohusz and Hrehory the Slupicas, got their biographies compiled by the present author for \textit{Polski słownik biograficzny}, the standard Polish biographical reference work.\textsuperscript{88}

The Kuna estate had been the subject of a book, narrating mainly the deeds of the Jaroszyński family of the individual arms or of Jacyna arms, proprietors of Kuna as of the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century, with a brief only mention to the Slupicas before them.\textsuperscript{89} The book is titled \textit{Po inkursji kozackiej. Z wewnętrznych dziejów}

\textsuperscript{84} APKr.: ASang., t. 143/1 (10 pages).
\textsuperscript{85} [Rulikowski, Edward, without name]. 1870. “Przed kilkuset laty (Bracławszczyzna) <Trusiewicz>.” In \textit{Kwiaty i owoce}. Trusiewicz, Ignacy, ed. Kyiv: Drukarnia Uniwersytecka 273-321. For other publications by the same author see note 11/V, p. 28.
\textsuperscript{86} Podolyanin [unidentified]. 1886. “Starinnyi Yuzhno-russkii dvoriantskii rod Slupits i ikh pomest’e Kuna <Podolyanin>,” \textit{Kievskaia starina} 15 (Iyul): 563-70. I was unable to identify the author in any of the pen-names’ compendia.
\textsuperscript{88} PSB, 1999 XXXIX: 120-22 (Bohdan Słupica, by Beata Nykiel), 122-23 (Bohusz Słupica), 123-25 (Hrehory Słupica).
\textsuperscript{89} This family well deserves a separate study, in view of its history and the abundance of materials extant on it. On the Jaroszyńskis see for example: Boniecki 1905 8: 267-72 (Jaroszyńscy); Żychliński 27: 40-62 (Jaroszyńscy); Orłowski, Karol hr. 1995. \textit{Jaroszyńscy herbu własnego}. Buenos Aires-Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Orloviiana; PSB. Cracow 1964, 11: 16-22 (biographies of a
Bradawszczyzny [After the Cossack Incursion. Some Episodes from the Domestic History of the Bracław Territory]. It was written by Antoni J. Rolle, a friend of the Jaroszyński family, who had access to their house archive before 1919. Hence the tremendous value of Rolle’s book for the 18th-19th-century story of the Jaroszyński family and the entire Bratslav territory. There are also a few articles on Kuna in collected volumes. The aforementioned articles on Kuna include an essay by Antoni Urbanński on the Jaroszyński country mansion and the one in Roman Aftanazy’s 11-volume work on the stately homes and manors in the old Eastern Marches of the Commonwealth. Finally, there are short articles on Kuna by Marczyński and Iwanowski, and the entry in the geographical dictionary of Poland (Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich).

5. The Aim of This Work.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the ongoing and development of a Ruthenian family in Eastern Podolia, the Šupicas, between the 14th and the 17th centuries.

After a discussion on the secondary bibliography or rather lack of it on Eastern Podolia, and the nature of the judicial sources used in this thesis, I will discuss briefly the area in terms of geography. The physical boundaries, rivers, ponds and woods etc. will be described, to allow to understand the reasons why few of the Jaroszyńskis); Nykiel, Beata K. 2005. “W tym miasteczku Kunie, nigdy nic szczególneego nie zazdrożilo”. Zarys dziejów Kuny od końca XIV w. do r. 1919.” In Pamiętnik Kijowski (Vol. VIII) (in print); See also the Jaroszyński files in the Deputy office for Nobility (Pol. Deputacja szlachecka) of Podolia Governorship, in which lots’ of original documents could be found. Among these files there are two of the Jaroszyński family of Korczak (variation of) alias Jacyna arms (Derzhavnyi arhiv Khmelnts’koi oblasti <DAKhO>: F. 230, op. 1 [Deputacja szlachecka], spr. 7278 and 7280).


HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 533, 577 (Kuna); MarczyńskiStatystyka, 1823: 3: 173 (Kuna); SłownikGeogr. 1883 IV: 873-75 (Kuna).
this area had been the theatre of war, throughout the period this thesis is discussing.

The natural resources, wood and its products, fish, gains and very fertile soil were some of the reasons to explain the persistent pattern of settlement in the area, despite the fact that it was constantly under the peril of attacks by different hordes. These resources will also shed light on the struggle of local lord families to control and develop the area, even to the expense of other neighbouring lord families or even other branches of their own family. A brief description of the different states in power in the area will be given, and their subsequent efforts to govern it.

In the second chapter, I will examine the origins of the family. The first mentions of their presence in the area and the patron-client relations, which allowed them to acquire their first endowments. While doing this, the early political history of the region until the 15th century will help us to understand the political system the early Slupicas lived in and utilized to grow. I will continue in the same chapter to discuss the social and political status of the Slupcia family members and their gains and losses, in the 16th century until the 17th century, when the family became extinct on the male line.

In the third chapter, the symbols of the family status like the arms and seals, their castle and clientage will enable us to visualize their successes and failures. Also, being a local Ruthenian family and following the Orthodox creed is another important element for the discussion. Their intermarriage system will only break-up in the 17th century with the permission into the family of non-Ruthenians and non-Orthodox.

The fourth chapter is devoted to their economic activities; the development of the Kuna estate; their struggle for settlers, and the problem of absconding peasants. The incentives given by the Kuna lords allowed the estate to grow and
the city to became stronger. However, more favourable terms given by others in the 17th century resulted to an exodus of subjects and consequent financial ruin.

The fifth and six chapters are exclusively devoted to the efforts of the family members to expand and defend the property against intruders, neighbours and family. The golden period for the Kuna estate during the time of the Slujicas’ guardian Ivan Meleszko, 1596-1612 and Tychon Semenowicz (1612-15) will end with the foray organized by the brother-in-law of Tychon, which resulted into his murder in 1615. Strenuous lawsuit cases and appeals by an increasing number of claimants marked thus the end of the Slujica family’s presence at Kuna.

In Conclusion, the case of the Slujicas is used as an example to describe “the fluid borderland” mentality whereupon ethical norms were determined by the urge for survival.

The thesis has a list of abbreviations for the most important archival sources and secondary literature; a glossary of terms as found in the documents; bibliography; maps of the area; a genealogical tree of the family in a simple and detailed version followed by a sample of original sources.
CHAPTER 1

Podolia, Eastern Podolia, Bratslav Voivodeship — general characteristics.¹

The southern part along the Dnister is called the Poberezhe (Pol. Pobereże — ‘Riverside’). [...] One may say of this land that it was flowing with milk and honey. Podolia and Ukraine could not entice those who had settled in the Bratslav (Pol. Bracław) territory along the Poberezhe.²

There is no doubt that Podolia despite being situated in a rather dangerous “neighbourhood”, the outcome of political and geographical divisions, had always been an attractive area of settlement. In the course of centuries it became a subject of competition between many different nationalities and political forces due to its natural resources, especially the vast densely afforested areas and the steppe encouraging extensive agriculture. This is true for the whole of the region, and in particular its eastern part. One has to also keep in mind Podolia’s position, between two large rivers, the Dnister in the west and the Dnipro in the east, the latter being regarded as one of the most important waterways of Eastern Europe. It was also not far from the Black Sea, although the wide and wild steppe separating Podolia from the sea was controlled partly by the Budziak Horde, and partly by renegades inhabiting the Wild Marshes (Pol. Dzikie pola).³


³ It is spacious steppe area northwards from the Black Sea, in the downstream of Dnipro, stretching between the Bratslav territory (of Eastern) Podolia and the Crimean Khanate. Formally this territory belonged to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, however it did was a “no-man’s-land,” unpopulated due to the frequent Tartar rids. Its boundaries had never been precisely defined, explaining the reoccurring necessity for state-level boundary commissions. For such commissions see e.g. Chapter 2/B/3: 126-31. Anecdotal information related to boundary commissions, is found in documents, like the Crimean Khan Sahib Girey’s answer to the King Sigismund Augustus dated 1548. While instructing his envoy heading for the Kingdom of Poland he stressed the following message should be conveyed to the King “this land neither belongs to you [the Polish King] neither to me [the Khan], but to God; so it belongs to the stronger one” (Quotation after Kolankowski, Ludwik. 1913. Zygmunt August wielki książę Litwy do roku 1548. L’viv: n.p. 286-87).
Podolia in the 16th and the 17th century was divided into two parts: Western Podolia was referred to as the Crown Podolia and administratively was similar with the Voivodeship of Podolia, while Eastern Podolia was known as Pobozhe (Pol. Poboże) or Bratslavshchyna (Pol. Bractławszczyna), and administratively belonged, since 1566, to the Bratslav Voivodeship. Only the north-western part of the entire province was relatively safe area. In the north, Podolia bordered with Volhynia, earlier a province of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The latter encompassing in the 14-15th centuries also Bratslavshchyna (eastern Podolia). After 1566 Volhynia was similar with the Volhynia Voivodeship, the one counted with Kyiv and eastern Podolia (the Bratslav Voivodeship) among Ukrainian lands. In the west, western part of Podolia (the Crown Podolia) bordered with the Polish Crown and going south-west with the Moldavian Principality. In the south the eastern Podolia neighboured also with the same principality and the Budziak Horde. Both the Horde and the Moldavian and Wallachian (below Moldavia) principalities were since the 15th century, vassal states of the Ottoman Empire. Continuing eastwards from Budziak, the border of eastern Podolia went alongside the abovementioned Wild Marshes. This area was not far from the Black Sea, and the Crimean Khanate. Following the Dnipro the border went alongside the Kyiv Voivodeship, to Volhynia in the north. However, before creation of the Voivodeship in 1566, the eastern border of Podolia was the vaguely defined as “no-man’s-land,” continuously exposed to both Tartar (of different hordes) and Muscovy danger. The swifts in borderlines due to political events in Ukraine (including internal conflicts in regard to the Bratslav and Kyiv Voivodeships dispute on the Zvinogrod and Cherkasy area) and the region at large have been discussed in all contexts, so I will not go into details.4

Eastern Podolia (Pobozhe or Bratslavshchyna) as a voivodeship bordered with two voivodeships - on the west of Podolia and on the northeast of Kyiv. On the south it was opened towards the steppe divided between the

---

4 For the history of Zvinogrod, and its powiat after 1569 in the context of the Kyiv-Bratslav conflict and successive boundary delimitation commissions and surveys see KrykunAdministratyvno-territorial’nyi, 1993, especially Part III (Voivodeship of Bratslav), 83-134, and Part IV (Voivodeship of Kyiv), 135-76. See as well maps in the Appendix 4.
Budziak Horde westwards and Wild Marshes eastwards. The landscape of Eastern Podolia was slightly hilly with Oak or mixed forests and woods watered by numerous rivers and ponds. Accounts of travellers traversing Ukraine and Podolia (e.g., in the late 16th century Erich Lassota von Streblau, in the 17th century Guillaume de Beauplan) had witnessed the beauty of the area. This type of countryside was abundant of natural products, wild animals and fish. In Eastern Podolia, the Boh River flows in the middle of the country and has numerous right and left bank tributaries. Nevertheless, similarly to Dnieper in its downstream, the Boh was cross-sectioned with rapids, thus making the navigation a difficult task.

The fertile land produces grain in such abundance that often they do not know what to do with it, the more so because they have no navigable rivers that empty into the sea, except the Borysthenes [Dnieper], which is blocked fifty leagues below Kyiv by [a series of] thirteen rapids.

However, the river and its tributaries offered abundance of fish and inundation allowing the construction of artificial ponds, fisheries and water mills.

On the other, that is the Ruthenian, side [the Right Bank of Dnieper] there are found a number of lakes so rich in fish that the vast numbers of these creatures, dying packed together in such stagnant water, cause an exceedingly great putrefaction that affects the very water.

Apart from the Boh of importance were mostly the boundary rivers, alongside which went the voivodeship border. The Dniester in the west, together with its left bank tributary Jahorlik; the Kodyma, the Boh’s right bank tributary in the south, and the Siniucha and Uhorski Tyklicz in the east.

The extensive forests were exploited in many ways; to make timber, fuel, potash, pitch, saltpetre; for hunting, wild fruit collection and honey and wax production.

---


7 Beauplan, 1999: 12.

It should be noted that all villages in Podolia and Ukraine are for the most part surrounded by wooded areas, where there are hiding-places to which the peasants withdraw in summer, when an alarm is sounded announcing [the approach of] the Tartars. These woods may very well be half-league wide.9

The second important economic activity was animal breeding suitable for the steppe areas offered (oxen, sheep, herd).10 One should not forget as well, that an important oxen trade trail from Moldavia to Muscovy (later Russia) passed through eastern Podolia. Good irrigation and a very fertile humus soil (Pol. czarnoziem) as a result of deforestation produced good cereal crops, from the end of the 16th century onwards.

Estimates on the population of Eastern Podolia are usually based upon rather imprecise and often misleading demographic data. When compared to the more secure neighbouring Volhynia, which was one of the most densely populated areas, the Bratslav Voivodeship looked rather deserted. Obviously the wideness of this territory and the Tartar raids had their toll in the number of settled enclaves in the region. Our information on the population density and level of urbanization for the Bratslav Voivodeship is equally discouraging. According to one calculation the Bratslav territory in the first half of the 16th century had ca. 450-500,000 of people. Whereas, another of 1528 calculates the population of the Kyiv and Bratslav areas to 168,000.11 Ca. 1569 the Bratslav Voivodeship had the surface of 35,024 km2, on which 65 settlements of municipal type were to be found, that is 873 km2 per one settlement.12

---

9 Beauplan, 1999: 72.
10 Lourie while writing on Spanish border pays attention to the fact that which can be relevant to Podolia, too. „The constant threat of Moslem raids as well as the aridity of much of the land [thus contrary to Podolia] made pastoral farming and stock breeding far more attractive than agriculture, since the animals could be moved away when the alarm was given. But for much the same reason cattle and sheep and horses were particularly attractive as booty, and cattle-stealing, especially between Muslims and Christians, was a frequent and lucrative occupation” (Lourie, Elena. 1966. “A Society Organized for War: Medieval Spain,” Past and Present 35: 54-76, here 58). See also Introduction, note 5, p. 23.
11 BlaszczykLitwa, 2002: 164 (1528), 165 (the 16th century). The estimate (second version) for 1528 was made by Henryk Łowmiański on the basis of 1528 popis registers. He counted then the whole of the Grand Duchy population for 2,7 million. According to the second opinion published by Ukrainian scholars the population of the whole of Ukraine was to be round 2-2,5 million, while 680,000 were to live in Volhynia, ca. 500-550,000 in the Kyiv and Bratslav territories and the resting ca. 650,000 in the Left Bank Ukraine.
12 BlaszczykLitwa, 2002: 172. For example the neighbouring Volhynia Voivodeship had respectively 39, 786 km2, 121 towns and country towns, thus one town per 329 km2, and the Kyiv Voivodeship 65,456 km2 (excluding Wild Marshes) and 21 towns, what made one town per 3117 km2. All three Voivodeships had in 1569 148 municipal settlements.
then a century later, in 1625 the Bratslav Voivodeship sustained, according to Jablonowski, 85,500 peasants and 225,800 townspeople, a total of 311,300 people living in 285 villages and 117 towns (together 402 settlements) on an area of 627 square miles, meaning 496 people per mile, the lowest number in the whole of Ukraine.\(^{13}\)

Podolia and its main centres are mentioned relatively late in the sources.\(^{14}\) Perhaps this is so because this area was situated in the periphery of neighbouring older state organisms, which were first the Kyivan Rus' (and later also Halych-Volodymyr Rus'), Poland, and Hungary. In addition, as we mentioned before, the settlement of Podolia was significantly influenced by vast steppes to the east, southeast and south, being penetrated by successive waves of nomadic peoples. The *Povest vremennikh let (The Tale of Bygone Years)*, states that in the 10\(^{th}\) century the Slavonic tribes of the Tyvertsy (Pol. *Tywercy*) and the Ulyche (Pol. *Ulicze*) inhabited the areas stretching from between the Boh and the Dnister to the Danube.\(^{15}\) In the 13\(^{th}\) century, in the area later called Podolia, the division along the Ushytsa (Pol. *Uszyca*) River came into existence. The area eastwards of this river started to be referred to as Pobozhe (Pol. *Poboże*), when its westward area became to be known as Podnistrovie (Pol. *Podniesień*) or Podnistrovie in this period constituted the northern part of the area reaching as far as the Danube and the Black Sea. It was then, the area was named Ponizhe (Pol. *Poniże*, Ruth. *Ponizie*) a term regarded as the origin of the later name Podolia.\(^{16}\) In the mid-12\(^{th}\) century, the

---

13 ZDz. 1894: 20 (IX) 86-87. In the same year in the Kyiv Voivodeship there were 1115 villages, 206 towns (together 1321 settlements), with a population of 115,320 peasants and 118,720 townspeople, in total of 234,040 for 2,815 km2.
14 See note 1, p. 58 and below in the text.
16 The term Ponizo is mentioned in chronicles as early as 1226. It was the name of the territory which was kept by Duke Mstislav Udaly [the Daring] (Pol. *Mściśław Udaja*) (1219, 1221?-27) after he relinquished Halych to the Hungarian Prince Andrew. In 1229, Sudyslav, the boyar of the Halych Principality seized it temporarily. See *Powieść minionych lat (Povest' vremenných let)*, Sicielki, Franciszek, transl. and ed. 1968. Wrocław: Ossolineum 394-403; *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisей* <PSRL>, 1843-1980 (35 vols.). St. Petersburg: n.p., here 1843 Vol. II (*Ipat'evskaia letopis*): 25, 166-67, 169, 174, 178-80, 191-92, 228-35, 298, 339; Priselkov,
eastern part (Pobozhe) was subordinated to the Kyivan principality. Later the whole of future Podolia came within the orbit of the Halych-Volodymyr principality, united in 1199 by Prince Roman Mstyslavych (1188-89, 1199?-1205). During the constant internal struggle in the 12-13\textsuperscript{th} century the fate of the eastern part of the area (Pobozhe) was tied up to Volhynia with its capital castle in Volodymyr of Volhynia (Pol. \textit{Włodzimierz Wołynski}), whereas the western part (Ponizhe) was bound up to Halych (Pol. \textit{Halicz}).\(^{17}\)

In 1240-41 the Mongols crossed over Podolia causing havoc in the provinces of Halych and Volhynia. Prince Daniel of Halych (1238-64), and his son Lev (1264-1300?) lost the whole of Pobozhe to the Mongols soon after 1257, and ultimately ca. 1260.\(^{18}\) In time, the Mongols divided the areas directly subordinated to them into separate districts (\textit{t’mas}, \textit{tumans}).\(^{19}\) It is assumed on the basis of the analysis of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century records that they included the following districts: Podolia (the north-western part of the future Podolia), Kamenets’, Bratslav, Sokolets (Pol. \textit{Sokolec}), Zvynogrod (Pol. \textit{Zwinogród}), Cherkasy (Pol. \textit{Czerkasy}), reaching as far as the Black Sea coast.\(^{20}\) The end of the 13\textsuperscript{th} century witnessed the reappearance of Ruthenian settlements, contributing to the emergence of such centres as Kamenets’ (most probably repopulated), Bratslav, Sokolets and Vinnytsia (Pol. \textit{Winnica}).\(^{21}\)

\(^{17}\) For the literature outlining the history of Podolia see in the Introduction, Part 1 note 9, pp. 24-25.
\(^{18}\) See note 15, p. 62.
\(^{19}\) A \textit{T’ma}, the division created for taxation purposes originated from \textit{tume or tumen} what meant 10,000 (SlownGeogr. 1887 8: 456 [Podole]).
\(^{20}\) Under the Mongols the provinces, that later constituted Podolia did not form a separate unit. Following the Mongol conquest, castles in the area (probably already in existence in 12\textsuperscript{th} century) like Bakota, Międzybóź, Ushytsa, Mykulyn, Bozsk and others (undoubtedly including Kamenets’), fell into ruin, being destroyed by order of the new lords. Only small settlement network survived. Its larger unfortified centres were most probably the seats of \textit{atamans}, which represented the local elders responsible in respective district (\textit{t’ma}) for passing the collected tribute to the khan’s tax collectors (\textit{baskaks}).
\(^{21}\) See the previous notes (15, p. 62 and 16, pp. 62-63) and the following publications: Kuczynski, Stefan M. 1965. "Sine Wody (Rzecz o wyprawie Olgierdowej 1362 r.) <KuczynskiSineWody>." In idem, \textit{Studia z dziejów Europy Wschodniej X–XVII w.} Warsaw: n.p. 152-53 (here the division into \textit{t’mas} based on retrogressive analysis of khans’ yarlyks);
Geographically, the terms Ponizhe in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century and Podolia in the 14\textsuperscript{th}-16\textsuperscript{th} century are ambiguous. In its narrow sense (i.e. with the castle of Bakota) Ponizhe was an important borderland area of Halych Rus' (Halychyna) on the Dnister. In the broader sense, Ponizhe included the forest-steppe region between the Dnister and the Danube as far as the Black Sea. This area was sparsely populated and loosely or symbolically tied to Rus'. Pobozhe in turn, was in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century an area stretching eastwards from Ponizhe. It included the same forest-steppe region between the Dnister and the Boh, however not reaching the Dnipro and Black Sea. Similarly, in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century the term Podolia, depending on the context in recorded sources, could refer to the north-western region (the Mongol Podolian t'ma excluding Kamenets' and Bratslav), the historical Podolia (including Kamenets' and Bratslav), the royal (Crown) Podolia (with Kamenets') at a later stage, and, finally, the territory reaching as far as the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{22}

The territory of historical Podolia (in the area of Podnistrovie and Pobozhe) got its final shape approximately in the second third of the 14\textsuperscript{th} century. This process was associated with the conquest of this land by the Lithuanian princes, the Koriatovychs (before 1351, rather than in 1362 or 1363).\textsuperscript{23} In 1377 the Podolian duchy of the Koriatovychs comprised of 11


castles and their districts, and they paid tribute to Louis of Anjou (1370-76), as the King of Hungary, not Poland.\(^{24}\) The Russian late 14\(^{th}\) century compilation written down in the chancery of Cyprian, Metropolitan of Kyiv and Great Rus', as *Spisok grodov russikh dal'nikh i blizhnikh* (*A Register of Ruthenian Castles*) enumerates the following „Polish castles” in Podolia: Kamenets’, Bratslav, Sokolets, Skala, Bakota, Vinnytsia, as well as Zvinogrod and Cherkasy.\(^{25}\) In conclusion, the list of Podolian castles closes with ten of them: Kamanets’, Smotrych, Bakota, Skala, Czerwonogród (in western Podolia, Podnistrovie), and Bratslav, Miedzybôz, Bozsk, Vinnytsia, Sokolets (in eastern Podolia, Pobozhe).\(^{26}\)

The administrative subordination of Eastern Podolia (with Bratslav) after 1395 has not been sufficiently researched in the secondary literature. One may assume, that it did not form one administrative entity. It seems most probable, that in 1411 Vitold got Podolia with Kamenets’ and two starosties – that of Bratslav, and of Zvinogrod - Cherkasy.\(^{27}\) After 1411 his aim was a permanent unification of both parts of Podolia, which in effect meant the incorporation of western Podolia into Lithuania. Evidence of such efforts can be traced in his endowments from 1411 to 1430 made in both western and

---


\(^{26}\) However, the list should be complemented with Khotin and Cherkôn on the Podolian-Moldavian border, and Zvinogrod and Cherkasy being the far eastern steppe outposts of Podolia.

\(^{27}\) While confronting the *Chronicle of the Grand Dukes* and *Spisok grodov russikh dal’nikh i blizhnikh* it may be assumed hypothetically, that prior to 1411 Vitold got from Jagiello under his administration the castles of Bratslav (ca. 1394/95?), and Vinnytsia with Sokolets (after 1402, or ca. 1409), however these castles used to be regarded as belonging to the Kingdom of Poland, not Lithuania.
eastern Podolia. In 1430-37 the object of Polish-Lithuanian conflict was the whole of Podolia, thus, its western and eastern part, too. After the defeat of Svidrygiello (1437) the eastern Podolia with Bratslav and Vinnytsia was part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, while the remaining territories of Podolia, reorganised in 1433/34, became part of the Kingdom of Poland. The last attempt to change the territorial affiliation of Podolia was made in the first period of the rule of King Casimir Jagiellonian (1440-92). However, the Polish-Lithuanian political dispute, which arose in 1447-53, did not lead to any changes in the Podolian borders.

The local political, administrative, and economic centres of Eastern Podolia were, from the early 16th century, Bratslav and Vinnytsia, as the Tartars had completely destroyed the Zvinogrod Castle. The eastern end of

---

29 On Svidrygiello’s domain see Chapter 2/A/2: 80-81, 85-86, 87, notes 43, p. 81, 63, p. 85. The Podolian voivodeship, created in 1433/1434, covered the whole royal Podolia. During the second half of the 15th century the administrative structures, which had existed in Podolia since the 14th century and were based on castle districts (Ruth. volost’, Pol. wolość/powiat, Lat. districtus) underwent the process of evolution. For this see also Introduction Part 2 p. 35, 38 and notes 30, p. 36, 36, p. 38. The furthest extent of Podolia to the south in the 1440’s was the castle of Karaul (Karawul) on the Dniester, along with the castles of Czarnogór and in the Dniester estuary and Chadzybejów (the future Odessa) on the Black Sea coast (ZDM, VIII: no. 2429; Kuczyński/Sine Wody, 1965: 177).
30 On this dispute, see Lewicki, Anatol. 1887. „Ze studiów archiwalnych. I. Wstąpienie na tron Kazimierza Jagiellończyka,” Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny 20: here 24-36, Stadnicki/Koryat i Koryjatowicz, 1877: 105-22; Długosz/Historia, V: 47-49, 95-97, 135-37, 293-95, 628-29 (e.g. criticism of the king’s relinquishment of the Province of Bratslav in favor of the Grand Duchy). The main western Podolian centres of the mid-15th century were enumerated in a compilation of Podolian towns (Civitates et oppida), both royal and private, included in the Royal Register of 1453 (AGAD: MK, sig. 11, p. 20). The towns constituting the royal demesne were: Kamenets’, Smitnych, Skaja, Czerwonogór, Bakota (this castle did not develop into a town), Latychow, Khmielnik, Olczadyjow, Rów, and Jáltuszków. For the latter period see Hrushevskyi, Mikhailo. 1895. „Opis’ podil’s’kich zamkiv 1494 r.” (The Description of Podolian Castles of 1494), Zapysky Naukovooho Tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka 7 (3): 1-18. In 1537-38, the Starosty of Bar emerged from the property around Jáltuszkow and Rów; founded as the town of Bar in 1540, which together with earlier founded Zinków (the mid-15th century) replaced in a way the devastated area of the Bakota (annihilated) and Latychow. For the Starosty of Bar see Hrushevskyi, Mykhailo (introduction by). 1893. Akty Bars’kago starostva XV-XVI v. AYZR, Vol.VIII/I. Kyiv: n.p. 1-126; idem. 1894. Bars’ke starostvo. Istoriicheskie ocherki (XV-XVIII v.). Kyiv: n.p. (in Russian). (Reprint). 1996. L’viv: n.p. (in Russian and Ukrainian). The inspection surveys of 1564-65, 1615-16 and 1629 describe three starosties of western Podolia: Kamenets’ (also including Latyczow and Smotnych), Bar and Khmielnik, and in 1615-16 and 1629 additionally the Starosties of Czerwonogór and Skaja (dating back to the 15th century).
31 Zvinogrod could not develop because of the constant Tartar threat, and was often referred to as a wilderness in the period from 1520 up to the 1604 survey. See Shypovich/Ogranitsakh, 1914: 9 (1520); ZDz., 1897 22: 90 (1604). The 16th century sources mention as well the Tartar Zvinogrod Trial, which was a branch of their major passage, the “Black” Trail. For the Tartar
the Bratslav territory comprised at the beginning of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century the former \textit{volost}' of Cherkasy, with Cherkasy and Zvinogrod as its centres of government. In the period under the Crown administration, Cherkasy was the headquarters of the starosty, while after Podolia had passed to Vitold, Zvinogrod was the starost’s residence.\textsuperscript{32} In the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century the former castle \textit{volost}'s of Bratslav and Vinnytsia were to be already referred to as \textit{powiat}s. However, in 1566, when the Bratslav Voivodeship was founded it comprised originally only one \textit{Powiat} of Bratslav.\textsuperscript{33} In 1598, due to the constant danger of Tartar raids and Cossack activities the administrative and judicial centre of the Voivodeship was transferred to Vinnytsia. From this moment onwards one can refer to three \textit{powiats} in Bratslavshchyna, that of Bratslav, Vinnytsia and Zvinogrod.

\textsuperscript{32} For Cherkasy we have the record of Rafal of Słupów as starost in 1409. In Zvinogrod, ca. 1411/1423, a certain Abraham held the office of starost. Most probably around the mid-15th century (after 1437?) Cherkasy became part of Kievan territory, while Zvinogrod and its environs remained in the Bratslav territory and by the late 15th century it was again the center of a crown estate. The starosty of Zvinogrod appears to have been founded at the close of the 15th century.

\textsuperscript{33} On the understanding of the terms \textit{volost}' and \textit{powiat} before the introduction of the 1564 reform see Introduction Part 2 p. 35, 38 and notes 30, p. 36, 36, p. 38, Chapter 2/A/2, note 64 p. 85. On the reform itself see Introduction Part 2 p. 42 and note 47, p. 42.
CHAPTER 2


A. From the Koriatovych to Vitold (Late 14th- Mid-15th Century):


Jabłonowski, who used a large collection of source material as a basis for his writings, had good reason to include the Slupica family among the “nested” or most ancient gentry of the Bratslav territories, settled in the region for the longest period and being affluent as lords (Pol. panowie) only next to the princely (Pol. kniaż, Rus. knez’) families. The family’s earliest known representative, confirmed by sources was Paweł Slupicz alias Slupica [1/1]. He was to be regarded as the founding ancestor, and also the force behind of the family’s economic and social position in 15th- and 16th-century Eastern Podolia. However, nothing is known about the property he held, while the later record of Vitold’s endowment (or endowments?, most probably confirming earlier donation, perhaps of Svidrygiello [Pol. Świdyrgielło] or even of the Koriatovychs – Fyodor?) with the Kuna and Nosowce estate ca. 1411/1430 may only hypothetically be associated with Paweł – on a not very strong hypothesis. More definite information relates to the aforementioned Vitold’s

1 ZDz., 1897 22: 604-05.
2 See note below 3, p. 63. For example KurtykaPodole, 2000: 25 and note 42, and TegowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997: 170-71, Appendix 1 and note 127. Basing on the below mentioned digests (see note 3) both scholars hypothetically related Vitold’s endowment from ca. 1411/30 with Paweł. However, from the other document it is well known, that the endowment on Nosowce was associated with Ivan (RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 195, part 5, f. 339v-340: a document dated on 3 February 1581, and issued in Warsaw to Hrehory [Bohuszewicz] Zdan Slupica [IV/3] to confirm the loss in a fire in Vinnytsia on 8 October 1580, of his deeds of privilege, including Vitold’s endowment of Ivan with Nosowce with
endowment of property on Ivan [II/1] (Nosowce) and Tychon [II/2] (Kuna?) Słupica, Paweł’s relatives (brothers or most probably sons), beneficiaries of the status Paweł had already built up for the family.³

Paweł is known from just a handful of mentions in the sources, for 1388-94. But they are enough to locate him within the transformations occurring in Podolia in the second half of the 14th century. The information we have is that Paweł belonged to the immediate environment of the Princes Koriatovychs, Constantine (ca. 1380–91/92) and Fyodor (ca. 1386–94), who ruled Podolia in accordance with the diarchic model.⁴ Later on Paweł rendered

³ On 15 April 1566 King Sigismund August (1548-72) endowed Semen Bohdanowicz Słupica [V/1] with the Kuna and Nosowce with adjacencies in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, issuing the privilege that was a confirmation of the former Vitold’s hereditary endowment (ca. 1411/30) to the unmentioned in this charter by name Słupica. The act of 1566 and the above-mentioned Vitold’s privilege are to be known in the hitherto historical literature only from the digest in a summary of the Słupicas’ documents from 1566 to 1633 (Summariusz zebranych transakcji Słupiczanskich, dated 1757), in 19th century collection of Edward Rulikowski (printed by Jabłonowski, in: ZDz., 1894 20: 106). The same digest was used by Ochmański (Ochmański, Jerzy (ed.). 1986. Vitoldiana. Codex privilegiorum Vitoldi magni ducis Lithuaniae 1386-1430 <Vitoldiana>. Warsaw-Poznań: n.p., here 134). See also Chapter 5/A: 230-43.

his services to Constantine’s sons, Fyodor and Vasil Konstantynowicz (Constantinovych), whose spell of power came to an end in 1394, by the intervention of Vitold, Grand Duke of Lithuania, acting on behalf of Vladislaus Jagiełło, King of Poland. Very likely Paweł had become a servant of the Koriatovychs, thanks to the mediation of the ancestors of the princely family of Lubartowicz Sanguszko of Volhynia, with whom the Slupica family had been firmly associated sometime before the 15th-16th centuries. Only the final stage in Paweł’s career, is more detailed in the sources, when he was a member of the Prince’s council (1388-92), and subsequently held the office of castle voivode at Kamenets’ Castle (ca. 1393-94). In earlier documents (1392), in which he appeared as a witness, he had availed himself of no title at all. His only known predecessor in the office of castle voivode, is Ostafij Matwiej Malentowicz (Malenkowicz?), noted down in 1374. The last record of Paweł is a mention of him as castle voivode of Kamenets’ at the turn of 1393 to 1394, and concerns his services to the Koriatovychs, who were removed from Podolia.
Scholarly literature provides contradictory views on whether and when the Koriatovychs paid feudal homage with Podolia to Casimir III the Great (1333-70). Due to the diarchical model of their power in Podolia, one may doubt the then superior authority of Poland over the lords of Podolia.

In more recent studies it is assumed that consolidation of the Koriatovychs power in Podolia took place simultaneously with the successive stages of incorporation of the Red Rus' into the Kingdom of Poland (in 1340, 1349, 1352 and 1366) by Casimir III the Great and of the struggle for Volhynia with the Lithuanian Duke Lubart, especially with the events in Lithuania being regarded as conductive to bring them closer to Poland, since after the death of Koriat (between 1358 and 1363) they were deprived of the Province of Novogrod (Pol. Nowogród). The campaign of 1349 might have led to subduing them in Podolia since it is known, that even Lubart, who maintained his influence only in the Province of Lutsk in Volhynia, temporarily acknowledged the superior authority of Casimir III the Great (see Trajdos, TrajdosKosciól 1, 1983: 118-21; PaszkiewiczOgenezie, 1938: 287; Kronika Jana z Czarnecka. Monumenta Poloniae Historica <MPH> 2: 629; Halecki, Oskar. 1919. Dzieje Unii Jagiellońskiej <HaleckiDzieje unii>. (2 vols.) Cracow: n.p, here 1: 64; Paszkiewicz, Henryk. 1925. Polityka ruska Kazimierza Wielkiego <PaszkiewiczPolityka>. Warsaw: n.p. 117-20, 125; see also KuczynskiSineWody, 1965: 153-54, 156; KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 133). However ca. 1352, with the support of the Lithuanian Grand Duke Olgerd and the Mongols they managed to free themselves from king’s authority. For the second time, and this time for good they paid homage to Casimir ca. 1356, for sure before 1366. Any conclusions must be based on indirect premises, since source information (excluding accounts in the Chronicle of Lithuanian duke) on their rule in Podolia and ties with Catholicism dates back as late as 1370’s Great are a decade older. For the dispute on these hypothetical homages ca. 1349/1350 and ca. 1356, together with the scholarly argumentation see: KurtykaPodole, 2000: 17-19; idem. KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 133. In the course of the battles of 1350-52 the Lithuanians recaptured Volhynia. Perhaps Olgerd subjegated also the Podolian fief. This is true, if one is to acknowledge the information from Długosz on bringing in 1352 the Mongol invasion to Podolia, which was then subordinated to Poland (Kronika katedry krakowskiej. MPH, 2: 630, 885; here Podolia as terra Podolye Regno Polonie subjecta; see also Długosz, Jan. 1964-85. Joannis Długosii Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae <DługoszAnnales>. (10 vols.) Warsaw: n.p. 9: 266-67; PaszkiewiczPolityka, 1925: 120-35; PaszkiewiczO genezie, 1938: 271-73; KuczynskiSineWody, 1965: 177). It was not included in the peace treaty of 1352 between Casimir III the Great along with his Mazovian allies and Dukes Javnuta, Keistut, Lubart, Juryi (Pol. Jerzy) Narymuntovych, and Juryi Koriatovich, who also represented Olgerd, Koryat and Patryk Narymuntovych.

However, the Koriatovychs participated in the victorious campaign of Casimir III to Volhynia in 1366, and in 1366-70 they are attested as having close ties with the King.\(^9\) After 1370, during the period of Louis of Anjou (the King of Hungary and Poland), the formal feudal subordination of Podolia to the Kingdom of Poland might have been in importance, but in 1377 it certainly ceased to exist.\(^10\) The feudal dependency of the Koriatovychs from Hungarian rulers in the period 1377-94 is being confirmed by four specimens of coin, which has been minted by Duke Constantine Koriatovych, the co-ruler of Podolia in ca. 1380-88/91.\(^11\) After 1382, Borys and Constantine the

---

\(^6\) In 1377, Alexander and Borys the Koriatovychs, who then ruled in Podolia, were among the Lithuanian dukes paying feudal homage to Louis of Anjou and recognizing themselves as vassals of Hungary, not Poland, from eleven of Podolian castles. See Halecki, Oskar. 1935. „Przyczynki genealogiczne do dziejów układu krewskiego <HaleckiPrzyczynki>,” _Miesięcznik Heraldyczny_ 14 (7/8): 102–106 (here the letter from King Louis to Franciscus Carrara, 29 September 1377); PaszkiewiczO genezie, 1938: 61-62, 139, 235; KuczyńskiSineWody, 1965: 146.

\(^10\) On the obverse of this coin an effigy of St. George (the Koriatovychs' sign) was placed, while on its reverse the Angevin dynasty arms. On both sides of the coin specimens one could
Koriatovychs formed close ties with Grand Duke of Lithuania Vladislas Jagiello and were his closest collaborators in constructing the union with Poland in 1385 and 1386. Soon after 1386, Borys was replaced by another brother, Fyodor (Ruth. Fedor, Pol. Teodor; the co-ruler of Podolia ca. 1386-94). In 1388 Constantine and Fyodor as lords of Podolia endowed Niemira with the castle of Bakota, and Hrynko with the castle of Sokolets. Later Fyodor independently confirmed the endowment of Sokolets (1391) and endowed Bedryshko (Pol. Bedrysza, Biedrysz) with villages in Podolia (1392); on all these documents appears Pawel Shipica (see below). Probably by then Constantine was no longer alive, and before 1394 another brother, Vasil Koriatovych, appeared at Fyodor's side as co-ruler. It is assumed that in 1392 or 1393 Fyodor banished his nephew Vasil Konstantynovych from Podolia, which was a pretext for the intervention of Vladislas Jagiello King of Poland and led to the cessation of the Koriatovychs rule in Podolia.

The first record of Pawel as a witness is to a charter issued at Kamenets' on 19 September 1388 by Constantine and Fyodor the Koriatovychs to their servant Niemira. By this deed Niemira received an endowment for the hereditary tenure of Dakota Castle with the villages comprising the estate, and the right to found new settlements in the midst of the already existing ones. Niemira was also granted juridictive immunity, exempting his subjects and vassals from the obligation to appear before the Prince's courts (justice officials). However, he and his men were liable to pay a contribution to the


Tartar tax (tatarszczyzna, Pol. tatarszchina), which was collected in Podolia.\textsuperscript{15} This is a relevant point for the early history of the Słupica family, too, since presumably their first endowments were pretty much like this one for Niemira. The long list of witnesses to this deed attests Paweł as undoubtedly belonging to the closest collaborators to the Koriatovychs.\textsuperscript{16} The names of some of them reappear also on other documents issued by these princes.\textsuperscript{17}

This company, in which Paweł held a prominent position, made up a substantial part of the Privy Council to the Koriatovychs. It consisted chiefly of local Ruthenians, Poles from the Kingdom of Poland (perhaps including Bernart Meszkowskij?), and migrants from Silesia (Bedryszko/Biedrzych, Hotart/Gotard Pecz), as a counter-balance to Lithuanian influence. One of the most interesting figures in the list was 

\textit{Kniaż} Vasil Winnicki (Vinnytskyi), who, according to Tęgowski, was probably a relative of the Princes Nieświckis, an ancestor of Fyodor Nieświcki and founder of the princely lines of the Zbaraski, Wiśniowiecki, Porycki, and Woroniecki families, though in the opinion of Kurtyka, he may have been the same individual as Vasil Koriatovych, installed in Vinnytsia by his elder brothers.\textsuperscript{18} Another noteworthy character is “Lord (\textit{pan}) Hrynko Sokolecki,” who was mentioned just before Paweł, and in all

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] The list of witnesses on this deed is as follows: Prince (Pol. \textit{kniaž}, Ruth. \textit{knez}) Semen (Siemion) Juriewicz (luryevych), Prince Vasil Winnicki (Vinnytskyi, of Vinnytsia), whose relative was the Princess Andrjejewna (Andrew’s of Vinnytsia wife) Winnicka (see below), Lord (Pol. \textit{pan}) Hrynko Sokoleccki, Paweł Słupica, Wyszko/Wyszek (Vysoko) Tołstyj/Tłusty, Chodko Czemerowicz (of Czemerowce), Wyszko/Wyszek Chudyj/Chudy, Paszko (Pashko) Wasnowicz, Adamko Sverszkowskij ([Svershchkovskyi] of Świrczkowce), Bedryszko/Biedrzych, Gotard Pecz (Pech), Franczko the Prince’s deputy cup-bearer (Pol. \textit{podczasy, Lat. pocillator}), Bernart Meszkowskij (Meschkovskyi), Michajło (Mikhailo) Proczewicz/Proczew (Proczyw), Jakusz Cietko, Michał Popowicz (Popowycz), Ludko Hniewomir, Chodor Verozub, Plomen Skerdo, Paszko/Paszek Busłowicz/Busłowicz and Jacko.
\item[17] An attempt to identify some of these individuals has been made by Tęgowski (TęgowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997 notes 124-130, especially note 127: Paweł Stupicz [sic] alias Słupicz). The complete specification of the persons appearing as witnesses in the documents of the Koriatovychs from 1374, 1375, 1388, and 1392 have been identified by Kurtyka (KurtykaPodole, 2000: 25-26), see also KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 157-58, nos. 24, 25.
\item[18] KurtykaPodole, 2000: 26 and note 47.
\end{footnotes}
likelihood is identical with the holder of the Sokolets endowment described below.  

Pawel Shipica's name occurs again in the list of witnesses to an extant original gramota (Ruth. hramota) document issued to Hrynko at Smotrych on 20 June 1391 by Prince Fyodor Koriakovych. By this deed Fyodor confirmed his endowment made out to Hrynko earlier (ca. 1388) and issued by himself in his capacity as joint lord of Podolia with his elder brother Constantine. The endowment was for Sokolets Castle (Pol. gród) within strictly defined boundaries, along with its volost'. This was accompanied by an additional hereditary endowment by the Lady (Pol. pani) Andrejowna Winnicka [Vinnytska] (with the consent of Fyodor and his council) of Mikulince [Mikulińce], Letyn [Litynia, Lityń], Wonjaczin [Woniaczyn], Deszkowce, Streżewka [Strzyżawka], villages from her own estate lying between Sokolets and Vinnytsia. Here the list of witnesses comprised 12 individuals from the Prince's retinue. 

———

19 On 1 November 1374 Hrynko Sokolecki (of Sokolets) witnessed the Koriakovychs document for Kamenets' bearing the title of the Voivode of Czerwonogród. See KurtykaPodole, 2000: 25 and note 44. See KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 158, no. 25 (ca. 1388), 158-59, no. 26 (20 June 1391); TęgowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997 Appendix 1, note 126; MolchanovskiiOcherk, 1885: 209. In 1375 Hrynko was already the Starost of Podolia on behalf of Alexander Koriakovych (U III/3: 114-15, no. 525). He was also witness in the privileges of Prince Svidrigiello issued by the latter as the Duke of Podolia in 1400 and 1401 to the Kamenets' based convents of Franciscan and Dominican Orders (Kurtyka, Janusz. 2001. ,JStajstarsze dokumenty dla fianciszkandw kamienieckich z lat 1400 i 1402 <KurtykaNajstarsze dokumenty>,” Roczniki Historyczne 67: 149-168, here Annex 1: 163-65 and note 4 [Franciscans, 1400]; ChmielZbiór, 1890: 10-12. See also KurtykaPodole, 2000: 26 and note 48. 20 Natsyianalnyi histarychnyi arkhiv Belarusi, Mensk Natsyianalnyi <NHAB>: F. 147 op. 2 [Radziwiłłowie], spr. 178, k. 581 (original of parchment diploma). The diploma published by Hrusha (Hrusha, Aleksandr (ed.) 2001 [2002]. “Neviadomaia gramata Fedara Kariatavicha za 1391 g. <HrushaGramataFedara>,” Belaruskii Historichechny Agyldy. Belarusian Historical Review 8: (1-2) [14-15]: 123-135, especially 133, 134 = KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 58-59, no. 26). The borders of this endowment went as far as to the area of Zvinogrod. Hrynko together with his men was obliged to help the prince when necessary, and his subjects were to pay the Tartar tax (see above note 8, p. 71). The judicial authority protected these estates against the claims of princely voivodes, and Hrynko himself was in power to alienate or forfeit the villages listed in the privilege.

21 They were: Niemira Bakocki (holder of Bakota from 1388), Januszko Skepeckij, Michajlo Prociewicz, Pawel Słupicz, Piecz Szmokij, Lord Rohożka, Lord Berdyszko, Chodko Werozub, Lord Wyszko Tolstij, Chodko Czemerewicz, Lord Prokop, and Paszko Wasnowicz. Of them, as witnessing in the aforementioned deed of 1388 were listed: Niemira, Michailo (Mikhailo) Prociewicz (= Prociewcz), Hodko Werozub (= Chodor Verozub), Wyszko Tolstij, and Chodko Czemerewicz. The first two witnessed afterwards together with Pawel in the document of 1392. See below p. 76 and note 22, p. 76. Pan [Lord] Rohożka is to be identified as Rahozka of Jazłowiec, in 1375 titled the castle voivode of the Smotrych Castle (KurtykaPodole, 2000: 25 and note 43).
The third document in which Paweł appeared again is a charter issued on 1 July 1392 by Fyodor Koriatovych to Bedryszko alias Biedryszko, who came from Silesia and was also mentioned among the witnesses to the documents of 1388 and 1391. Bedryszko received a perpetual endowment with the right of alienation and liability for service, judicial authority over his subjects and the duty to pay the Tartar tax on the villages of Sutermince, Olchowce, Kliminice, and Suprunkowce. Again Paweł Słupica testified for the Prince, along with Niemira Bakocki (of Bakota) and Michajło Procewicz.

Much evidence corroborates the claim that in 1382-94 Podolia was formally still the Hungarian fief. Polish and Hungarian interests became divergent after Sigismund of Luxemburg consolidated his power in Buda. Despite securing Hungarian reinforcements, Fyodor and Vasil the Koriatovychs were removed from Podolia in 1394 by the detachments commanded by Duke Vitold, who acted on behalf and by order of King Vladislas Jagiello, and those activities were co-ordinated with subordination of Kyiv by Jagiello’s closest collaborator, Skirgiello (Pol. Skirgiello). The seizure of Podolia was of all probability in close relation with the expulsion from Kyiv of the Kyivan Grand Duke Volodymyr Olgerdovych (who ruled in Kyiv in 1384-94). The latter, either was regarded by the Koriatovychs as senior, or in the period of the collapse of their power laid his claims on Podolia. The banished Koriatovychs

---

22 ZDz., 1877 5: 20-22 = PrzedzdieckPodole, 1840 1: 119, 140-43 = KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 159, no. 27. See also MolchanovskiiOcherk, 1885: 225-26, 314. As a newcomer from Silesia Berdyszko is identified by Kurtyka (KurtykaPodole, 2000: 22 and note 34). The author collects as well, the data on other endowments made by Fyodor Koriatovychs.


found shelter in Hungary. Sigismund of Luxemburg endowed Fyodor with the
castle of Munkács (Pol. Munkacz) and the district (Lat. comitatus) of Beregh.
In the following years, the issue of Podolia was a permanent matter during the
Polish-Hungarian negotiations (1397, 1412, 1440), without, however, leading
to any changes of its status.27

The final document we know as being associated with Paweł Ślipica
was an undated letter expedited by Fyodor Koriatovych to Prince Skirgiello.28
The only record of this message we have (as the original was lost) is the rejest
(digest) in the inventory of documents collected in the Archives for the
Kingdom of Poland for 1567-69. In his letter Fiodor informed the Lithuanian
prince that he was dispatching Paweł Ślipica, his appointed voivode for
Kamenets’ Castle, for negotiations with him (Skirgiello). It is believed the
letter was written around 1393/94.29 Paweł may have been sent out to
Skirgiello, who was the King Vladislas Jagiełło’s chief adviser and
collaborator, on a delicate diplomatic mission, most probably aimed against
Vitold, who was then preparing to take over Podolia on orders from Jagiełło,
while Skirgiello was conducting military action, in co-ordination with Vitold’s
Podolian campaign, to bring the Kyivan territories under the King’s power.30
Perhaps the antagonism between Skirgiello and Vitold offered a chance of

---

27 See Wyrozumski, Jerzy. 1997. „Sprawa Rusi halicko-włodzimierskiej i Podola w stosunkach
polsko-węgierskich wczesnej epoki jagiellońskiej.” In Węgry - Polska w Europie Środkowej.
[955] = KutrykaRepertorium, 2004: 159, no. 28. See also U III/3: 10; KutrykaPodole, 2000: 25
and note 42; lakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 215, note - here in 1392 as a member of Fyodor
Koriatovych’s council, and later on as Voivode of Kamenets’.
29 HaleckiZamoyskiInwentarz, 1919. Skrzypek (SkrzypekUsunięcie, 1934: 318) supports the
hypothesis of Halecki (HaleckiDzieje unii, 1919. 1: 144) in accordance to which this letter must
have been written prior to 1393.
30 Tegowski offered recently the date 1394 as the date of the conquest of Podolia by Vitold
(TegowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997: 163-67). In the previous literature this event used to be
dated in 1393 after the latopys’ accounts. In the opinion of Skrzypek Vitold’s campaign lasted
from October to the end of 1393 (SkrzypekUsunięcie, 1934: 320). Full bibliography concerning
Skirgiello’s and Vitold’s activity in Podolia and in the Kyivan territories in 1393/94 is offered
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success for Paweł's mission.\textsuperscript{31} In 1394 Kamenets' Castle and its environs had not been captured yet, but Jagiełło in his royal powers as King of Poland had already entrusted it to Vitold as a fief.\textsuperscript{32} This endowment was amended once Vitold had taken the whole of Podolia, along with Bratslav and Kamenets', its chief castles in the Valleys of the Dnister (in the west) and Boh (in the east). There is a possibility, that as a result of this change Vitold might have got Bratslav as a fief.\textsuperscript{33} We do not known what happened to Paweł Słupica after 1394. He was either killed in ongoing battles in Podolia, failed to return from his mission to Skirliełło, changed sides and joined Jagiełło and Vitold or he had accompanied Fyodor Koriatovych into exile in Hungary.\textsuperscript{34}

2. Ivan and Tychon the Słupicas: Between Svidrygiello and Vitold (ca. 1400-30). Growth of a Neighbourhood Environment for the Słupica Family (the Mikulński Family).

There are no contemporary records for Bratslav for 1394-1411 (if we ignore the later \textit{Chronicle of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania}). On the strength of the document issued by King Vladislas Jagiello on 13 June 1395, and confirmed on 10 July 1395 by his spouse Queen Jadwiga (Hedwig), Voivode of Cracow Spytek of Melsztyn received as enfeoffed land the western part of Podolia with the castles of: Kamenets', Bakota, Skała, Smotrycz and Czerwonogród. His status of the Podolian vassal was to be identical with that of Lithuanian dukes, who since 1386 had been paying feudal tribute to Jagiełło as king and to the Kingdom of Poland. The Spytek's endowment did not include districts

\textsuperscript{31} Danilo\l{}owicz\, \textit{Latopisiec Litwy}, 1827: 51-52. The Lithuanian \textit{latopis} informed on the occasion of the conquest of Podolia by the Vitold's forces about the imprisonment of the voivode on behalf of Fyodor Koriatovych, certain Nestis in 1393 [sic]. He might have been related to Bratslav, thus be the Bratslav Castle voivode. See also U III/3: 11; KurtykaPodole, 2000: 25 and note 45; KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 134.

\textsuperscript{32} Tegowski\, \textit{Sprawa przyłączenia}, 1997 Appendix 2: 171-72. See also Danilo\l{}owicz\, \textit{Skarbiec}, 1860 1: no. 649 (digest); U III/3: 11.

\textsuperscript{33} Danilo\l{}owicz\, \textit{Latopisiec Litwy}, 1827: 51-52 = PSRL, Vol. XVII: 80; U III/3: 11. Ultimately Fyodor went to Hungary (see p. 77 and notes 27, p. 77, and 34, p. 78). The majority of Podolian castles in his hands were manned during his absence, with Moldavian garrisons. Vitold seized first Bratslav, and next Kamenets', Skała and Smotrych (SkrzypekUsunięcie, 1934: 318-20; KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 134).

\textsuperscript{34} Fyodor died in Hungary ca. 1416 (Wolff\, \textit{Kniaziowie}, 1895: 177-78). The ties with Hungary of the Słupica family were attested in the 16th century in the biography of Matiasz alias Mikołaj Semenowicz [VI/2]. See Chapter 2/C/2: 166-68.
belonging to the castles of Międzybóz, Bozsk and Vinnytsia, which Jagiełło left at his own disposal. In her document Queen Jadwiga corroborated these decisions, adding that the endowment does not comprise the castle of Zvinogrod on the Siniucha River, and of Cherkasy (Pol. Czerkasy) on Dnipro. In practice it led to Melsztyński receiving western Podolia as feudal property in 1395. This marked the beginning of permanent division of Podolia into the Polish and Lithuanian parts.

It is known (although from later chronicles) that in the second half of 1394 Vitold’s activity in Podolia was accompanied by actions taken by Duke Skirgiello in Kyiv region during which he captured Kyiv, removed from it Volodymyr Olgierdovych, and also took Zvinogrod and Cherkasy. The death of Skirgiello (at the end of 1394) probably led to unknown temporary solutions, thanks to which Vitold assumed administrative control of the areas reaching as far as the Dnipro, thus extending the territory of Podolia. Its conquest enabled him to lead anti-Mongol campaigns to the east of the Dnipro, which ended in his defeat on the Worskla in 1399. The whole of Podolia Vitold subjugated on

35 Western Podolian districts around Trembovlia and Scianka, which had already been incorporated in the Province of L’viv at the time of Casimir the Great. See above note 8 p. 71.
37 See above note 36, p. 79. Zvinogrod and Cherkasy lay in the northern part of the area of Sine Wody and Beloberezje, remembered for Olgierd’s campaign of ca. 1362/63 (KuczyńskiSineWody, 1965: 179).
behalf of the Polish king. However, his position in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania rapidly gaining in importance could be a factor contributing to the permanent division of the land. King Jagiello agreed to his keeping its eastern part — probably formally as feudal property.40

Perhaps after the death of Spytek of Melsztyn in 1399 (in the Worksła Battle), Podolia was temporarily administered on behalf of the king by an unknown starost. It is certain that before 17 August 1400 Vladislas Jagiello endowed Podolia as a fief to his brother Svidrygiello (Pol. Świdrygiello).41 His entourage consisted of Ruthenians and Poles, recorded as witnesses in his documents from 1400 and 1401.42 Attestations of Vasil of Bozsk and Hrynek of Sokolets could suggest that Svidrygiello’s fief included at least part of the Podolia property, which in 1395 was excluded from the endowment to Spytek of Melsztyn. In reaction to Vitold’s strengthened position after the Unions of Vilnius and of Radomsk (1401), at the turn of 1401/02, Svidrygiello initiated a rebellion, garrisoned the Podolian castles with faithful followers, and on 2 March 1402 in Malbork, he concluded an alliance with the Teutonic Order, which became the reason for depriving him of the fief.43 Hryčko Kierdejowicz

40 According to documents issued to Spytek of Melsztyn, the castles of Vinnytsia, Międzybóź, Bozsk as well as Zvinogrod and Cherkasy were left at the royal couple’s disposal. See above p. 79 and note 36, p. 79.
41 In turn, Svidrygiello immediately appointed Hryčko Kierdeyovych as Starost of Podolia. At that time, in a separate document the prince committed himself to not yielding administration of the castles to the schismatics and to restoring the fief to the king, if Spytek of Melsztyn returned from Mongol captivity. See U III/3: nos. 526, 527. The endowment act with Svidrygiello’s obligation is mentioned in Zamoyski’s inventory of the Crown Archive, however without offering its date (AGAD: Archiwum Zamoyskich, sig. 32, p. 930 and 952). For the 1400 dating, see HaleckiZamoyskiInwentarz, 1919: XII/1, 160-61, and KurtykaPodole, 2000: 31-32, note 65.
42 Among witnesses were: Duke Vasil (Wasiło) Bożski [of Bozsk] (1401), Hrycko Kyrdeyovy[ch] [Hryčko Kierdejowicz], Starost of Kamenets’ (1400), Hrynko of Sokolets (1400-1401), former Voivode of Czerwonogród and Starost of Podolia at the time of the Koryatovych’s rule, Michał Walach [Walach] (1400), Imam of Czulice (1400), undoubtedly from Lesser Poland, Damian Werosub (1401), Wojciech Rowski (holder of the Rów property, 1401) and Waśko, Court Marshal (1401). In the recent literature see Przyboś, Kazimierz. 1994. Urzędnicy województwa podolskiego XV-XVIII wieku. Spisy. Cracow: n.p. 9-10. Here Hrynko of Sokolets is mistakenly identified with Hryčko Kierdejowicz (Kierdeyovych) (both are mentioned in Svidrygiello’s act of 17 August 1400). For proper identification see KurtykaNajstarsze dokumenty, 2001: 163-64. For an attempt to identify Duke Vasil Bożski see TegowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997: 168-69.
43 According to Wolff, Svidrygiello was in succession: Prince of Podolia 1400-02, of Chernihov (Pol. Czernihów) 1419-30, the Grand Duke of Lithuania 1430-32, and ruler of Volhynia 1437-52 (WolfKniaziowie, 1895: 339). There remain two extant documents from the period of Svidrygiello’s reign in Podolia, which were issued in Kamenets’ for the local Franciscan (17 August 1400) and the Dominican (30 May 1401) Orders. In these documents
(Kyerdeyovych), his Starost of Podolia already on 23 June 1402 took an oath of allegiance to the King of Poland and obliged himself to surrender Kamenets’ and other Podolian castles to Dzierslaw Konopka of Koźuchów, who was appointed by the king.\footnote{Codex epistolaris, 2: no. 26. See also ProchaskaPodole ljemnem, 1895: 269-70; HaleckiDzieje unii, 1919 1: 173-74; AGAD: Archiwum Zamoijskich, sig. 32, pp. 929, 951-952 = TegowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997: 160-69, 172-75 (Appendixes 3-5); registers in: DaniłowiczSkarbic, 1860 1: nos. 778, 779; WolfKniaziowic, 1895: 177-78).}

From 1402 to 1411 Western Podolia and some areas of Eastern Podolia (definitely Cherkasy and Zvinogrod, and probably Vinnytsia as well) were administered by Polish starosts, appointed by Vladislaus Jagiello King of Poland.\footnote{Codex epistolaris, 2: no. 26. See also ProchaskaPodole ljemnem, 1895: 269-70; HaleckiDzieje unii, 1919 1: 173-74; U III/3: 115-16. The new state of affairs was sealed while the Polish King stayed in Podolia in August. See KurtykaNajstarsze dokumenty, 2001: 165-67 [6 August 1402]; HrushevskyMateriały, 1905: no. 11 = ZDM, Vol. 6: no. 1651 [9 August 1402]. While returning from Podolia, on 15 September 1402 the King certified in Dobrostan the property of the Dominican Order in Kamenets’ (RadzimirskiArchSang., 1887 1: no. 23).} They undoubtedly reflect the increasing influx of the Polish element into those areas. A large endowment of 9 March 1404 of a number of villages in the Districts of Smotrych, Latychov (Pol. Latyczów) and Vinnytsia to the Lord High Steward of Cracow Piotr Szafraniec, probably in connection with his appointment as Starost of Podolia, deserves special attention.\footnote{See KurtykaPodole, 2000: 33-34, 37.} Most probably after banishing Svidrygiello, Vitold made an attempt to intercept western

Svidrygiello was referred to as dux Lithuanie, dominus et heres terre Podolie, and dux Podolie. See KurtykaNajstarsze dokumenty, 2001: 163-65 [17 August 1400] (= original in APKr: Acta Castrensia Cracoviensia Relationes <CCR>, sig. 10, pp. 455-456); ChmielZbiór, 1890: no. 6 [30 May 1401] = ŹródłaDziejPol., 1843 1: 155-56 (here: wrong date 1405, repeated by Simaskevych (= Simaskevych, Mitrofan. 1872. Rimskoie katolichestvo i iego ierarchiia v Podolii <SimaskevychRimskoe katolichestvo>. Kamenets’ Podil’s’kyi: n.p. 459-60). See also ProchaskaPodole ljemnem, 1895: 267-69; TrajdosKiściół, 1983: 134, 140-41; CodexVitoldi, 1882: 82-84, no. 249. One of the consequences of Svidrygiello’s rebellion was a failed attempt of Fyodor and Vasil the Koriatovychs to reestablish themselves in Podolia. They were captured by royal starosts as recorded in three documents, drawn up by them (on 1 July 1403 at Hrubieszów by Vasil, and on 9 July 1403 at Szczekarzewo, two Fyodor’s acts). Finally, they paid homage to the king obliging themselves not to take any action against the Crown and Podolia. Soon after they were allowed to return to Hungary (HaleckiDzieje unii, 1919 1: 173-74; AGAD: Archiwum Zamoijskich, sig. 32, pp. 929, 951-952 = TegowskiSprawa przyłączenia, 1997: 160-69, 172-75 (Appendixes 3-5); registers in: DaniłowiczSkarbic, 1860 1: nos. 778, 779; WolfKniaziowic, 1895: 177-78). See KurtykaPodole, 2000: 33-34, 37. The specification of the Szafraniec endowments seems to indicate that after western Podolia had been captured from Svidrygiello in 1402, the power of the Starosts of Kamenets’ was extended to the east. Thus, it included the Districts of Latychov and Vinnytsia. See U III/3: no. 530 [Piotr Szafraniec]; Katalog dyplomatyczny małopolski. 1876-1905 (4 vols.), here 1905 4: no. 1079 [9 March 1404: villages in the Districts of Smotryc and Latyczów]. Soon after 1411, when he was granted Podolia as life property by Jagiello, Vitold purchased the Szafraniec property (ZDM, Vol. 7: no. 2083: villages in the Districts of Smotrych, Latychow, and Vinnytsia = KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 206, no. 109).
Podolia, which could involve some unknown conflicts with Poland. In 1409, on the eve of the war with the Teutonic Order, Jagiello contemplated transferring the administrative power over western Podolia to Vitold. He realized this intention after concluding the Peace Treaty of Toruń in 1411, however without consulting the Council of the Crown, by endowing Podolia to Vitold for life. From 1411 to 1430 Vitold, Grand Duke of Lithuania, held the whole of Podolia as tenure for life, including Kamenets’, Bratslav, and Zvinogrod-Cherkasy, the latter ones already in his possession round (or soon after) 2 June 1409. In the Treaty of Lubowla of 1412 concerning Red Rus’, Podolia and Moldavia, he appeared as governor of Podolia. After 1411 Vitold’s aim was a permanent unification of both parts of Podolia that is the binding of western Podolia with Lithuania. This intent can be traced in his endowments in 1411-30, both in the Districts of Czerwonogrod, Kamenets’, Smotrych, Bakota and Skała (in western Podolia) and in Latychov, Bratslav, Vinnysia, and Chmielnik. The starosts of Podolia appointed by him in the same period were his most trusted dignitaries, who without exception had served earlier as his court marshals.

What seems to indicate this is the fact that he renewed his oath of allegiance to Vladislas Jagiello and the Polish Crown in Kamenets’ on 20 September 1404. See below note 48.

Codex Vitoldi, 1882: 107-08, no. 302 = Codex epistolaris, 1876 1: nos. 32 (1404), 402 (1409).

Interests of the Polish Crown were to be secured by an oath taken from Polish gentry, stressing that after the death of Vitold their representatives would transfer this territory to the Polish king. It took place probably as late as in 1418, as the Podolian gentry was reluctant to accept Vitold’s reign (MPH, 3: 213; DługoszAnnales, 11: 206-07 (Polish ed.); DługoszHistoria, 4: 122-23, 5: 47-49, 95-97, 135-37; Codex epistolaris, 2: nos. 191, 192; ProchaskaPodole lennem, 1895: 274-76). It is corroborated that Podolians paid homage to Vitold irrespective of the oaths of allegiance to the king and the Polish Crown. See as well Codex Vitoldi, 1882 1: 427-28, no. 805 [30 December 1418]; KurtykaPodole, 2000: 38.


They were: Jurij (Jerzy) Gedygold [Giedygold] (1411-23), Piotr Montygerdowycz [Montygerdowicz] (ca. 1424-25) and Jan Dowgird (1426-30). See U III/3: nos. 535 (Jerzy Gedygold), 536 (Piotr Montygerdowicz), and 537 (Jan Dowgird). The endowment to Vasil Karaczewski (Karapczewski) of ca. 1411/1423 (the date is distorted) bears the names of starosts Jurij Gedygold of Podolia, Swinka of Bratslav and Abraham of Zvinogrod, which indicates that under Lithuanian rule after 1411, a separate starosty administration was preserved for the western and eastern parts of Podolia (AYZR, 1893 VII/1: no. 1). For another act of Vitold (evidently forgery, dated 1383), involving an alleged endowment of land to Vasil
Soon after the death of Vitold on 27 October 1430, Jagiełło met in Troki on 7 November 1430 with the new Grand Duke Svidrygiello. The king declared his will to preserve peace until Polish-Lithuanian disputes would be settled at the joint assembly set for 15 August 1431. Meanwhile, Polish lords of Podolia banished the Lithuanian starost Jan Dowgird and also took control of his dependent castles of Smotrych, Skala and Czerwonogród, annexing them to the Crown. As a consequence, Jagiełło found himself under pressure as the new Grand Duke Svidrygiello demanded restitution of the captured castles. In the act signed on 29 November 1430 at Svidrygiello’s court of Jeleni Dwór, the king declared his will to return four of the captured Podolian castles. In turn, the duke and Lithuanian lords obliged themselves to return these castles to the Crown in case, the royal council did not agree to the terms of the act, or the agreement would not be reached at the announced assembly on 15 August 1431, or the king died. Nevertheless, the return of Podolia to Lithuania was not concluded.

This complicated political picture was reflected in the story of successive generations of the Słupica family, Ivan [II/1] and Tychon [II/2]. The next Słupica representative known by name was Ivan [II/1]. He was recorded as a Bratslav landowner (Pol. ziemiań bradawski) as a matter of fact only in one source, an endowment issued by the Grand Duke Vitold for the Nosowce estate along with its adjacencies. This document, known only from the digest (rejest),


56 The new Starost of Kamenets’, Michal of Buczacz received a secret letter from the lords in the royal circle in Vilnius, in which they disapproved the Lithuanian envoys led by Duke Ivan (or Michal) Baba, who were sent to Kamenets’ on that purpose. See Długosz Historya, 4: 424-25, 432-33.
may be dated to 1411-30. In the account of the destruction of the Ślupica family’s charters in 1580, preserved in the Volhynian Metrica, there is no distinct mention of the fact that Vitold only confirmed the earlier endowment from Svidrygiello. This possibility, however, suggested Rulikowski, who saw some non-existing documents from the Kuna estate family archives. In the light of the events, such an endowment may have taken place only in 1400-02, thus prior to Svidrygiello’s rebellion. Like his contemporary Tychon [II/2], Ivan may have been associated with the princely Sanguszko (Sangushko) family, and with them he may have undergone the political evolution typical of this period.

Another of Svidrygiello’s associates was the abovementioned Tychon [II/2], who is recorded in the sources of ca. 1411-46, and whose public activities are fairly well documented. Perhaps Tychon was the brother of Ivan. At any rate they must have been closely related, if we are to judge by the proximity of their tenancies, which formed the framework of the later Kuna estate. However, it is difficult to determine beyond all doubt the relationship between Paweł [I/1], Ivan [II/1], and Tychon [II/2]. Nevertheless, we may assume that Vitold’s endowment of Kuna (as described in chapter 5) was for Tychon. Contrary to what is written in the 18th-century digest in the Vitoldiana and Źródła dziejowe, the endowment was for Kuna itself, and is to be dated around 1411-30.

In 1430-37 there was war between Vitold and Svidrygiello, the newly invested Grand Duke, as of 1432 recognised only on the Ruthenian territories

57 See notes 53, p. 82 and 53, p. 83 and Chapter 5/B/4 note 99, pp. 258-59. For all Podolian documents issued by Vitold, which are undated or known only from their shortened versions, we can assume, that they were compiled between 1411 and 1430. The same applies to those concerning endowments in Eastern Podolia. See KurtykaReperatorium, 2004.


of the Grand Duchy. It was conducted in Volhynia and Podolia and for both territories. So the object of Polish-Lithuanian conflict in 1430-37 was the whole of Podolia, e.g. its western and eastern part. According to the two-year armistice signed in Lutsk on 1-2 September 1431, the two sides were to preserve the resulting state of affairs in Podolia: the King - the castles of: Kamenets’, Smotrych, Skala, Czerwonogróód along with their districts (and the towns of Olczydajow and Jałtuszków adjoining Kamenets’); Svidrygiello - Bratslav, Sokolets, Zvinogrod, Latychov, Dashkov (Pol. Daszków) and Chadzibejów (on the Black Sea); finally, the District of Bakota was divided. The progress of war was reflected in the changes that occurred in the Starosty of Bratslav from 1431 to 1437.

60 On 1 September 1432 the coup d’état in Lithuania took place, supported by the Poles that led to overthrowing Svidrygiello. Sigismund Keystutovych assumed the power of Grand Duke. In consequence the Union of Grodno on 15 October 1432 came to conclusion, according to which Lithuania formally acknowledged Polish claims to the whole of Podolia (DługoszHistoria, 4: 479-87; Akta unii, 1932: nos. 55, 58-60; LewickiPowstanie, 1892: 147-58).

61 In the course of the battles in the first half of 1431 the Duke received assistance from the Teutonic Order and the Hospodar (Lord) of Moldavia Alexander the Good. He took control of the eastern part of Podolia, made a failed attempt at besieging Smotrych and began annoying raids from the neighbouring Volhynian castles of Kremenets (Pol. Krzemieniec), Olesko and Zbaraż. In the summer Poles besieged Lutsk in Volhynia (DługoszHistoria, 4: 434-35, 442-62; Codex epistolarius, 2: nos. 191, 192).

62 From a number of extant endowments’ acts of King Vladislas Jagiello issued between 1431 and 1434 and connected with the successive stages of the war, the majority concerned property in the western (royal) Podolian Districts of Kamenets’, Smotrych, Skala, Bakota and Latychov. For the full list of these endowments with bibliographical data see KurtykaPodole, 2000: 42 and notes 105-109. However, there were also endowments of villages in the Districts of Vinnytsya [8 September 1431], and Bratslav [4 May 1431] (ZDM, vol. VII, no. 2083 [Vinnytsya], no. 2073 [Bratslav]). Perhaps both documents issued after some unknown Polish military successes in eastern Podolia). See also KurtykaRepertorium, 2004.

63 BCzart.: Parchant no. 374 (the act of Svidrygiello and his allies, 1 November 1431); DaniłowiczSkarbiecz, 1862 2: no. 1562 (the act of Vadislas Jagiello, 2 November 1431). See also Codex epistolarius, 2: nos. 197, 202; StadnickiKoryjat i Koryjatowicze, 1877: 78-79; LewickiPowstanie, 1892: 73-104. An undated record of land property subordinated to Svidrygiello from the Teutonic Order chancellery being so far associated with his agreement with the Teutonic Order signed on 2 March 1403 can probably be dated ca. 1431/1435 (KurtykaPodole, 2000: 40). Of Podolian castles, one can find there: Bratslav, Sokolets, Zvinogrod, Cherkasy, Chadzibejów, Karaul, Czarnogróód, and Latychov (DanilewiczSkarbiecz, 1860 1: no. 746).

64 On the territory of the wole of Podolia hierarchy of magistrates started to develop already under the princely Koriatovych family (13497-94). One may observe the step by step process of emergence of starosties (Pol. tenuta) on the basis of administrative districts organised around respective castles, and subdivided territorially into volost’ (Pol. wolaźć), apparent in the whole of Podolia from 1431 onwards. The first occupants of the starosty in the Pobozhe area after 1437 were Prince Fedko Nieświecki, formerly an ally of Svidrygiello, and a group of Polish lords, most of them western Podolian starosts, who temporarily governed Eastern Podolia on Vladislaus Jagiello’s behalf. The fighting against Svidrygiello, which went on intermittently from 1400 until his capitulation (1437), must certainly have delayed the crystallizing of a hierarchy of magistrates in eastern Podolia. Halecki was right to observe that during the fighting for Volhynia under Svidrygiello the starosts appointed by him temporarily to
In 1432 Svidrygiello remained in power in the Ruthenian provinces of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and his most eminent commander was Starost of Podolia, Duke Fyodor (Fedko) Nieświcki who was based on Bratslav. At the end of 1432 the castle in Bratslav was burnt, and Fedko was defeated at Kopystrzyn on the Murachwa River. However, in September 1433 he managed to recapture Bratslav and take captive the Starost of Podolia (= of Kamenets’) Teodoryk of Buczacz. In September 1434 (i.e. after the death of Jagiełło), being in conflict with Svidrygiello, Fedko obliged himself in a separate document to support the Poles and recognize the Crown’s ownership of Volhynia and Podolia, on condition that the new king entrusted him with Bratslav and Kremenets (already held by him) as life property along with adjacent districts. He also wanted the king to maintain him as holder of the Districts of Zbaraż (in Volhynia), Vinnytsia, Khmelnik and Sokół (in Podolia) as hereditary property. Before 7 September 1434, Svidrygiello managed to deprive Fedko of Bratslav and maintain the castle till the spring of 1435, when the Moldavian heir to the throne Stefan II seized it for Poland. Some time later Bratslav (undoubtedly with eastern Podolia) was subordinated to the Starost of Podolia (of Kamenets’) Dzierslaw of Wlostowice, who lost it quickly due to his carelessness. The Poles managed to recapture Bratslav for a short time in 1436 – in the period after 11 October 1436, and before 16 January

Kremenets (Pol. Kremieniecie), i.e. Fedko Nieświcki and Iwaszko Moniwidowicz, held this office in combination with the starosty of eastern Podolia, viz. Bratslav. Also Jursza, Casimir’s appointee to the starosty of Bratslav in 1446/47, had earlier been starost of Lutsk (Pol. Luck) and Kremenets (Halecki, Oskar. 1915. Ostatnie lata Świrdygiello i sprawa wołyńska za Kazimierza Jagiellończyka <HaleckiOstatnie lata>. Cracow: n.p. note 2, and 98-99). For the complete list of starosts see NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A.

The same castle, which has been mentioned in Chapter 3/2a: 177-79. There pay also attention to the notes 29, p. 178, 31, p. 178.


The event took place probably in April 1435 because Fedko renewed then his act of homage to Poland considerably reducing his claims.

This happened probably already before 1 April 1436, when Svidrygiello also recaptured Kremenets in Volhynia, and Iwaszko Moniwidowicz appeared as his Starost of Kremenets and Podolia (= Bratslav).
1437, as the Starost of Bratslav appeared Michał Mużyło of Buczacz. The war ended in 1437 with the surrender of Svidrygiello, who received Volhynia, while Eastern Podolia, including Bratslav and Vinnytsia, remained under Lithuania.\(^6^9\)

Tychon Słupica was recorded as a Bratslav landowner (ca. 1411-30 and 1446), and as a courtier to the *hospodar* (lord = Grand Duke) in 1443, which would suggest a status identical to that of Ivan, who was also a landowner with the right of alienation and inheritance, liable to certain services for his starost and *hospodar*. Tychon's description as a landowner of Bratslav also indicates that his endowment was associated to the *volost* (district) of Bratslav Castle. This in turn implies that the Kuna estate was founded from land belonging to the abovementioned *volost*.\(^7^0\) Tychon appears on a document as “courtier to the Hospodar” (Pol. *dworzanin hospodarski*). He is mentioned along with Vasil Omelkowicz (Omelkovych) and Semen Josipowicz also referred to, as “courtiers to the Hospodar” alongside their lord, Prince Vasil Sanguszko, Starost of Bratslav, who had been appointed to that office by Svidrygiello and held it between 1443 and 1446.\(^7^1\) The document, dated on 17 December 1443 at Nowosielića, was a deed of landed estates delimitation carried out by Sanguszko on orders from Svidrygiello.\(^7^2\) The estates in question concerned the

---


\(^7^0\) Compare IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 28-30 - here on the understanding of *volost* in the 14\(^{th}\) and 15\(^{th}\) centuries.


\(^7^2\) The dating of this document caused quite a lot of controversies. In the older literature this source occurred under 17 December 1428 or 1429. Seemingly the privilege of Svidrygiello dated 21 May 1446 that contented the information on this document existence used to be misdated on 2 or 21 May 1431. It was only Halecki who settled the proper date of both documents as 17 December 1443 and 21 May 1446. See HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915: 59, 84-86, 292-93, 289, 299 [here on the real data of both documents from 1443 and 1446];
villages of Poczapinče and Mikulińce in the Vinnytsia district (former volost', Pol. powiat), owned by Karp Iwanowicz Mikuliński, a Bratslav landowner, and Puhowce and other properties, which were held by the boyars of Khmelnik Castle. The original deed has not survived. We know of it from a second document issued to Karp I. Mikuliński, also quoted in later transcripts. Both the original and the subsequent deed were erroneously dated in the early scholarly literature. The second deed was a charter issued by Svidrygiello at Vilnius on 21 May 1446, upon Mikuliński’s presentation of the original deed for confirmation and entry into the Lithuanian Metrica.  

Tychon’s presence in the retinue of Vasil Sanguszko is a point worthy of note. It marks the Słupicas connection with the princely family of the Sanguszkos, one of the key political powers in Volhynia and Eastern Podolia in the 14th and 15th centuries. The association was to continue into the 16th century, and much of the evidence indicates that it was probably a classic patron-and-client relationship, although certainly less strict as connecting princes and lords, thus families of upper social strata. A separate issue involves the joint appearance of Tychon Słupica and Vasil Sanguszko as representatives of Svidrygiello, whose rule in Eastern Podolia cannot exactly be called peaceful and abounded in a series of political about-turns as it was mentioned above. Svidrygiello was in power in Volhynia in 1442-52, and in Bratslav until 1446. The last document he issued for the Powiat (district) of Bratslav is the abovementioned charter of 21 May 1446 for Mikulinski. The fact that perhaps already in 1442 or early in 1443 some members of the Sanguszko family who had been supporters of the King (Casimir the Jagiellonian, 1440/47-92) joined...
Svidrygiello’s faction suggests that the Sanguszkos entered a temporary alliance with Svidrygiello.\textsuperscript{76}

Another noteworthy point is Tychon’s participation in the legal transaction concerning Mikuliński and his property, as the two families were related. It is quite possible that their association started in the times of Paweł [I/1], who in 1391 was a witness to the charter endowing Hrynko with the village of Mikulińce, which later became the core of the hereditary estate that passed down in the Mikuliński descent, a family which like the Stupicas was regarded as one of the lines of landed gentry “nested” in the Bratslav territory.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{76} HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915: 59-61, 86 (Vilnius, 21 May 1446). The defectors included the two sons of Fedor Sanguszko, Vasil Fedorowicz, who was Starost (Pol. namiestnik) of Bratslav Castle, and his brother Alexander Fedorowicz, a member of the Prince’s privy council in 1446-51. Halecki noted Alexander Sanguszkwowicz as a member of Svidrygiello’s privy council in the period between 29 December 1446 and 29 December 1451 (HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915 Annex 1: docs. nos. 28 [Lutsk, 29 December 1446], 35 [Lutsk, 25-31 December 1451], 36 [same date], 37 [Lutsk, 29 December 1451], Annex 2: 299). Alexander died in 1491 as Starost of Kremenets in Volhynia on behalf of Casimir Jagiellon (WolffiKniaziowie, 1895: 423-24, 455). It is not clear what their father’s position was. Most probably Fedor remained loyal to Casimir, although earlier he had sided with Svidrygiello. Prince Sanguszko Fedorowicz alias Fedkowicz (1433-55) was a member of Svidrygiello’s privy council in the period between 30 March 1437 and 23 April 1438 (HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915 Annex 1: docs. nos. 6 [Lutsk, 30 March 1437], 15 [Lutsk, 23 April 1438], Annex 2: 299). See also, WolffiKniaziowie, 1895: 422-23, 455.

\textsuperscript{77} ZDŻ., 1897 22: 625. See also MoleczanowskiiOcherk, 1885: 321. As can be observed from the above mentioned documents (see above note 72, pp. 78-88) and of a printed edition (AntonovichGramoty, 1868: 56-58, no. 28 = KurtykaRepertorium, 199-200, no. 102) the Mikuliński were endowed by Svidrygiello with the Mikulińce estate on the River Zhar and Poczapińce on the River Row (Rów), together with Borki, Nowosielica and Rog/Roh (Róg) [later on Poczapiński Rozek], to which later on Suprunów and half of the village of Mieziaków from the Starosty of Vinnytsia were added. The addressee of the second deed (no. 28) was Bratslav landlord Olechno Iwanowicz Mikuliński, father of Zofia. This document is to be known only from the privilege of Sigismund I dated 5 August 1531 at Niewolomice (near Cracow) by which the King confirmed former family deeds. Zofia was first married to Bohdan Iwanowicz Shipica [IV/1], and then to Jeremalat Meleszko, Bohdan’s successor as deputy starost (Pol. podstarości, Lat. vicecapitaneus) of Bratslav and father, from the said Zofia, of Ivan Meleszko, future guardian to the minor sons of Semen Bohdanowicz Shipica [V/1] - Matiasz [VI/2] and Tychon [VI/3]. Accordingly to this privilege (1531) Olechno was to take part in many anti-Tartar campaigns due to which a few times he suffered captivity. Sigismund I’s confirmation dealt with the deeds granted to the Mikulińskiis by Vitold, Svidrygiello and Casimir Jagiellonian. The benefactor of Vitold’s endowment was the first recorded family representative – Bohdan. As it is known from Sigismund I’s privilege, he was killed in the course of the Battle of Bratslav against Tartars, acting then as commander-in-chief to Vitold’s forces. During the same campaign Tartars seized Vinnytsia and burned the town to a cinder. On this occasion among prisoners taken were Bohdan’s wife and son Ivan Bohdanowicz. It was also then, that Vitold’s deed was destroyed. On the strength of this privilege Bohdan came to possession of Mikulińce, Borki, Nowosielica, Rog/Roh and Poczapińce, all of them situated in the volest’ of Bratslav, between Vinnytsia and Lityń. Ivan Bohdanowicz was released from captivity thanks to the ransom paid by Svidrygiello, who also invested him with his father’s endowments, for which he issued a separate deed. Then King Casimir corroborated Svidrygiello’s endowment to his son Suprun Iwanowicz Mikuliński and additionally invested him with the villages of Suprunów and half of Mieziaków. It is not clear enough whether there
Most probably like perhaps the Słupica family, the Mikuliński received their Bratslav estates through endowments from Svidrygiello, which were subsequently confirmed by Vitold. The Mikuliński properties were situated fairly near the Słupicas estate. In view of the fact that there were only a handful of families that owed their lands to endowments from Svidrygiello later endorsed by Vitold (or vice versa) or from Vitold, we may infer that both the Słupica and Mikuliński families were close associates both to Svidrygiello and Vitold, participating in the defence, colonisation, and administration of Eastern Podolia. They might have joined Svidrygiello already in 1400-02, since as Rulikowski states, their endowments by him were later confirmed by Vitold. This is all one can say about the 15th-century history of the Słupicas, as the next records in the sources of this family are for the 16th century.

was any affiliation of Karp Iwanowicz with the above mentioned offspring of Bohdan, whom Rulikowski claims to be Suprun’s brother. On 3 February 1581 in Warsaw Ivan Horodyjewicz Mikuliński, the Bratslav landlord [also the Bratslav territorial notary (Pol. pisarz ziemi)] acting as well on behalf of his cousins Ivan and Michał, sons of Piotr the Mikuliński manifested the loss due to the fire in Vinnytsia Castle (8 October 1580) of royal deeds and privileges, among which those regarding Mikulińce and Poczapińce with adjacencies, Rohborki [Borki and Roh], Nowosielia Mikulińska, Suprunów, half of Mieziaków and Czerpeszyńce. The act of 1581 listed also many other documents, including a receipt from Lady Meleszko to Michał Mikuliński for the payment of 70 kops [three-scores] of Lithuanian groszs, owed to her according to Piotr Mikuliński’s last will (CDIAUK: MW, F. 389 op. 1, spr. 195 part 5, f. 340v-341v = F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 120, f. 141-142v: extract of oblata in MW = MW Edition 2002: 344, no. 160 = KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 1999-200, no. 102; Digest of oblata from the Crown Metrica in AGAD: Zbiór Czołowskiego, sig. 522, f. 33 (an extract from the MK series dated 11 September 1773). The father of the aforementioned Ivan was Horodij Mikuliński, married to Raina (Regina) Czeczeloówna [of the Czeczels], daughter of Hrehory Sadowskowicz Czeczela of the Jelita arms, Bratslav deputy starost (Pol. podstarości, Lat. vicecapitaneus) in 1584-1603/4. After Horodij’s death Raina married to Fedor [Gniewoszewicz Koszka] Strzyżowski of Dołega arms; the latter succeeded Czeczel in the office of Deputy starost in 1604-05 (ZDz., 1896 21: 404-05; CDIAUK: F. 49 op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1386, f. 37-38). The relationship between the Mikuliński and Koszka of Strzyżów (the Strzyżowski) has been established much earlier. Olechno Uhrynnowicz [sic] (apparently Iwanowicz) Mikuliński was Matiasz Lachnowicz Strzyżowski’s plenipotentiary in his delimitation conflict with the Vinnytsia Starost and the Vinnytsia burghers. The editor dated the document regarding this issue on 1530. In reality however, this conflict must have taken place in 1540 (see below note 107, p. 115). Piotr Mikuliński and Lady Horodyjowa Mikulińska (wife of Horodij) signed in 1569, among Bratslav gentry the popis act from the Powiat (district; former volost’) of Vinnytsia (ZDz., 1894 22: 102-03). On the Mikuliński see also: Trusiewicz, 1870: 295-96, 297, 306 (Zofia of the Mikuliński Słupczyna); ZDz., 1877 6: 109-10 (the Mikuliński).

As states Jablonowski the privileges from Svidrygiello and Vitold possessed among others the Kociuba clan members: the Jakuszyński (AntonovichGramoty, 1868: no. 4) and the Kleszczewski family (ZDz., 1897 22: 625). See also KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 200-01, no. 103 and compare as well Mikhailovs’kyiZakhidne Podillia, 2004 (Annex).
B. The 16th Century: Prosperity and Decline. In the Company of Princes Sanguszko Clients:


Przyłuka (the castle and a big, newly erected town encircled with walls and [consisting of] of 4000 house holdings; the property of Lord [Prince Janusz, the Bratslav Voivode] Zbaraski [situated] on a plain on the Desna). 3 miles. Notice: This town possesses very beautiful, fertile and vast fields and arable grounds, one may notice on them here and there lots of small strange houses with the shooting holes. They stay separately, and while being suddenly and unexpectedly assailed by the Tartars, peasants seek in them their shelter and defence. Thus, each peasant, when he goes on field has his gun hanging on his neck and his sword or chopper at his side, as Tartars are their [peasants] very frequent visitors and they are hardly ever safe from them.79

According to Iwanowski’s calculations, between 1240 and 1699, Podolia (both East and Western) suffered 91 major Tartar incursions.94 Owing to the proximity of Moldavia and Wallachia, the emergence of a no-man’s land in the belt of steppe-land known as the Wild Marshes (Pol. Dzikie Pola), and the fact that the main inroads for Tartar invasion (the “Tartar Trails”) ran across it, the Bratslav territory was the part of Podolia most seriously and most frequently ravaged by attacks. The Tartar issue has been for a long time an attractive subject for research. It followed two main directions of analysis: the narrower aspect of Polish-Tartar relations, or the broader context of relations between Poland-Lithuania and the Ottoman Empire.95 The majority of the source-based

---

studies, which may be used for further examination of this aspect in the history of Eastern Podolia were written in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Of the 20th century work, the publications by Bogusław Baranowski and especially by Maurycy Horn deserve special attention.

Looting expeditions into Polish-Lithuanian dominions were organised by all the hordes subjected to the Ottoman Empire and the Khanate of Crimea. They consisted of Tartars mainly from the steppes around the shores of the Black Sea – the Hordes of Budziak (the name originated from the Turkish...
bucak = a corner), Bialogrod (Pol. Bialogród, Tur. Akkerman; actually a branch of the Nogay Horde), and Ochakiv (Pol. Oczaków, Tartar and Turkish „New City” or „Dnipro Castle”, also Cankerman and Özü Kalesi), and occasionally the Nogay Horde. The Crimean Tartars, who figure in the Polish and Ruthenian sources as the Perekop Tartars, organised their separate expeditions, with diminishing frequency in the 17th century. They only rarely coordinated their actions with the northern hordes. The average number of Tartar raids for Podolia was 3-4 per year. Usually small groups of up to 100 horsemen performed three of them on a local scale, and there was a huge one, consisting of the combined tribal forces (e.g. the whole of Budziak Horde) often under the leadership of the khan himself, which could easily ravage an entire province. The main goal of such raids was the looting and kidnapping of people in order to raise money. It was often accompanied by a complete devastation of the existing material infrastructure.

The Tartars usually took routes along the watersheds between the rivers, and the area over which they would spread out would depend on the numbers in the posse. There were two main trails across the Bratslav territory – the Black

98 The Budziak (Dobrudha) or Bialogrod (Pol. Bialogród) Horde used to camp in the steppes between Bender and Bialogrod in the mouth of Dnister, and Kilia in the mouth of Danube. The Budziak Tartars recognized the Khan of Crimea as their suzerain in 1637. Beaplan described Bialogrod and Budziak as follows: „Bialogrod is situated on the Dniester River a league from the sea. This town, called Ak Kirman [Ak Kerman] by the Turks, is also under Turkish rule.” „Budziak, situated between Bialogrod and Kilia, is a plain about twelve leagues distant, and five to six leagues wide. This is the refuge of those mutinous Tatars who pay allegiance neither to the khan nor to the Turk. There are some eighty or ninety villages in the area. It is these lawless Tatars who constantly raid the wilderness areas to capture Christians to sell for galley service. Like birds of prey, they live only by plunder. From time to time they make incursions into Ukraine and Podolia, but they do not remain there for long and are forced to retire promptly, the more so since they number no more than four to five thousand Tatars. However, they are continually [active] on the borders and in the wilderness areas.” „They dwell in Budziak, which is a plain located between the mouths of the Dniester and the Danube, as we have described. In my time, there were at least 20,000 of them, who had taken refuge or been banished there (...) The plains between Budziak and Uzhhorod are usually occupied by eight to ten thousand Tatars, divided into units a thousand strong, each separated from the other by a distance of ten to twelve leagues, to seek its own fortune.” (Beauplan, 1993: 35-36, 56).

99 So far the best study describing in details the routes of communication tracts and passages of the Right Bank Ukraine, including the Tartar trails is Rulikowski’s paper of 1878, which has been supplemented by some remarks of Jablonowski (Rulikowski, Edward. 1878. “Dawne drogi i szlaki na prawym brzegu Dniepru i ich znaczenie historyczne,” Ateneum 3: 502-28, 4: 58-84; ZDz., 1897 22: 49-52 [Szlaki tatarskiej]). From this period onwards at least a few articles on this subject have been published, dealing exclusively or in large parts with Tartar trails, however none of them questioned Rulikowski’s statements, or extended his conclusions (Czołowski, Aleksander. 1938. Zaby szlak. Stanisławów: n.p. Offprint from vol. 1 (Yearbook
Trail (Pol. Czarny Szlak) and the Kuchman Trail (Pol. Kuczmań; Kuczmański Szlak). A number of secondary routes led off them, which would be used during minor incursions. The sources and the literature apply a variety of names for these offshoots, especially in Eastern Podolia. The principal inroad was the Black Trail, which owed its name to its initial section in the “Black Wood” at the source of the River Ingul. It followed the watershed between the Dnipro and the Boh. Rulikowski marked out the course of this route in accordance with G. de Beauplan’s map, running from the Crimea, via Tawań on the Dnipro, then south from the Upper Roś; then turning north-west for the town of Machnówka in the Voivodeship of Kyiv; from where its main artery headed out for the town of Ulanów, where an offshoot branched off; and then further west. Its left branch ran through Humań and Targowica (Voivodeship of Bratslav); and its right branch through Korsoń and Biała Cerkiew (Voivodeship of Kyiv).

The Kuchman Trail started in the Ochakiv steppes and headed for Podolia in an eastward direction, viz. for the Bratslav territory. It diverged from the Black Trail in the area of Martwe Wody [Dead Waters]; then it crossed over to the right bank of the Boh, and after fording this river, it went up to the

---

1) dated 19 May 1541 from Vilnius to the Princes Wiśniowiecki notifying of the Tartars approaching alongside the Zvinogrod Trail (APKr.: ASang., t. IV/28), 2) on 9 June 1541 from Vilnius to Prince Fedor Andrzejewicz Sanguszko. The monarch informed Sanguszko about Tartars’ occurrence on the „Zvinogrod trail” (APKr.: ASang., t. IV/37 = Radziımıński ArchSang., 4: 287, 293). Under separate names appear as well other minor sub-branches of the Black Trail. For example, the Udycz or Udycki Trail, which went alongside the Udycz River towards the Boh or Krzywoszarowski Trail. Accordingly to Jabłonowski the latter run alongside the River Uhorski Tyłicz. One can assure that both these sub-branches encompassed the Bratslav territories (ZDz., 1897 22: 51).

95
sources of the River Kodyma, from where a branch led off to Ochakiv. Then it turned and followed the watershed between the Boh and the Dniester up to the sources of the River Murachwa. It was here, along the watershed between the Murachwa and the Rów (a tributary of the Boh) that a wilderness called Kuczmiań was located. From then on the Trail went across the part of Podolia in the Kingdom of Poland, heading out for L’viv, however bypassing Bar and Czarny Ostrów Castles. A lateral trail from Sawrań joined it on the south. Several mentions are to be found in the sources of the Kuna estate as being located “in the middle of the Kuchman Trail.”

The numerous 16th- and 17th century testimonials give an idea of the scale of the damage caused by Tartars both in the economic as well as in the social sphere. I shall mention only a few kinds of damage, concentrating on documents of a general nature referring to the entire gentry and nobility of Volhynia, Podolia, or of Bratslav in particular. A highly informative account of the extent of the devastation comes in the relation, delivered by Gniewosz Koszka Strzyżowski on 3 February 1581 to Sejm during its session at Warsaw. The list of charters held by the Koszka family, which perished in the fire in Vinnitsia Castle on 8 October 1580, mentions two undated documents with a description of the way the whole of the gentry of the Bratslav territory was organised in the 15th century. They were a charter issued by King Casimir the Jagiellonian (1447-92), and a letter of Sigismund I (1506-48) to Prince Ilia Konstantynowicz Ostrogski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnitsia. They must have been drawn up in connection to the Tartar incursion of 1487, which laid waste virtually the whole of Eastern Podolia. King Casimir’s charter gave the gentry of the Voivodeship of Bratslav and their subjects “the right to freely inhabit the towns of Bratslav and Vinnitsia.” They were to be exempt from the juridictive authority of the starosts of Bratslav and Vinnitsia,

---

103 For the Kuchman Trail see also ZDz., 1894 20: 144, 1896 21: 304, 407.
104 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 15, f. 7v. See also above pp. 94-95.
106 The others of the then entered complaints do not mention both discussed above privileges. See Chapter 5/B/4: 258 and especially note 99, pp. 258-59.
except for the liability of bridge building and defending the castles and
towns.\textsuperscript{108}

Sigismund I’s letter to Prince Ostrogski gave the people of the region
permission to “freely erect houses and structures in Bratslav and Vinnytsia
Castles for defence against the enemy and for the safe keeping of the valuables
of the gentry inhabiting the Voivodeship of Bratslav.”\textsuperscript{109} This document must
have been compiled in 1529-39, when Ostrogski held the office of Starost of
Bratslav, Vinnytsia, and Zvinogrod, and in connection to the Tartar incursions
of the early 16\textsuperscript{th} century. I am mentioning both these documents since they are
reach in information on the organisation of public life in the Bratslav territory
due to the permanent Tartar threat, and also because they have not been
discussed before, in the literature referring to Tartar invasions. An analogous
deed was the charter issued by King Alexander (1501-06) on 13 March 1502
from Vilnius, for the entire gentlefolk of Volhynia and Bratslav territories.
According to it, the monarch exempted them for another 2 years from the
cattle-tax. The Volhynian landowners had already been enjoying this
exemption since 1492, but its term was due to expire in 1504. The reason for its
prolongation in 1502 was the recurrence of invasions and that their property
was “continuously at risk from attack and looting by the Tartar heathen.”\textsuperscript{110}

We have numerous records of the devastation of Bratslav and Vinnytsia
and their environs by Tartar hordes in the 15\textsuperscript{th} and 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{111} Some have
already been discussed in connection with the endowments of property received
by the Mikulński, Koszka, and Žabokrzycki families in recognition of their
military efforts to defend the country against the Tartar raids.\textsuperscript{112} On the basis of

\textsuperscript{108} RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 195, f. 330v.-332 (Strżyżowski’s complaint), here p. 331v.
no 151 [book 6, f. 330v.-331v.].
\textsuperscript{110} ZDz., 1877 6: 149.
\textsuperscript{111} On this subject see among others: Górski, Konstanty. 1891. „Obrona granie
Offprint form “Ziemia Czerwińska” 1-34.
\textsuperscript{112} See Chapter 2/A/2: note 77, pp. 89-90 [the Mikulinski] and B/2: note 89, p. 107 and pp.
108-09 [the Koszkas], 111 and note 99, pp. 111-12 [the Žabokrzyckis] as well as Chapter 5/B/4
note 99, pp. 258-59.
the chronicles of Jan Długosz, Bernard Wapowski, Marcin Bielski, and Marcin Stryjkowski, Rolle lists only four major expeditions into Podolia up to the middle of the 15th century (1433, 1438, 1442, and 1448), the first of which was connected to the transfer of power in Bratslav from the Svidrygiello faction. However, he goes on to enumerate no less than 24 invasions of Volhynia and Podolia for the century from 1450 to 1550. In 1478 the Nogay Tartars burned down the town of Bratslav, while the Castle withstood the attack. The next great surge came in 1487, by the Crimean Horde. A battle was fought on the Sawrań. In 1489 Prince Jan Olbracht engaged the Tartars on the Murachwa near Kopystrzyń, on the border of Eastern and Western Podolia.

There was a continuous stream of incursions from 1500 to 1540, including raids into Podolia in 1502, 1507, 1513, 1516, 1520, 1523, and 1528. In the July and autumn of 1516 the Crimean Tartars launched two substantial onslaughts into Red Rus' and Podolia, which rallied the majority of the Polish forces in the region to the defence. One of the commanders of the defence force in both campaigns was Prince Roman Andriejewicz Sanguszko, who was killed in battle in November 1517. After 1537, following the devastation of the previous years, Vinnytsia Castle was restored on Queen Bona’s orders by Bernard Pretwicz (d. 1561), the soldier commemorated in the well-known Polish proverb about the border being “free of Tartars under Lord Pretwicz.” There are detailed registers extant for the years 1539-43 of the grave damage caused by Tartar raids. The inspection carried out in Vinnytsia

114 RolleZameczki, 1880 1: 13 and note 17: here and in note 18 references to the aforementioned chronicles. See also Chapter 2/A/2: 84-85 and notes.
115 RolleZameczki, 1880 1: 13 and note 18.
116 Baliński/Lipiński, 1844 2: 1399; SłownikGeogr., 1880 I: 346 (Bratslav); RolleZameczki, 1880 1: 13 note 18, no. 8.
118 RolleZameczki, 1880 1: 13 note 18, no. 9.
120 See NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A.
122 Those raids, from one up to a few in the course of each year, concerned first of all the villages in the Bratslav territory (AGAD: Libri legationum 11, f. 96-102). See also ASangGorczak, 1890 3: 223-224, no. 171: here detailed account of both raids and of Polish preventive measures.
Castle in 1545 includes a petition from the local gentry for the restoration of Zvinogrod Castle as well, devastated by Tartars in 1541.\textsuperscript{123}

A particularly severe blow came in September 1551, when the Crimean Horde led by Devlet Girey assailed Bratslav.\textsuperscript{124} Following these events, a substantial group of gentlefolk moved for good from Bratslav to Vinnytsia. In 1552 an intensive restoration project started on Bratslav Castle.\textsuperscript{125} In 1559 the Castle and town of Bratslav were to experience another Tartar assault. Tartars reoccurred at the gates of Bratslav on two occasions in 1560.\textsuperscript{126} In mid-September 1574 a 7,000-strong horde under Bahay laid waste Podolia and the borderlands.\textsuperscript{127} According to Marcin Bielski’s \textit{Chronicle}, 1575 was the year of a particularly bad attack on the entire Braclaw territory.\textsuperscript{128} In the 1580’s and 90’s the man who assumed most of the defence duties against Tartar hordes on the rampage in Podolia was Hetman Stanislaw Żółkiewski (1547-1620; killed at the Battle of Cecora, 1620). There are numerous accounts of Żółkiewski’s exploits.\textsuperscript{129} Particularly vicious attacks came in 1589, 1590, 1594, and 1595.\textsuperscript{131} Finally, after yet another incident in 1598, a decision was taken to move the administrative capital of the Voivodeship from Bratslav to Vinnytsia.\textsuperscript{132} In 1599 Żółkiewski sent several reports to the Chancellor Jan Zamoyski that

\textsuperscript{123} RolleZameczki, 1880 1: 17 note 18, no. 23; ArchSangGoreczak, 4. These are letters of King Sigismund I to Prince FedorAndrejewicz Sanguszko, Marshal of Volhynia dated from Vilnius on 5 and 14 February 1541, in which the King ordered Sanguszko to pay attention to the supplies and military equipment of all Volhynian castles as in the eve of Tartar intrusion.
\textsuperscript{124} For details see Chapter 2/B/5: 144-47.
\textsuperscript{125} For details see Chapter 2/B/5: 149-51.
\textsuperscript{126} KolankowskiKrym, 1935: 281 and note 1. According to the author the damages afflicted during the first raid have been estimated to 4,530 \textit{kopa\^{}} of Lithuanian \textit{grosz}, while during the second one to 570 \textit{kopa\^{}} of Lithuanian \textit{grosz}. Also 69 people were then in captivity.
\textsuperscript{127} See also Chapter 5/B/4: 256 and note 93, pp. 257-58, 258 and note 96, p. 258 (1575).
\textsuperscript{128} Trusiewicz, 1870: 284 and note 29. Rulikowski quotes the testimony of Marcin Bielski and a poem by Jan Kochanowski. This very raid encompassed the entire Bratslav province up to Sieniawa, and its result was apart from the robbed movable assets highly exaggerated number of captives mounting allegedly up to 55,000. Kempa offers details on this raid (Kempa, Tomasz. 1997. \textit{Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski} (ok. 1524/1525 –1608) wojewoda kijowski i marszalek ziemi wołyńskiej <KempaOstrogski>. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszalek. 73-74).
\textsuperscript{129} See among others Artur Śliwiński, \textit{Hetman Żółkiewski}. Warsaw 1920; ŻółkiewskiListy, 1868. Horn’s chronology produces a full schedule of Tartar invasions in 1600-47 basing on a rich collection of source references. See HornChronologia, 1962.
\textsuperscript{131} The Sejm gathered for deliberations in Warsaw in March and April 1598 made the decision. The Diet issued special regulation on request from the Bratslav Voivodeship deputies (VL, 1859 2: 375). See also Heleniusz [Iwanowski, Eustachy]. 1882. \textit{Pamiętki polskie z różnych czasów przez Eu...go Heleniusza}. (2 vols.) Cracow: n.p., here 2: 131; Baliński/Lipiński, 1848 2: 1365.
Tartars had been spotted on the Kuchman Trail in the Bratslav area. On 10 October 1599 he wrote from Bratslav that he was setting off in the direction of the Sawrań, since he “suspected there were Tartars abroad.” Already on 28 October 1599 he sent word from Szowigród that he was patrolling the Kuchman Trail.

Kuna and Nosowce as well as their estates must have been devastated and depopulated many times owing to Tartar raids. There are practically no documentary records available for Kuna in the early 16th century, which like the rest of the Bratslav territory, must have been reduced to a “wilderness.” Not until the late 16th century are there any records extant for the damage sustained to the Shupicas’ properties. Most probably the Kuna properties were affected in 1584, 1589, and 1590, during the invasion described by Bartosz Paprocki, wherein the environs of Vinnytsia and Khmelnik were laid waste. Evidence of the destruction comes in the below listed documents. The one of 1590 regarding the “franchise” for Kuna, the Kuna’s municipal charter of 1605, and finally the deed of Tychon Semenowicz discharging Ivan Meleszko of his wardship duties of 1612. The latter mentions the fact that the Kuna settlement was desolate when it passed to the heirs of Semen Shupica in 1596.

The only fully reliable 16th-century account of a march of a Tartar troop through Kuna is in a letter from Prince Janusz Zbaraski to Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski, dated in Kremenets on 24 February 1593. Zbaraski wrote to the Hetman that “on the Tartars […] there had been no further disturbances after the latter’s departure, except for an assault on Kuna, the Lord Shupica property, where a few people had been taken off into captivity, and in another place,
where a few Tartars had appeared; and that should there be any further news, he would immediately send word to the Hetman in Brody.\textsuperscript{138}

In 1612 the conflict between Poland and the Ottoman Empire again flared up over Moldavia. The Poles suffered a defeat at Sasowy Róg on the River Prut (19 July), under Stefan Potocki, who had organised an expedition to put his brother-in-law Constantine Movila (Pol. \textit{Mohyla}) on the hospodar’s throne, and was defeated by joint Moldavian and Tartar forces. In retaliation the Tartars made an incursion deep into Podolia, and one group made an attack on the Bratslav territory. In 1613 the Crimean Horde conducted three expeditions. In the first, against the Bratslav area; Vinnytsia and Bratslav were laid waste. In the following year the Tartars swept across the Polish part of Podolia and again over the Voivodeship of Bratslav. Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, fully rebuilt (\textit{de nova radice}) the Bratslav Castle following the fire of 1604 and the incursion of 1612, as confirmed in an act of \textit{Sejm}, 1613.\textsuperscript{139} But in 1615 the same area again fell victim three times to the Tartars, and twice in 1616.\textsuperscript{140} The inspection of 1616 reported that neither the new nor the old town of Vinnytsia was paying taxes, but it reminded the inhabitants that they were obliged to put up a “Tartar guard.”\textsuperscript{141} At the turn of March and April 1618 the Crimean Horde devastated the southern part of the Bratslav territory, and in a second campaign in May again they swept across towards Red Rus’. Its third expedition, in mid-July, was again targeting Red Rus’ (L’viv and Halych). But the main strike, by the most numerous force under the leadership of Devlet Girey and Kantymir, Khan of the Burdziak Horde, came in September of that year. Having crossed the Dnister on 28 September, Kantymir’s men headed for Jampol, Zbaraż,

\textsuperscript{138} AGAD: Archiwum Zamoyskich, sig. 3036: Miscellanea regarding Cossacks, Tartars and Turks (1584-1791). Section II. The Tartars, f. 329 (original, badly damaged).
\textsuperscript{139} The \textit{Sejm} regulation regarding Kalinowski stated that “the Vinnytsia Castle after it was burned down, [it was] de nova radice erected by Starost Walen[t]y Alex[ander] Kalinowski on his own expense and labour. We have appointed commissioners, who are to watch diligently and attentively to the castle’s erection, with its military equipment and fortifications. When dismissed from this revision, they have to give full information about all what they have seen on the coming \textit{Sejm}” (VL, 3: 92-93); ZDz., 1897 22: 88.
\textsuperscript{140} HornChronologia, 1962: 18-23.
\textsuperscript{141} See The \textit{Lustracja} of Vinnytsia Starosty of 1616 (AGAD: MK, Dz. XVIII, sig. 73b, f. 174-176 = ZDz., 1877 5: 74-76; a copy from 1719/1775: CDIAUK: F. 227, op. 1 [the document collection; the so-called \textit{Seria Nowa}], spr. 95, f. 20-21 = AYZR, 1890 VII/2, 388-393, no. XXIII).
Niemirów, Płoskirów, Beresteczko, and Konstantynów. A prey to them fell almost the entire southern belt of the Bratslav region. Stefan Chmielecki (d. 1630), Pretwicz's successor, was the commanding officer of the Polish defence troops against a series of expeditions in the 1620's (1623, '24, '28, and '29). Several accounts survive, of Chmielecki's anti-Tartar campaigns.

For the 17th century the presence of Tartars in the environs of Kuna is confirmed in only one document. Although Kuna is not actually named in it, we may conclude that the events described in it occurred in the Kuna estate, in the region of the "Vitold's bridge" on the River Sob, that is near Hajsyn. The document in question is a relation of Stefan Chmielecki, Standard-bearer of Bratslav, commander of the troops defending the border since 1625, addressing the king. It deals with the fighting against the Tartars under Muhamed Girey and Sahin Girey in 1629. Chmielecki gives a detailed account of the pursuit and skirmishes with the Tartars of the Bialogrod, Dobrudzha (Budziak), and Crimean Hordes, who numbered around 4,000 men under Muhammed Muzra. The incidents occurred along the Black Trail west of Humań on 21-23 May. Since 5 May Chmielecki was observing the Trail from his camp on the River Uhorski Tyklicz. Then he followed the hordes along the Kaniów road in the direction of Humań, where the latter spread out over a wide area along the River Jartoń (latran') and started to lay waste the Kalinowski property. Chmielecki wrote, "On the second day [22 May] I received news that he [Muhammed Murza] was on Vitold's bridge in the direction of the River Boh, and following his trail for a mile and a half from that place to surround him, for a more convinient crossing of the river, I turned off the Tartar trail to take the

---

144 However, the topography of this source presents certain difficulties as regards interpretation, although it is hardly imaginable that there should have been another "Vitold's bridge" in the area apart from the one on the Kuna estate. See below. In accordance to the sources regarding the Słupicas conflict with Piotr Świrski, tenant (Starost) of Hajsyn, the Vitold's bridge has been erected on the Sob.
145 PrzyłęckiUkrainne sprawy, 1842: 84-87: here on p. 85 and 86 mentioned Vitold's bridge on the Boh. The whole collection composed mostly of Chmielecki's accounts from 1627-29, deals mainly with Bratslav territories, including the vicinity of Kuna.
ford over the Boh at Kaniów, which is a mile away from the Vitold’s bridge. My troops crossed the river and surprised the enemy, who was resting unwary in his camps.”


Just as with their forfathers, it is impossible to ascertain the family relationship between Stećko (Stec’ko) [III/1], his listed above ancestors as well as his contemporaries, Ždan [III/2] and Bohusz [III/3]. The task is even more difficult owing to the lack of information on the property he held. Stećko appeared as a witness probably on 4 April 1509 (the year is illegible), in the company of Prince Semen Fedorowicz Czartoryski and Hrehory Hłuski (Głuski), then Starost (plenipotentiary) of Bratslav Castle as well as the Lord Korotki. This is the only document in which Stećko Słupica is mentioned. The title pan (Lord) is used next to his name (ziemienin Bracławski Pan Stecko Słupica – the landed gentleman of Bratslav, Lord Stećko Słupica), which confirms the patently hereditary character of the estates he owned. Some noteworthy conclusions regarding the persons mentioned may be drawn from the interesting information presented in this source.

The document was issued by Roman Ładyżyński (of Ładyżyn) and his wife Lubka Jesmanówna (Jeszmanówna; daughter of Jesman, the direct ancestor of the Krasnosielskis) concerning the sale of a hereditary estate, the village of Plisków at the source of the River Rośka in the Powiat of Bratslav to Semen (Siemion) Koszka. The original has not survived, and is only known from an 18th-century transcript of an 18-item summary digest of charters of the Koszka family for the years 1494-1585. The title pan, which appears next to

146 PrzyłęckiUkrainne sprawy, 1842: 85. Next the Standard-bearer related that the Tartars moved their camp from the Boh 3 miles in direction of Kodenica, a bit above the village of Berezki [Berszadzkie?], and „on the very day crossed the Boh close to the Vitold’s bridge on the Boh” where Chmielecki also stayed overnight with his troops. On the following day [22 May] he attacked the Tartars near Sina Woda in the vicinity of Kahorlik [Jahorlik] (ibidem, 86).

81 APKr.: ASang., t. I/24 (here transcript in the summary of the Koszka’s privileges (18 pieces) from 1494-1585). The copy is an extract from Lutsk (Pol. Luck) castle court series, dated 7 October 1585 at Lutsk. Jabłonowski on the basis of Gorczak’s edition (Gorczak Bronislaw ed.,
the names of Stećko and Korotki (alias Korotko), is noteworthy. Iakovenko has
discussed in a detail this point, using examples from the areas of Volhynia,
Kyiv, and Bratslav. Suchocki also offered cases from the area of Lithuania
proper.\(^ {82} \)

Similarly, Ždan’s [III/2] name occurs in just one source document, from
1533. Here, too, it is hard to determine his relationship to the other members
of the Słupica family. Perhaps this Ždan is the same individual as Hrehory
Bohuszewicz (son of Bohusz) known as Ždan [IV/3], but the considerable time
lapse between the dates (1533 and 1569) suggests that they might have been
two different persons. Bohusz [III/3] comes earlier in the chronology, and is a
contemporary to the Ždan identified as his son Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3].
The information on Ždan comes from Rulikowski, a researcher on the history
of the Ukraine who, while writing his text examined the now no longer existent
house archives of the Jaroszyński family. He claimed, rather laconically, that
the Bratslav landowner Ždan Słupica attended the delimiting of the boundaries
of the arable land belonging to himself and his neighbours, Jan (Ivan)
Žabokrzycki and Bohdan Markowicz (son of Marek) Mormil.\(^ {83} \) The latter
owned the village of Mormilec otherwise known as Mormilówka, bordering the
Słupicas’ and Žabokrzyckis’ properties, unspecified in the document. Using

---

\(^ {82} \) IakovenkoShliakhha, 1993: 121-202, especially 121-46, see also the Introduction note 6, pp.

\(^ {83} \) Trusiewicz, 1870: 301.
other extant sources to supplement this deed, sheds light to the Słupica family’s
neighbourhood and other connections in the mid-16th century.84

Since there is a connection between the persons named in this document
and the deed in which Stečko appears, I shall present them chronologically —
first those associated with Stečko, then those with whom Zdan is mentioned. I
shall thus obtain a picture of the relatives and neighbours of the Słupica family
in the early 16th century. The fundamental conclusion to be drawn from this
review is that most of the persons named were servants of the starost and had
been endowed with properties in the areas of the old vo/ost’s estates of Bratslav
and Vinnytsia Castles, which by that time had been transformed into the
Powiat’s (pl. Powiaty, districts) of Bratslav and Vinnytsia respectively,
although the official introduction of the powiat administrative division came in
1564. Many of these individuals were associates of the Sanguszkos, who,
alongside the other princely family of the Ostrogskis related to them, had
monopolised the starostial tenancies of Bratslav and Vinnytsia by the late 15th —
early 16th century.

I shall start with the party issuing the document of ca. 1509, Roman
Ładyżyński and his wife. Jabłonowski has ascribed the Ładyżyński family to
the “nested” gentry of the Bratslav territories. It was still extant in the region in
1595.85 Semen alias Siemion/Sieńko Koszka is regarded to be the founder of
the Bratslav line of the Koszka family, which was considered one of the most

84 As to which of the Słupicas estates might have been involved in the delimitation procedures
see Chapter 5/B/1.
85 ZDz., 1897 22: 607. Roman Ładyżyński’s wife, Lubka Jesmanówna, came from the Jesman
family, the direct forbears of the Krasnosielskis, who in turn were related to the Słupicas by at
least two family ties. The Jesmans (Jeszmans) held under Vitold and Casimir the Jagiellonian,
various endowments in the Powiaty (Districts) of Bratslav and Vinnytsia (RGADA: MW, F.
337]; KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: 195, no. 96). A certain Hrycido Jesman has been invested by
Casimir Jagellon with the volost’ (in the narrower sense of the term, meaning hereditary
property of a given family) called oratowska (of Oratów) together with the village of Oratów
on the upper course of the Roś River, which later became the family nest of the Oratowskis,
as well as the settlement (sieliszcze) of Czahów on the River Zyda that was rumoured to be a
tributary of Rośka (ZDz., 1897 22: 719). The Krasnosielski family was also endowed in
Volhynia. In 1500 its representatives got in the District of Bratslav the village of Palczykowo,
cautiously identified by Jabłonowski as Palczyk on the Gnily Tyklicz River in Zwinogrod area,
which afterwards came in possession of the Koszkas (ZDz., 1897 22: 629). On their landed
property in the mid-16th century would be talked later.
ancient in the Bratslav territories, alongside the Słupicas and the Mikuliński families. Semen deserves special attention in view of the later links between the Koszka and Słupica families. It was probably also on his behalf, that Semen Fedorowicz Czartoryski, probably Prince Michał’s grandson and thus a representative of Koszka’s patrons, put his signature as a witness on the charter. That charter, which was subsequently endorsed for Semen Koszka by King Sigismund I the Elder on 30 August 1507. The village of Żórawicze

86 According to Jabłonowski the Koszka (Koszko alias Koszczyc) family traced its origin back to the Smolensk (Pol. Smoleński) province in Lithuania. Rachuba and his research team define accurately the original tenor of their name as Koszkin. Iwaszko alias Ivan Antonowicz Koszka in 1482-96 kept the office of okolniczy in Smolensk. His son Ivan Iwanowicz performed the same duties in 1497-1526, although it cannot be stated explicitly that he took over directly from his father (Rachuba, Andrzej, chief ed., Henryk Lulewicz, and Przemysław P. Romanuik (eds.) 2003. Urzędnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy. Vol. IV: Ziemia smoleńska i województwo smoleńskie XIV-XVIII wiek. Warsaw: Oficyna Wydawnicza DiG. 52, no. 52 [Iwan Antonowicz], 53, no. 58 [Iwan Iwanowicz]). The Volhynian branch of the Koszka family is known under the cognomen Żurawnicki. Endowments in the Bratslav line, which later split in two branches of which one is known under the name Strzyżowski, after the village of Strzyżawka in the Vinnytsia district, were connected with Kings Casimir Jagiellonian (1447-92) and Alexander (1501-06). (ZDz., 1897 22: 606).

87 Semen Koszka received from Prince Michał Wasilewicz Czartoryski, Bratslav plenipotentiary starost (see below note 88) two villages out of volost' of Bratslav - Chaniód and Osztykow [Oszytkow] on the upper stream of Roś River (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 23; ZDz., 1897 22: 606), which allows us to assume that he belonged to a close circle of servants and clients to Czartoryski.

88 Similarly to the Sanguszkos two representatives of the Lithuanian branch of the Czartoryski family of the Pogon Ruska arms took places in Svidrygiello’s privy council. They were brothers: Ivan Wasilewicz (22 November 1442 – 31 December 1451) [docs. nos. 19, 20, 24, 28, 34, 37 and 38], and Alexander Wasilewicz (27 March – 23 April 1438) [nos. 14 and 15] accompanied by their relative of the Volhynian branch Michał Wasilewicz (3 March 1445-31 December 1451) [nos. 23-25, 27 and 38], who in 1445-51 was also the court marshal to Svidrygiello. See HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915: 298, Annex 2 (numbers in square brackets are being referred to Annex 1); WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 18-19. After the death of Svidrygiello Prince Michał Wasilewicz Czartoryski became plenipotentiary Starost of Bratslav, acting on behalf of Casimir Jagiellonian, and held this office in 1451-79. He died ca. 1489 (NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A). It was him, who invested Semen Koszka with two villages in the volost' of Bratslav Castle. See above, note 87. The father of this prince, whose sales contract on his behalf witnessed Semen Koszka might have been Fedor (Fiodor) Michajłowicz Czartoryski – the son of Bratslav plenipotentiary Starost, himself Starost of Lutsk in 1522-42, married to Princess (Ruth, kniahinî) Sanguszkówna, daughter of Andrzeja Aleksandrowicz SanguszkoWicz, Marshal of Volhynia, and niece of Prince Constantine Iwanowicz Ostrogski (see below note 91, p. 108), who died in 1542 (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 24-25). The problem is that Wolff as sons of Fedor lists exclusively Alexander and Ivan, it is possible however, that in the copy of the above mentioned document one of them have been erroneously written down as Semen Fedorowicz.

89 See Boniecki, 1907 11: 366 (the Koszka family of Dołęga arms); ZDz., 1897 22: 606; The 18th century genealogy of the Koszka, starting with Siemion (Semen) and going as far as Ivan Andrejewicz, accompanied by the summary of deeds of privilege and landed property transactions beginning with Siemion, which is being preserved in APKr.: ASang., t. 115/49. Accordingly to this 18th century genealogy and summary of documents Semen was the hereditary owner of the following estates in the Bratslav province: Chaniód alias Chamów, Szpików Palczyków, Oszylków alias Oszków (Jabłonowski claims that Szpików earlier used to be named Oszpiejków and was lying not very distant from Bratslav, yet in the light of the analysed here privileges it seems to be an evident mistake), the Lake [Lake of Udycz] and of

106
alias Żórawice (Żórawnice) in the Powiat of Lutsk (Volhynia) was bestowed on Semen and his son Juchno (a royal courtier in 1518) for their military involvement in fighting against the Tartars. They also jointly obtained two deeds of confirmation for all of their previous endowments and transactions, issued by Sigismund I on 29 August in Cracow, and on 10 December 1518 at the Sejm (Diet) of Berest (Pol. Brześć Litewski), witnessed by the Grand Duchy's top political figures. This deed declared that the Koszkas had “often

the listed below estates belonging to his wife. He owned as well together with his son Juchno (1518) the village of Plisków bought from Roman Ladyzyński, and also Dżosow (Dżosow), purchased from Andruszko Buszniewski [Buszyński]. See above, notes 81, p. 104 and 85, p. 105 (the Ladyzyński) and below note 91, p. 108 (the Buszyński). On 30 August 1507 in Vilnius Sigismund I confirmed to the Koszkas their endowments of Chaniów and Oszytków. This new document was issued on the basis of royal letters (privileges) of Casimir Jagiellonian and Alexander, as well as the deed of Prince Michał Wasilewicz Zbaraski, Starost of Bratslav (from 16 February 1504 to ca. between 7 September 1507 and 14 March 1508) produced by Semen, which all confirmed the Koszkas’ endowment from Prince Michał Wasilewicz Czartoryski. By the same document Sigismund I confirmed also King Casimir’s endowment of the Koszka family with the villages of Oszpieykowo and Paleczykowo, to which Prince Michał Wasilewicz Zbaraski, contemporary Bratslav starost added his own privilege issued to Semen for the Lake Udecz [Udycz]. Meanwhile, most probably in 1509, Paleczykowo became the source of conflict. It seems, that soon after he obtained the deed of privilege from Prince Michał Zbaraski, Koszka resigned his legal rights to this village on behalf of Iwaszko Krasnosiełski. However, the Bratslav and Vinnytsia starost of that time Prince Constantine Ostrogski invested with the same village a royal servant (Pol. siuga hospodarski) certain Szyma, for whom he „Royal Letter on these settlement with the King procured”. When producing this deed Ostrogski complained also, that nobody knows „by which means this Settlement came about” by Iwaszko Krasnosiełski what happened in his absence in Bratslav. Prince Starost, either disrespected the endowment by replacing him on office Zbaraski, or had no knowledge of it, which seems to be less probable. Any way, he forced Semen Koszka to pay him 20 kopas [three-scores] of the Lithuanian grosz. This amount was claimed from Koszka by Krasnosiełski. At the same time Ostrogski demanded from Krasnosiełski to cease to harass Koszka, but to address him over for the money, if in reality he had a title supporting his claim. The letter of Ostrogski on this matter was dated on 14 September 1509? (the year date illegible) written in Polonne (APKr.: ASang., t. I/24). But the mentioned above villages were not the only properties given to Koszka as a reward for services, chiefly for the defence of Eastern Podolia against the Tartars. Earlier Alexander the Jagiellonian had confirmed a charter bestowed by Casimir Jagiellonian in 1494, for the village of Szpików, as well as a charter for the settlements of Oszpieykowo and Paleczyków on the shores of Lake Udycz, along with the lake itself (at the confluence of a river of the same name), granted to Koszka by Prince Michał Wasilewicz Zbaraski, plenipotentiary Starost of Bratslav Castle. All of these tenancies were in the Powiat (district) of Bratslav. After the request of Sierko (as is the name in the summary) Alexander, still being the Grand Duke of Lithuania confirmed in 1495 the deed of privilege for Szpików. He wrote about this matter from Vilnius on 7 May 1495 to the current Starost of Bratslav and Zvinogrod Prince Fedor Iwanowicz Czetwertyński. From this document it is known to us, that already King Casimir had endowed Koszka with Szpików. He got this estate after a certain Hryszata, and at the time of the Casimir’s endowment Szpików was „a deserted settlement”, most probably devastated in the course of one of the Tartars’ raids, perhaps the one of 1487. Alexander’s privilege stated, that „he [Koszka] may hold this Settlement and serve us with [military] service, in accordance with local customs” (APKr.: ASang., t. I/24).

Boniecki, 1907 11: 366-67. Semen was married to Bratslav landlady (Pol. ziemiańska brackawska) Anna (Hanna) Worobijówna [of Worobijówka], widow of Hrycko Obodeński, who had daughter Miłochna with the first husband, the future mother of Vasil Romanowicz Obodeński, from whom Juchno Semenowicz took over his share in the estates listed below (APKr.: ASang., t. I/24; see also below note 98, p. 111). Anna subsequently handed over her
served against the heathen Tartars, and sustained many wounds in our service.”

Perhaps their participation in the defence of Bratslav in 1478 and 1479, and in the Battle of the River Sawran in 1487 had made up part of this hereditary estates in the Bratslav area (Rohozna, Czeremoszna, Ichnatowce and Falków) to her son Juchno Semenowicz. These transactions have been witnessed by the next Shjpica – Bohusz [III/3]. The deed of 29 August 1518 issued in Cracow confirmed to Juchno, son of Semen his legal titles to parts of the village of Rohozna called Worobijówka in the Powiat of Bratslav, transferred to him by his mother, and to the village of Plisków in the same Powiat of Bratslav, bought from the Ladyżynskis by Juchno’s father (AGAD: Archiwum Zamoyskich/ Zbiór dokumentów pergaminowych [penchant collection], sig. 6790 – penchant in Ruthenian script dated on 29 August 1518 in Cracow; erroneously in the collection’s catalogue as Rogożna and Plikowo). On Juchno see note 98, p. 111.

The document issued on 10 December 1518 at Berest addressing both father and son was a confirmation of previous endowments in the Powiat of Bratslav (Chaniew, Oszytkow, Szpekowo, Palczkowko, the Lake of Udecz) and of Dzozow purchased from Andruszko Buszmiński in the same area (APKr.: ASang., t. 1/24). The list of witnesses to the royal deed was: Wojciech, Bishop of Vilnius; Paweł, Bishop of Lutsk and Berest; Voivode of Vilnius and [Lithuanian] Chancellor Lord Mikołaj Mikołajewicz Rzędziłłowicz; Lord [Castellan] of Vilnius, hetman najwyższy (commander-in-chief to the Lithuania), Starost of Lutsk, Bratslav and Vinnystia, Marshal of Volhynia Prince Constantine Iwanowicz Ostrogski; Voivode of Troki and Court Marshal Lord Hrehory Stanisławowicz Ostykowicz; Lord [Castellan] of Troki, Starost of Zmiad (Samogitia) Lord Stanisław Janowicz; Marshal of Mensk, Tenant (plenipotentiary Starost) of Słonim Lord Jan Mikołajewicz; Voivode of Polock (Polotsk), Tenant (plenipotentiary Starost) of Mozyr Lord Ołbrycht Martynowicz Gasztładowicz; Starost of Horodło Lord Jurej Mikołajewicz; Voivode of Novogrod (plenipotentiary Starost) of Dówgiłłow (Pol. dzierżawca dowgiłowski) Lord Jan Janowicz Zbaraskis, Starost of Berest, and [Lithuanian] Marshal Lord Jurij Iwanowicz Iliniczka, and “others Lords members of the Council of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania “. It is not known, when precisely Koszka might have bought the village of Dzozow. Most probably the village under consideration has to be identified with the mentioned by Jabłonski Dzozow (Czozow alias Zozow) in the source of Sob River, which before 1590 had been bought together with Szpików and Rohozna from the Koszka by Princess Zbaraskis, who were still in possession of them in 1629 (ZDz., 1897 22: 236, 603, 715). As to Andruszko himself, he represented undoubtedly the „nested gentry” family of the Buszynskis of Buszyniec, the village, which was situated on the left bank of Boh. The original nest of the Buszyński family was Busza on the same name river, belonging later to the family branch calling itself Rudewicz. A certain Buszynski, perhaps Andruszko owned in 1545 a common horodnia in the Castle of Bratslav, which he shared with Kleszczewski, Siemaszko and Ziałowskiego (ZDz., 1877 6: 118). A horodnia was a house-like wooden edifice (less often of bricks) within the castle’s walls. Usually it was fortified and most often attached directly to the walls. The owners of horodnias were local noblemen, villagers and burgars. The main aim of these constructions was to store food and mobile property of local population, seeking refuge within the castle’s walls in case of emergency. On 3 January 1589 Jan Zamoyski, Chancellor to the Crown and hetman wielki koronny (commander-in-chief to the Crown Army) paid to the Buszynskis – a certain Buszynski and his married to Bajbuza sister (wife of Hrehory Bajbuza, the castle court notary in Vinnystia; see NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B) 800 kopa [three-scores] of Lithuanian grosz for the sold by them Busza estate. The transaction was written down in Vinnystia Castle court books on 8 January 1590 (ZDz., 1894 20: 120 (rejest, on 3 January 1589), 1897 22: 277, 603, 722, 726). On the legal proceedings between the Buszynskis and the Bajbowus, and the transactions of Jan Zamoyski with the Buszynskis regarding Busza alias Zdzieław in 1585-1644, see AGAD: Archiwum Zamoyskich, sig. 2680 (originals and copies of documents in Polish, Latin and Ruthenian, pp. 1-84). See also CDIAUK: F. 256, op. I [Zamoyscy], spr. 60 (the Buszynski family file, here among others, f. 57-58v [Ruthenian original], and f. 59-60v [Polish copy] document dated on 6 June 1597 at Bratslav a case brought by Zamoyski’s plenipotentiary against the Buszynskis in connection with the aforementioned transaction of 1589). See as well Chapter 6/C/3: 319 and note 159, p. 319.
service.\textsuperscript{92} It is highly probable that the endowments made to the Słupica family were likewise rewards for military defence services against Tartar raids.

Coming back to the document of our interest, the next individual, Hawrylo (Havrilo) Hłuski (Głuski), was the provisional tenant of Bratslav, recorded in this office (probably temporarily) in 1508-09, as a deputy for the absent starost, Prince Constantine Iwanowicz Ostrogski. Hłuski’s testimonial probably had a double purpose. First of all, he was the representative of the starost, whose duty was to officially approve the conveyance. He might have also appeared as the envoy of Ostrogski, who was closely related to the Czartoryskis (see Fedor Michajłowicz) through the Princess Sanguszkówna.\textsuperscript{93}

Finally, there was Lord Korotki, a representative of the nested gentry of Bratslav, who appeared as a witness for Ładyżyński. The Korotko alias Korotki family held a vast stretch of land on both banks of the River Boh near the confluences of the Rivers Sielnica and Sob. In the mid-16\textsuperscript{th} century the country town of Ładyżyn was located at its central point. By the close of the century the Korotki estate numbered some 30 settlements and was referred to as a “fortune”\textsuperscript{94}. According to Jabłonowski the Korotkos probably acquired Ładyżyń by purchasing it from the Ładyżyńskis.\textsuperscript{95} However, the personal


\textsuperscript{93} Hrehory (Grigorij) Hluski (Głuski), as Starost of Bratslav is known only from two accounts. \textit{De facto} most probably he was only temporary replacement in the Bratslav starosty of its current Starost Prince Constantine Iwanowicz Ostrogski. One is the document of our interest and second the letter of Ostrogski drawn in Ostrog on 6 August 1508? (The year date illegible), written to him regarding the sales of Plisków estate to Semen Koszka by Roman Ładyżyński (APKr.: ASang., vol. I/24). In this period Ostrogski once again (after his return from the Moscow captivity, where he stayed captive from 14 July 1500 to August 1507) took over his starostial duties (1507-16), until he resigned on behalf of Prince Roman Andriejewicz Sanguszko, his brother-in-law’s son. Andrzej, father of Prince Roman replaced Constantine Ostrogski in the Bratslav Starosty in 1500-04, and of most likely also temporarily in 1507/08, during the absence of his son, the formal plenipotentiary. See NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{94} See Chapter 5/B/6a: 266-73.

\textsuperscript{95} On 11 January 1596 a sales contract dated on 30 June 1595 was written down in the Vinnytsia castle judicial books. As it becomes clear from its text Hrehory Olechnowicz Korotki sold to Prince Janusz Zbaraski, the then Voivode of Bratslav his inherited settlements in the Bratslav voivodeship: Bohusza (Bohusze), Michałowce (Michałkowce), Strumiatynce (Strelatyńce), Katarzyn, Kołaszyński, Nakiszynce (Skaszymyce) together with half of the grounds in Stawy and Hniła Ruda and Besedki, which had been bought earlier from Roman Ładyżyński. The contract was for 200 kopas Lithuanian grosz “counting each grosz of 10 of white coins (Pol. pieniędzy białych), and one kopa of 60 grosz”. However, the other shareholders of the
identity of the Lord (*pan*) Korotki is hard to determine. It might have been Danilo, or maybe one of his sons, Bohusz or Olechno. The conditions of the endowment, and especially the sum of the deposit (Pol. *zaręka*), make it quite plain that the parties concerned were members of wealthy families. In view of the general context and the Słupica family connections with the Krasnosielskis and Korotkis, we may assume that Stecko acted as a witness for Ładyżyński, although soon there would be new bonds of legal testimonials associating the Słupicas with their neighbours - the Koszka family. Stecko's mention in this company shows that by this time (the early 16th century) the family's position had stabilised and ranked pretty high up the social and assets ladder.

One of the persons named in the document, which mentions Zdan Słupica [III/2], was Jan (Ivan) Žabokrzycki, son of Isaij, married to Maria, one estates enumerated in the contract raised a protest against this deal, since at the time of sale the estates had not been divided yet. In turn Korotko obliged himself, that in the course of next 10 years, beginning with the transaction date „on a simple word of Prince Zbaraski is to turn up and fulfil the [judicial] duties”, as it was stated in the contract. This fact was to play a part later in the unfavourable for other participants division of the Korotkos' fortune. On the same day (11 January 1596) in Vinnitsia a second sales contract concluded between Prince Zbaraski and Hrehory Olechnowicz was written down in the judicial books. This time it concerned the settlements of: Tryizby, Michałówka, Szurutow, Supiatow and Ładyżyn on Sob and Boh Rivers together with uncultivated lands (Pol. *uroczyszcza*; usually situated in the middle of forests) of Woronowa Łuka and Kijowiec, which were sold for 400 *kopas* Lithuanian grosze (ZDz., 1894 20: 120-21). The reason behind both transactions was most probably the complete devastation of the many of these settlements due to the Tartars’ raids. In the letter addressed to Prince Zbaraski, Ivan Samczyński wrote that Korotki „because of Tartar intrusions [was] pretty badly impoverished in his property” (Trusiewicz, 1870: 303-04; ZDz., 1894 20: 120: here Bohusza, Michałkowce, Strelatyce, Kośaszyniec, Skaszyńce, Hnita Ruda and Biesiadki).

Bohus Danilowicz married to Princess Zbaraska (this is why part of estates was sold to the Zbaraskis in 1595), with whom he had three daughters, among which: Ducha Bohuszaówna married to Juchno Krasnosielski (see Chapter 5/B/6a: 267, 273 and notes), and Marusza, wife of Roman Zytynski (see Chapter 5/B/6a: 267, 273 and notes). Ducha and Juchno Krasnosielski had the sons: Danilo, Michał, Dimitr and Hrehory, and the daughter Eudoksja (Owdotia) married later to Semen Bohdanowicz Słupica [V/1] (Trusiewicz, 1870: 305, 308-10). Marusza in turn had the unknown by name son and two daughters. Of daughters the one unknown by name married to Kondrat Kozar, the castle judge of Bratslav, and the second Katarzyna to a certain Poloczyn (Boniecki, 1908 12 part 1: 46; Trusiewicz, 1870: 305). The son of Olechno was the above-mentioned Hrehory, who deceased childless (Trusiewicz, 1870: 303, 304, 308). Wolff does not enumerate any Korotkówna being a wife of any of the Zbaraskis. It is possible, however, that he made a mistake and it went of Prince Janusz’s mother – the first wife of Prince Mikolaj Audirowicz, who is referred to by the same author after Niesiecki (Niesiecki, Kasper. 1839-46. *Herbarz polski* <Niesiecki> Bobrowicz, Jan Nepomucen (ed.) (10 vols.) Leipzig: n.p. (Reprint). 1979. Warsaw, here 1845 10: 117) as “kniahinii [Princess]” Koziczanka alias Kozech [Kozika] (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 616).

Of some interest was here a condition, which stated that if any of parties involved would break the agreement, being found guilty of breaking the contract it would have to pay to the King 50 *kopas*, while the witnesses of transaction would be forced to pay 20 *kopas* of Lithuanian groszs each. Thus, if such a situation had to happen, Koszka and his descendants were to be paid 30 *kopas* each. (APKr.: ASan., t. 1/24).
of Juchno Semenowicz Koszka's sisters. Like several of his relatives including his brother Dachno, Ivan chose a military career and rendered distinguished service in the defence of the marches against the Tartars. In

98 It was this Koszka and his mother Anna whose legal proceedings related to property transactions was attended by Bohusz Słupica [III/3] in 1516. He was also present in another case involving Koszka and his sisters and brothers-in-law in 1521. Ivan Żabokrzysi had two brothers Dachno and Vasil. The latter of whom was the first on record following the Polish-Lithuanian Union of 1569 to bear the title of Military curator (Pol. wojski, Lat. tribunus) of Bratslav. In 1574 Vasil (8 January-June) was also the first person to be recorded carrying the title of Bratslav military curator (Pol. wojski) (Litwin, 2000: 210). On 9 November 1559 the sons of Isaac and Maria née Koszczanka: Vasil, Ivan and Dachno wrote down into the Lithuanian Metraca acts the privilege issued to them, after the Bratslav District judicial books had been burned down by Tartars. The deed confirmed their hereditary rights to the perpetual ownership of the Żabokrzysi estate and its adjacencies based on landed law (CDIAUK: F. 36, spr. 5, f. 12).

The Żabokrzysi family of the Ulatucki arms came to Bratslavschyna from Volhynia (see below note 99, p. 111-12), where in the Powiat of Kremenets their family nest, Zabokrzyski was founded. Plewczyński, making reference to the Bartosz Paprocki's armorial and the presence of Polish names in the family, suggests that the Żabokrzysi might have came to Volhynia from the Crown territories, in particular from the Łęczyca Voivodeship [Greater Poland] most probably in the 15th century (Plewczyński, Marek. 1995. W służbie polskiego króla. Z zagadnien struktury narodowościowej Armii Koronnej w latach 1500-1574 <Plewczyński>. Monografie, No. 29 Siedlce: n.p. 250 and note 222). In the Pobozhe area there was the village Żabokrzysk, situated on the river Dochna, close to Bratslav, which was the family nest of the Bratslav branch of the Żabokrzysi. In the survey of 1545, similarly to the Mornils (see below note 100, p. 112), they were counted among the “lesser” (Pol. podlejsci) noblemen (ZDz., 1877 6: 118, 1897 22: 104, 540, 630-31). In 1569, while the military register (Pol. popis) of the landlords of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia Powiats were to be made, the Bratslav landlords brothers Vasil, Ivan and Dachno the Żabokrzysi appeared in front of the royal commissioner (ZDz., 1894 20: 101), and on 16 June they took an oath to the Polish-Lithuanian union of Lublin (Plewczyński, 1995: 75 and note on 254). The assumption that they were sons of Isaac is based on documentation concerning Vasil, in which he was recorded as “royal landlord of Bratslav” (Pol. siemianin hospodarski braclawski) with the patronymic Isajewicz (son of Isaac). On 9 January 1574, being sick and childless Vasil Isajewicz confirmed to his ward and servant Pietruszko his legacy of 19 November 1572, which was a reward for Pietruszko’s long-lasting faithful service. The Vasil’s legacy concerned the estate of Kobyle (the landed property situated between royal grounds and the ones belonging to Kondrat Kozar, castle judge of Bratslav) that he had purchased together with a half of the Udycz Lake. The act was written down in Bratslav, in the house (city manor) of Vasil in the presence of the Bratslav deputy starost (Pol. podstarości, Lat. subcapitaneus) Lew Lasota. In this document Vasil laid down the condition that neither his wife, nor his brothers and nephews should have questioned his legacy (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 241, doc. 3, f. 5-6; extracts of the same document from the Vinnytsia castle judicial books dated on 13 November 1621 and 21 August 1778). From another source, it is well known that Żabokrzysi bought Kobyle and half of the Lake of Udycz on 4 July 1565 at Bratslav from Jan Juchnowicz Koszka (on these properties see above note 89, pp. 106-07). The latter decided to sell his hereditary village with half of the lake for 15 kopas Lithuanian groszs „counting of 10 Coins in one grosz” soon after the property division he had made with his brother Andriy Juchnowicz Koszka [see below note 119, p. 120] (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 242, doc. 4, f. 7-8v; as above, extracts from the Vinnytsia grod books dated on 13 November 1621 and 21 August 1778). On 5 August 1599 in the Castle of Vinnytsia a case brought by Jakub Rotkiewicz against Ivan Żabokrzysi was heard. Rotkiewicz claimed the third part of the following villages: Żabokrzys, Bobrow, Solhutow and Hwozdow, which had been donated to Rotkiewicz in the last will of the late Vasil, Ivan’s brother (ZDz., 1896 21: 415, digest).

99 Żabokrzysi Jan (Ivan) alias Iwaszko of Żabokrzysi appeared first on the rally of 1545 as powietnik (a landlord belonging to certain Powiat) of the Powiat of Lutsk in Volhynia. He
turn, Bohdan Markowicz Mormil, another individual named in the document, represented a family related to the Meleszkos. Ivan Jermolajewicz, later the guardian of the children of Semen Bohdanowicz Słupica [V/1], was a member of this family.100

According to the popis (surveys) documentation of 1545 for Bratslav and Vinnysia Castles, the Żabokrzycki family were tenants of the settlement Bobrów (perhaps Bobryk on the Kodyma River, which was held by Isaij Żabokrzycki), part of the lands belonging to Bratslav Castle. Hence it is reasonable to assume that this family, too, was in the group of landed gentry endowed with estates from the former volost’ of Bratslav. Isaij Żabokrzycki, along with Bohdan Słupica [IV/1] and Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, were joint proprietors of the first of a series of horodnia defence structures within the walls of Bratslav Castle.101 The Żabokrzycki are reputed in 1602 to have sold part of the villages Torków and Jurkowiec (Jurkowce) in the Boh Valley, near the source of the Sielnica and adjoining Żabokrzyz, their ancestral seat in the

entered the Crown military service in 1553 as towarzysz (comrade) in the cavalry detachment of the so-called ambient defence troops. Afterwards he served in the Powiat of Lutsk levy with an 8-horses retinue (7 of husarze – heavy cavalry) under the banner and in the company of Stanisław Struś. Together with his brother Dachno he kept as well a horodnia edifice in the Castle of Lutsk. As his two villages lied down on the border area of two of the Volhynian Powiats, he kept also a separate horodnia in Kremenets. On the popis (military revue) in 1565 he posted from Żabokrzyki 2 horseman and 2 so-called putni (servant) boyars. In 1567 the widow of Ivan, lady Iwanowa Żabokrzycka managed to post only 1 Cossack (Plewczyński, 1995: 29, 56, 59, 62, 75, 249-50, 254 and corresponding notes). Żabokrzycki Dachno of Żabokrzyki, brother of Ivan also appeared on the rally of 1545 as powietnik from the Powiat of Lutsk. He entered the Crown service in 1548 as towarzys of a cavalry detachment active in the ambient defence structure. He started with the retinue consisting of 2 bowmen and 1 Cossack, but already in 1549 all his retinue fought as heavy cavalry (Pol. husaria, he served “po husarsku”). Dachno served from Volhynia with 3-horses retinue until 1550, subsequently in the companies of hetmans (commanders-in-chief) Mikołaj Sieniawski and Hieronim Lanckoroński (Plewczyński, 1995: 55, 59, 62, 75, 78, 249-250, 254 and notes). Other Żabokrzycki family members in the Crown Army were: Maciej of Żabokrzyki, towarzysz in the cavalry troops of the ambient defence in 1537/38, who served with Stanisław Żabokrzycki in the cavalry companies of Wojciech Starzechowski and Stanisław Dobrosołowski. Fedor of Żabokrzyki, towarzysz most probably also in cavalry troops of the ambient defence as powietnik from the Powiat of Lutsk, was present on the rally of 1545; Jacek Żabokrzycki of Horodyszcze, towarzysz in the cavalry troops (?) of the ambient defence, who owned two horodnia edifices in Lutsk, but was himself powietnik of Kremenets (Plewczyński, 1995: 62, 250 and notes 222-24).

100 The Mormils alias Mormile (Mormule, Mormuly) represented the family of Turkic descent (ZDz., 1897 22: 108). In 1545 they were counted among „Jeser“ landlords of the Bratslav district, the so-called potużnicy (ZDz., 1877 6: 118, 1897 22: 540). Jabłonowski described them as being the only example in the whole of Bratslavshchyna of the family commonly administering all its estates (the so-called siarbiostwo), an act explainable by their nomadic roots (ZDz., 1897 22: 646). See also Chapter 6/A/1: 278 note 3.

Another of the enumerated families, the Mormil, owned Ziatkowce on the River Kublicz, Żerdenowce (Żerdenówka), which was nearer the River Sob, and Kuźmińce on the Sob. They also had their own horodnia in Bratslav Castle. In 1609, according to the record dated in Vinnytsia on 18 May (the extract’s date), Bohdan, Roman, and Tychno the Mormils, grandsons of Eudoksia née Kożuchowska, delimited the boundary between their portions in properties in three villages, in proceedings where the other party was Iwan Meleszko, the legal guardian of Semen Słupica’s sons. Iwan Meleszko was also a grandson of Kożuchowska, and earlier (1606) had held portions in the same properties, which had passed to him from his grandmother. Finally, the village of Mormilec alias Mormilówka is to be identified with Mormulewka on the Roś River.


Bohusz [III/3] is one of the better-documented individuals in the Słupica family. The information from the sources illustrate his family and
neighbourhood connections, as well as his public activities. The earliest record is dated 1516, and the next one 1521. Again with Bohusz it is not certain who his immediate ancestor was. But since there are two other contemporary members of the family cited in the documents, Bohdan Iwanowicz (son of Ivan) [VI/1], and Hrehory Bohuszewicz (son of Bohusz) [IV/3], we may assume that Bohusz was either the paternal uncle or first cousin of Bohdan. He was definitely the father of Hrehory known as Ždan [IV/3] and a girl named Ždanna [IV/4], who married Roman Krasnosielcki. There is no information on Bohusz’s wife.

On 15 June 1516 at Vinnytsia the Bratslav gentlewoman and tenant Anna, widow of Semen Koszka, “by permission of His Lordship Prince Roman Andrzejewicz [son of Andrzej, Sanguszko], the Hospodar’s Starost for Bratslav and Vinnytsia,” next to whom were to be found “pan Bohusz [Słupica], Prince Roman’s Jego Msci [His Excellency] official in Vinnytsia”, alienated to her son Juchno Semenowicz (son of Semen) the perpetual rights to his paternal and maternal estates in the Powiat of Bratslav. The estates in question were the village of Koszkow and three parts of the village of Rohozna alias Worobijowce (so after Gorczak). The witnesses to the deed, apart from Lord

106 This document is known from its edition by Gorczak, and also from the transcript in the Koszka summary digest of charters and deeds, thanks to which the inaccuracies of the printed version could be corrected (ASangGorczak, 3 (1432-1534), 222-23, no. 170 = ASang., t. 1/24). In accordance with an entry in the summary of the Koszkas Anna resigned to her son half of the village Worobijowce (Worobijówka), half of the village of Szpików together with their settlements and with people in the cities of Bratslav and Vinnytsia what in total constituted his paternal inheritance. Moreover Anna resigned on Juchno’s behalf, the third part of her own paternal inheritance, the village of Rohozna „coz się zowią Worobijówkę” [which is to be called Worobijówka], pointing to the fact that after her death her children would have to divide among themselves two parts in Czeremoszne, Ihnatowace and Falków. Therefore, Juchno was in possession of the third part of paternal estates with the right to repurchase missing parts from his sisters and from Vasil Obodeński (APKr.: ASang., t. 1/24). Under this deed Juchno also received his mother’s permission to redeem the remaining portions of his patrimony from his three sisters and Anna’s grandson, Vasil Romanowicz Obodeński, on condition that he provided care and maintenance for her for life. Juchno’s sisters enumerated in the deed, the Ladies Owdotia Jakowiecka, Maria Isajowa, and Milochna Zialowska (his half-sister, Anna’s daughter by an earlier marriage), were already married to Wańko Jakowiecki, Isaj Żabokrzyski, and Fedor Ziałowski respectively. The identity of Juchno Semenowicz’s sisters and the grandson of Anna Worobijanka (from her first marriage to Hrycjo Obodeński) in her second marriage Semenowa Koszczyna’s can be determined based on the documents already quoted above and those to be quoted below, as well as on the basis of the aforementioned genealogy (APKr.: ASang., t. 115/49). The majority of these acts were written down to the Koszka’s summary in their full versions. On 16 February 1523 at Vinnytsia the Bratslav landlord Vasil Romanowicz (son of Roman) Obodeński gave to his paternal uncle Juchno Semenowicz Koszka, his share in the estates inherited from his
Bohusz Slupica, were Krzysztof Kmietc [Kmitycz], Iwaszko Frusowicz, Ivan Dubicki, Iwaszko Łankowicz (Sankowicz?), and the Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia himself, Prince Roman Andriejewicz Sanguszko, who acted as guarantor of the transaction.  

107 deceased father the villages of Czeremoszna, Ichnatowce and Falków. In return Koszka agreed to pay his mother a dowry as she had decided to take a veil and enter a nunnery in Kyiv. Vasil’s mother being already a widow decided to become a nun in Kyiv (“do Świętej Przeczystey Pieczarskiego Monasteru w Czernicy”), but her son was not able to pay back her dowry. In the case of not fulfilling the contract conditions the party guilty was to pay to the King 200 kopas, and to the current Bratslav Starost 100 kopas Lithuanian grosze. The witnesses of the act were: the current Vinnytsia Plenipotentiary starost on behalf of Prince Constantine Ostrogski - Marcin Zbunicki (NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A), Vinnytsia landlords Olechno Suprunowicz [Mikulinski] and Vasil Packowicz, “Ivan, a monk in the Vinnytsia Orthodox Spaski Monastery” and „Pisarz Daszko Diak Winnicki” [Daszko <Dashko>, a notary and diak (psalmist) at Vinnytsia, of high probability in the same Spaski Monastery]. Two months later, on 17 April at Vinnytsia, Vasil’s mother – Milochna, daughter of Hrycko Obodeński and Anna in hers first marriage Semenowa Koszyczna, widow of Fedor Zialowski gave the mentioned above villages that were her maternal inheritance to her stepbrother Juchno Semenowicz Koszka. This time the witnesses were: Kuźma Antonowicz „będą na ten Czas od Xięcia Konstantyna JegomoSci Urzqdnik Winnicki” [at this time from His Highness Prince Constantine appointed Vinnytsia official] (see NykielBratslavStarost, 2004: Appendix A), Lords Vasil Szandyrowski and Ivan Woynikowicz Berdyczowski, and Vinnytsia burgers Miśko Perekhabicz and Paszyna Krawiec. „Daszko Sosoński, Xiążejca Jegomości Diak Winnicki” [Daszko <Dashko> Sosonski, His Highness Prince (Constantine Ostrogski) diak in Vinnytsia <most probably also of the Spaski Monastery>] wrote down the act. See above note 90, pp. 107-08. On 14 September 1525 at Kozłów Owdotia (Piódksja) Semenówna Koszyczna Waśka Jakowicka (married to Waśko Jakowicki) in the presence of her husband sold to her brother Juchno Semenowicz for 50 kopas Lithuanian groszes (of „pulgroszkowe” <half-groszs> Lithuanian groszs) her parts in maternal estates in Czeremoszne, Ichnatowce and Falków, and in the city of Bratslav. The witnesses this time were: Bohdan Michajłowicz Zahorowski, Prince Ivan Michajłowicz Różyński and the Lords Waśko Bielikowicz Kozłowski and Semen Lachowski.  

Krzysztof Kmietc is without any doubts Krzysztof Kmita alias Kmitycz, Tenant of Czernobyl (Chernobyl) in 1523, military commander in Kyivan territories in 1524, Tenant of Ovruch (Pol. Ovrucz) in 1534-47, Starost of Vinnytsia in 1542, who died ca. 1552 (See NykielBratslavStarost, 2004: Appendix A). See also below note 138, p. 128; Iwaszko Frusowicz was a member of the Frus alias Chrus family deriving its roots from the Land of Pinsk in Lithuania, who at the beginning of the 16th century had already settled down in Kyiv territories. Here, in 1510 Strymiatycze near Tyypol, and later on also other estates, mainly on the Roś and Pryęć Rivers and in vicinity of Czernobyl belonged to them (ZDz., 1897 22: 615). On the right bank of Dnipro the Fruss possessed Roczyc and Kozarowicze on the Dnipro (ZDz., 1897 22: 152). See Andrzej Frus Vinnytsia’s burgher, below note 112, p. 118; Ivan Dubicki was husband of Anastazja of the Kmitycz family (see above). According to the AYZR editors, royal commissioners delimited some of the Vinnytsia district hereditary estates from the grounds belonging to the Vinnytsia municipality in 1530. Among the hereditary owners of the grounds was Anastazja of the Kmitycz family Lady Iwanowa Dubicka (married to Ivan Dubicki, sister of Semen Kmitycz, who acted in this conflict as plenipotentiary to the Dubickis). In the document published in AYZR collection the Vinnytsia burgiers denied endowments from Prince Semen Pronski made to the Kmitycz and Dubicki families in the period when he was the Starost in Vinnytsia and Bratslav. As the same act mentioned Juchno Koszka as being already dead, one has to assume that the document under consideration had to be written down not in 1530, under which date it has been published, but in 1540 (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 13: here the date 25 May 1530. In this period the Starost was still Prince Ilia Ostrogski. Thus, the burghers could not question the endowments made by Pronski). It is probable, that Anastazja was the same Lady Dubicka, who in 1545 owned two horodnias in the Castle of Vinnytsia, one of which was built by the villagers of her Kamienohorka estate (ZDz., 1877 6: 115
On 17 June 1521 at Bratslav Maria Isajowa Żabokrzycka, attended by her husband Isaij Żabokrzycki, alienated to her brother Juchno her portion in the estate of her mother Anna Semenowa Koszczyna, that is, her part of the villages Czeremoszna, Ichnatowce, and Falków, for a sum of 20 Lithuanian grosze (in accordance with a provision made in the above discussed act).

Similarly to the previous deed mentioned, there are two versions of this document. The parties agreed on a deposit of 100 Lithuanian groszs payable to the Prince [Roman A. Sanguszko] should any of their descendants decide to rescind the transaction they had just contracted. This time the witnesses were Michno Jakubowicz (titled Starost of Bratslav, but actually provisional deputy starost on behalf of Prince Constantine Ostrogski), Kuźma Antonowicz titled Starost of Vinnytsia (holding this office by appointment from the same Prince

On 7 October 1585 this deed was presented in the obłata register in the Grod (Castle) of Lutsk by Juchno’s son Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, who leased part of his patrimonial estates to Prince Constantine Ostrogski on a 15-year lease for the sum of 60,000 Lithuanian grosz. Oblata (entry) registered on 7 October 1585 at Lutsk. Oblata (entry) registered on 7 October 1585 at Lutsk. Separately Ivan Juchnowicz gave for registration to the judicial books a summary digest of different charters and deeds of the Koszka family in 1494-1585. This is one of most interesting sources to the history in this period (APKr.: ASang., t. 1/24), together with the above quoted document (= ASangGorczak, 3, 208-09, no. 217). Information on the time span of the lease was to be found in the other summary of the Koszka family deposited in AGAD in Warsaw under the title: „Sumariusz dokumentów [Koszków] w Sprawie Granicznej z Strzyłczyami y Pieczary etiam Dziedzictwa Dobr probuujących lubo według Kategori wlożonych, jednak ordine Actum posobie idących, a do Fascikulu No. 2 do należących (AGAD: Zbiór Czołowskiego, sig. 650, f. 124). Two years after the conveyance, Juchno Semenowicz and his mother obtained a royal privilege issued in Cracow on 29 July 1518, confirming Juchno’s right to the perpetual freehold of his mother’s sieliszcze (settlement) Rohozna, and Plisków, a property his father had purchased from Ladyżynski and his wife. It is highly probable that on this day mother and son presented the deed of 15 June 1516 to Sigismund I for royal endorsement (AGAD: Zbiór dokumentów pergaminowych (the parchment collection), sig. 6790 [old sig. no. 58 “BOZ 370”]; parchment, original in Ruthenian script; damaged). The possibility of presenting the deed of 15 June 1516 to the King may be confirmed, apart from its content, by the following lines: „with signature and seal of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia Starost Prince Roman Andrejewicz [Sanguszko] and of other good people”. The witnesses to royal endorsement were Lithuanian officials, Land Marshal and Tenant (Plenipotentiary Starost) of Słonim Prince Jan [Ivan] Mikolajewicz Radziwiłł and Land Treasurer (Pol. podskarbi) and Starost of Kowno Awram Jezorowicz.

Similarly to the quoted above, this document was written down (obłata) on 7 October 1585 at Lutsk. See second summary of the Koszkas (AGAD: Zbiór Czołowskiego, sig. 650, f. 124).
Ostrogski), and the landed gentlemen Bohusz Słupica of Bratslav and Olechno Suprunowski [Mikuliński] of Vinnytsia.  

On the grounds of these documents one may assume that the signatory of 1516, “the Lord Bohusz, official of Vinnytsia to His Highness Prince Roman” was the same individual as the Bohusz Słupica who signed the 1521 document. The hypothesis is not justified exclusively on the grounds of Bohusz appearing on these deeds as a servant (client) of Sanguszko. His mention on the document of 1521 immediately following the “masters” of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, who held their offices by appointment from Ostrogski, Sanguszko’s uncle, also suggests such an interpretation. Tychon Słupica [II/2] had been in the retinue of Vasyl Sanguszcowicz, Prince Roman’s grandfather. Bohusz Słupica was a servant of the latter’s descendant, and even acted as the young Sanguszko’s provisional plenipotentiary in Vinnytsia, which is how the information in the deed should be read. Thus, by this time the Słupicas had established a firm association with the Princes Sanguszko, and Bohusz himself must have enjoyed a considerable amount of Prince Roman’s confidence. Bohusz’s period as deputy to Sanguszko may well have been connected with Sanguszko’s absence due to yet another anti-Tartar expedition. In July and autumn of 1516 there were two incursions into Ruthenia and Podolia by the

---

109 The act was to be written down by Oysym pop “Pokrowski” [Orthodox priest of the Pokrova Monastery]. There is no doubt Oysym was an Orthodox priest in the St. Pokrova [Maria] Monastery at Bratslav; Michno Jakubowicz Starost of Bratslav on behalf of Prince Constantine Ostrogski in 1521 (NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A). In 1545 he owned two horodnia edifices in the Castle of Vinnytsia and villages of the Vinnytsia Castle voïvodship: Semakow [Siemaków], Machnowce and Nowosielica (ZDz., 1877 6: 109, 110, 116); Kuźma Antonowicz, the Starost of Vinnytsia on behalf of the same Prince was recorded in the sources in the period from 17 June 1521 to 17 April 1523 (NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004; Appendix A); Olechno Suprunowski [Mikuliński] of high probability is to be identified with unknown by name Mikuliński of Suprunow, who in 1545 leased his horodnia in the Castle of Vinnytsia and Suprunow estate to a certain Babiński. He might have been identified as well to the mentioned in the same document Olechno Mikuliński, the owner of a horodnia, which had been built up from his Mikulin estate, and with the owner of Poczapińce. The popis (military revue and register) of 1545 mentions also a lease by one of the Mikulinskiis of the village of Nowosiółka to Dimitr Krasnosielksi (ZDz., 1877 6: 110, 113, 116). The same Olechno as Suprunowicz witnessed in 1523 the resignation letter of Vasyl Romanowicz Obońckski on behalf of his paternal uncle Juchno Semenowicz Koszka (see above note 90, pp. 107-08). The name Suprunowski came from the village of Suprunów with which Suprun Iwanowicz, the son of Ivan Bohdanowicz Mikuliński has been endowed (SłownikGeogr., 1887 VIII: 353 [Poczapińce]). See note A/2: note 77, pp. 89-90.

110 Prince Roman obtained the right to act as plenipotentiary on 23 January 1516. He was the favourite of his uncle Constantine Ostrogski, who performed the duties of grand hetman (the military commander-in-chief) and would take him on all his expeditions against Muscovy and the Tartars.
Crimean Tartars, which mobilised most of the Polish forces in the region. Roman Sanguszko fought in both expeditions against them and fell in one of the battles around November 1517.\textsuperscript{111}

A few words need to be said about Bohusz's testimonials on the documents relating to Juchno Semenowicz Koszka and his son Ivan. Juchno was recorded in 1518 as a courtier to the king. In 1531 he had a manor house (Pol. \textit{dwór}) in Vinnytsia, bordering the house of Iwaszko, “\textit{swiaszczennik Spaski}” (a priest in the Eastern rite) and to the manor house of Maria Michalewna Komarówna, who was married to Fedor Trębačz, “courtier to His Highness [Konstanty Ostrogski]”. He witnessed one of the transactions of Komarówna his neighbour.\textsuperscript{112} Juchno died before 18 March 1552, when in turn Vasil Iwanowicz, son of Ivan Szabanowicz “\textit{Swiaszczennik y Kaplan} [Priest] of Great St. Nicholas’ Church in the Borough of Vinnytsia,” sold his house.\textsuperscript{113} On 7/25 August 1541 the Bratslav landowners Ivan Juchnowicz and his brother Andriet obtained in Vilnius royal confirmation of the validity of their father's

\textsuperscript{111}\textsuperscript{118} ASangGorczak, 1890 3: 223-24: here a detailed description of both Tartars’ raids and Polish preventive actions. See also above note 110, p. 117.

\textsuperscript{112} In July 1531 Komarówna sold her property to “Lord Michno Jakubowicz Starost of Vinnytsia.” Next Michał sold his house to one Jusza (Jursza?) Potapowicz, who in turn conveyed it on 5 November 1533 to Jurij Semenowicz Koszka, who thereby became the neighbour of Juchno Semenowicz Koszka. The contract was concluded on 6 July 1531 at Vinnytsia. Mrs. Trębačzowa, who was accompanied by her husband sold her manor house (\textit{dwór}) for „Trzy Kopy pieniędzy, y za Dziesięć pieniędzy” [three \textit{kopas} of money, and for 10 money <\textit{grosze}>], and took as payment from “His Lordship [Jakubowicz] for these three \textit{kopas} and for 10 grosz [which was] paid in \textit{Mośkie} and Kontryszowe cloth <\textit{Suknem Mośkim, y Kontryszowym}>”. The witnesses to this contract were: „Protopopa Bracławski i Winnicki Swiaszczennik Alexey Nikolski Winnicki” [Chief \textit{pop} of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, priest Alexey of the Vinnytsia St. Nicolas Monastery], Vinnytsia landlord Maciej Daszkowicz Korniłowicz, „Swiaszczennik Iwaszko Spaski Winnicki” [Iwaszko, priest <\textit{pop}> in the Vinnytsia Spaski Monastery] and Vinnytsiaburghers – Trocki and Andrij Trus (Frus?). See above Iwaszko Frus in note 107, p. 115. In a dozen or so months later (on 17 December 1532) Michno Jakubowicz sold his manor for “pulpiety Kopy groszey” [half feet of \textit{kopa groszs}] to an unidentified purchaser. The witnesses to this transaction were this time: \textit{pan} Szyszma, \textit{pan} [Fedor?] Kordysz and Vinnytsia’s bailiff (Pol. \textit{wojt}) Dedera. As it is evident from the next document the purchaser was Jusza Potapowicz and his wife Barbara. They in turn sold on 5 November 1533 to Jurij Semenowicz Koszka for 4 \textit{kopas} Lithuanian \textit{groszes} the manor house purchased from Michno Jakubowicz. On this occasion the witnesses were: Enya Kuźmić titled in the deed Vinnytsia Starost, in reality Plenipotentiary starost on behalf of Prince Ilia Ostrogski and Fedor Kordysz (APKr.: ASang., t. I/24).

\textsuperscript{113} In the same deed of conveyance the property’s location on Spaska [St. Mary's] Hill is described as “next to the house of the Late Lord Juchno Koszeczyc.” The purchaser was Juchno’s son, Ivan Koszka, who paid for it 8 \textit{kopas} Lithuanian \textit{groszes}. The seller emphasised that it (manor house and its intermediate surroundings) was not Church property, which meant that his nearest relatives had no legal rights to make any claims to it. The witnesses were this time: Borys Fedorowicz Jakuszynski, \textit{pan} Ivan [Łasko] Woronowicz, \textit{pan} Ichnat Kleszczowski – ducal (\textit{hospodarscy}) landlords of Vinnytsia (APKr.: ASang., t. I/24).
transaction. On the same day Sigismund I issued a charter to the Koszka brothers for the dwór (manor house) in Vinnytsia, the one Juchno had purchased from Jusza Potapowicz and his wife Barbara. Also the fact that Andriej Juchnowicz Koszka married Fetyianna Rohozińska is a relevant detail for developments to come.

In 1545 Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka held the property in the volost of Bratslav known as Czame around the confluence of the River Udycz, which “in olden times belonged to the Castle.” Prince Semen Proński, Starost of Bratslav ca. 1539-41 (officially until 1544) had been endowed with this property. On 9 January 1582 in Bratslav, the brothers Ivan and Andriej divided the estates they had inherited from their father Juchno between them. In the light of their grandfather Semen’s endowments and the efforts made by their father Juchno to integrate his patrimony and keep it intact, it is remarkable that soon afterwards (after 1582) Ivan and Andriej decided to alienate a considerable part of their ancestral estates to Constantine Ostrogski, which they accomplished in

114 The deed in question was Juchno’s purchase of the maternal portions in the estates of Czeremoszna, Ichnatowce, and Falków from his sisters Owdotia Semenówna Kosczanka wife of Wańko Jakowicki, Miłochna Hryckówna Obodeńska wife of Fedor Ziałowski, and Maria Semenówna Kosczanka wife of Isaij Zabokrzycka, and with Vasil Romanowicz Obodeński the grandson of Anna Semenówka Koszczyna. See above note 90, pp. 107-08.
115 APKr.: ASang., t. 1/24: here the date 25 August 1541 at Vilnius = AGAD: Zbior dokumentów pergaminowych (the parchment collection), sig. 6856 [old sig. “BOZ 436”] – parchment, original in Ruthenian script, here the date 7 August 1541 at Vilnius (related to the confirmation of the validity of Ivan and Andrew father’s transaction with his sisters, related to their maternal portions in Czeremoszna, Ichnatowce and Falków. In the collection catalogue estates erroneously described as: Czeremoszna, “Wygnatowce” and “Chwalkow”).
117 Yet, in the popis (military revue and survey) of 1545, Bratslav burgers made a compliant to the royal controller regarding Proński’s endowment on behalf of Ivan. They claimed there were no deeds and charters to persuade them on the rightfulness of the Starost’s privilege, because the latter acted „z welkoiu szkodoiu zamku hospodarskiego” [with the great harm to the royal castle], meaning that he deprived them from the right to fishing in the only lake in the castle’s environs (ZDz., 1877 6: 123). In his own defence against the accusations of the townsfolk and magistrate of Bratslav discrediting validity of this endowment, Koszka claimed that King Sigismund I had confirmed it in a royal charter. Also in Vinnytsia Castle with one Sasin Ivan jointly maintained a horodnia (ZDz., 1877 6: 109).
118 About this division, known to us only through later digests one may deduce, that it was a proportional division and that the pond in Worobijowce on Bielildwka River constituted Andrew’s portion. While Ivan got the pond called „Nizny“ (Lower) on the same river (AGAD: Zbior Czołowskiego, sig. 650, f. 124; APKr.: ASang., t. 115/49 – here no date offered). On 16 February 1583 Andriej presented a description of his inheritance to the oblota register in the grod at Vinnytsia. In this document Rohozna and Worobijowce are described to be separate villages, contrary to the earlier records (AGAD: Zbior Czołowskiego, sig. 650, f. 124 [digest]). The issue of the identity of Rohozna and Worobijówka, situated on both banks of the Boh River, would reappear from this point onwards in the successive family divisions.
The reason for their decision were the continuous Tartar incursions (1497, 1500-15), especially the foray of September 1551 by the entire Crimean Horde into Bratslav, which I shall return to later in greater detail. As a result of these recurrent invasions their property was left completely devastated and they were compelled to move permanently to Vinnytsia. This move gave rise to a

1585. The reason for their decision were the continuous Tartar incursions (1497, 1500-15), especially the foray of September 1551 by the entire Crimean Horde into Bratslav, which I shall return to later in greater detail. As a result of these recurrent invasions their property was left completely devastated and they were compelled to move permanently to Vinnytsia.

On 7 October 1585 in the grod of Lutsk Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, Bratslav land (Pol. ziemski) judge brought to register in the local castle books an account of Beadle (Pol. woźny, Lat. tribunus) of the Voivodeship of Bratslav, Dimitr Szczekiczyński. The account dated on 16 July 1585 concerned the establishment (Pol. wwiązanie) of Prince Constantine Ostrogski, Kyiv Voivode and Marshal of Volhynia into the estates sold to him by Koszka. Initially the transaction spoke of the 15-years period and the sum of 10,000 kopas Lithuanian groszs. The portions under consideration were in the hereditary estates inherited by Ivan Juchnowicz and his younger brother Andrije Juchnowicz. There were: village (Ruth. siolo) of Worobijowce with a manor house and following settlements (Ruth. sieliszcza): Czereemosz, Falków, Jahotowok, Ichnatowce, Derepcyzn, Rohozenia, Poczapce, Michałowce, Holoisko, Stryjej, Oharów, Plisków, Chaniew, Dzosome, Oszytków, Wowczok, Oleksyjew, Hubin, Tetyjew, Palczoków, Michałowce, Kuźnica and Zemenyka with adjacencies. The sale comprised also the Koszkas’ villein subjects (Pol. poddani ciągli – the ones obliged to perform their corvée service with their horses or oxes) in Vinnytsia – 28, and in Bratslav – 3, as well as ponds belonging to both brothers in Falków, near Szpików and in Plisków. The official act of establishment took place in Koszka’s manor house in Worobijowce in the presence of Bratslav landed gentry: Olechno Daszkowski, Matiasz Ziałowski, Dimitra Szandyrowski and Andrzej Juszkowski. Earlier, however, delimitation of borders had been carried out (for which both sides delegated their representatives), as described in detail in the blade’s account. Thanks to this one may identify the Koszkas neighbours in 1585: Prince Janusz Zbarski (Strzeleczynce and Ostrówek, Żywołów), the Żabokrzczyk (Terków and Żabokrzczyz), certain Ziałowski (the border on the Kuczman Hill until Łuka [meadow] Berezowska), one Kleszczowski (the border in the Lubiańczyk Forest, next on the Zwonica River, and on the Koszowski ground), certain Obodeński (bordering grounds on Hodorówka Wielka and Sob River), one Krasnosieński (bordering grounds on the Kożanka River near by the Kożanka Forest), Olesza Karnienohorski (the border on the Zornowski ground) and finally Juchno Krasnosieński (Obaczów, Oaharewic) and one Oratowski (bordering ground near the Siwkowe Grove) (APKr.: ASang., t. 130/5 = ASang., t. 119/12 – here regest of the description of the border lines and of the blade’s account; Urbański, Antoni. 1929. Memento kresowe <UrbańskiMemento>. Warsaw: n.p. (Reprint). 1991. Gdańsk: Oficyna Wydawnicza “Graf”. 12). On 6 August in the grod of Bratslav, most probably in accordance with the above-mentioned contract, a description of the borders of the Koszka (Koszczyne) family estates was presented to the oblata. Unfortunately, information in the digest is too vague. It is possible, however, to assume that, it was Ivan’s portion under discussion here. On 7 January 1590 upon the request of Constantine Ostrogski attending in person the transcript from the Lutsk land books of 1585 was written down in the land (Lat. terrestrial) books of Bratslav. It is not clear whether this transcript was related to the perpetual resignation of his portion by Andrije Koszka, or the 15-years lease from Ivan, as both of them registered their transactions with Ostrogski in the terrestrial office of Lutsk. At first Andrije resigned to Prince Constantine Ostrogski his portion in estates (the matter was an exchange of half of Krasne, for half of Szpików) on the basis of a contract written down in Lutsk on 7 October 1585. From the regest of this deed, it is clear as well that Ivan originally resigned his portion for 10 years. Soon afterwards, because of lack of resources Andrije decided to sell his portion perpetually to Ostrogski. The transaction took place on 6 October 1586 in the land office in Lutsk. Its transcript was transferred later to the Bratslav land books on 17 January 1590 (AGAD: Zbiór Czołowskiego, sig. 650, f. 124).

In accordance with the survey of 1552 most of the local nobles who survived the Tartars’ foray decided to move to Vinnytsia, where they have been waiting for the re-erection of the Castle of Bratslav. See below, B/5: 149.
second Koszka line, known as Koszka Strzyżowski (of Strzyżawka) named after the largest village in the environs of Vinnytsia. 121

Ivan Juchnowicz held the office of territorial judge for Bratslav in 1569-86, and died without issue ca. 1587. 122 Under Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki as Starost of Bratslav and Prince Fedor Andriejewicz Sanguszko in the Starosty of Vinnytsia, Ivan Koszka became the leader of the local landowners in disputes with the two starosts. He was sent several times by the local gentry to Sigismund Augustus in his capacity as Grand Duke and King with complaints against the unlawful conduct of the two Princes, and their infringements of the law, especially in regard to military service, division of spoils, and prisoners of war. He was on such missions to the King against Fedor Sanguszko in the mid-1540’s, and again in 1551. However, his missions did not bring the required results, and on 30 April 1552 after yet another refusal to take the field under the starost’s leadership, the landed gentry again sent him to the Grand Duke with another petition. 123 In 1566 or 1567 at the Sejm (Diet) of Grodno the envoys representing the Powiats of Bratslav and Vinnytsia (with Ivan Koszka among them) lodged another written complaint against Prince B.

---

121 On the Koszka Strzyżowscy see: NeimanKoszkowie, 1889: 532-47 and the article’s critical review: J. A. M. 1899. „Staraja Brachavszzchina i jeja Ludi” przez C. Nejmana,” Kwartalnik Historyczny 1899: 785. The best-known representative of the Strzyżowski line was Gnieznows Dimitrowicz [Koszka] Strzyżowski of Strzyżawka, Military curator (Pol. wojski, Lat. tribunus) of Vinnytsia in 1566-1609 (Litwin, 2000: 210: here as appointed before June 1574 until 13 May 1609). He is also an example of the disputes between the municipality and nobility of Bratslav and their starosts. Gnieznows took the municipality of Vinnytsia to court in litigation over the boundary of his hereditary village Strzyżawka. The case ended with a ruling issued on 25 May 1566 by the Starost Prince Bohusz F. Korecki, who had a new boundary drawn up to separate Strzyżawka from the municipal property (AYZR, 1890 VII/1: 259). Strzyżowski also brought proceedings against the Starosty of Vinnytsia for the delimiting of a boundary between Strzyżawka and the village of Mieziaków, an estate belonging to the Starosty, the inhabitants of which were systematically encroaching on his property. This dispute went back to the 1530s, when Dimitr Lechnowicz had been the owner of Strzyżawka, and Prince Ilia K. Ostrogski, Starost of Vinnytsia. Finally the royal commissioners who had come to delimit Voivodeships of Podolia, Kyiv and Bratslav resolved this case as well (AYZR, 1890 VII/1: 231). On 23/24 April 1570, in the presence of the interested parties, they marked out a new boundary between the two villages. See above Neiman, 1889: 540, 541-42 and the popis description of 1545 Vinnytsa Castle. It was then that the Vinnytsa townsfolk brought up the matter of the Starost’s enfeoffments of Juchno and Ivan the Koszka with the castle property (half of the village of Stawy) and the Lake Udyce at the Czarne confluence (ZDz., 1877 6: 123).

122 Litwin, 2000: 208 (1569 - 6 October 1586). The successor of Ivan became in 1590 Semen Obodeński.

123 Plewczyński, 1995: 74 and note 253. As the result of the boycott of the service in the defence structures conducted by Bratslav landed gentry due to its conflict with the Starost, in 1552 only one Michał Czeczel of the Powiat of Vinnytsia entered in cavalry troops.
Korecki. These activities of Ivan show that by the 1540’s the political sympathies of the Koszka had diverged from those of the Stupica family. The latter continued to be loyal servants to the Sanguszko and to the following starosts Semen Proński and Bohusz Korecki.

Deprived of the patronage of Roman Sanguszko, who died in 1517, Bohusz stepped out beyond the circle of starostial magistrates, not for a long though. In the meantime, according to his feudal responsibilities, he served “in the field and on the roads,” in the then efficiently working system of the so-called obrona potoczna (ambient defence), or more precisely in its cavalry units, acting in the defence structure of the Lithuanian forces (the so-called zastawa litewska). From a military point of view, the beginnings of an

124 AYZR, VIII/5: 155-57; See also Franyuk, Tetiana. 1927. “Vinnits’ka shliakhta v XVI v.,” Istoriychno-heohrafichni Zbirnyk 1: 23-31 here p. 29. One of the reasons for lack of firm reaction from the part of Royal Court was probably the fact that Korecki had the sum of 5000 kpas Lithuanian groszy secured against Vinnytsia. This money after the death of Prince Bohusz obliged himself to pay back to his successors, the next Starost Jurij Struś of Komárów (1579-1604). Ivan Koszka was an envoy also to the Sejm walny (General Diet) assembly in January 1580 (CDIAUK: MW, F. 389 op. 1, spr. 195 part 3, f. 230-231v. We are not able to determine beyond any doubts for how long Bohusz was Sanguszko’s plenipotentiary, and whether his assignment expired with the Prince’s death.

125 In general, border areas distinguished themselves by fortifications at key points on both sides of a not always clearly defined “border”. They were usually located in towns or smaller cities and villages, in the Ukraine (including Podolia) and were often privately owned. Numerous small strongholds and strong points like palanks in the Balkans or stanice and horodyszcza in the Ukraine were placed between these fortified points, often referred to as border fortresses, being defended by very small military units. The majority of these key points belonged to a state structure of ambient defence, while smaller ones were quite often in private hands. To a great extent, the same structure existed on the Ottoman side where the key fortifications were located in the seats of sancaks or lower officials responsible for a kaza or for a garrison of an area. On both sides of the border these infrequent castles were supposed to be part of an organised military system, subjected to an over-all commander, but in fact, they were under the control of local officers acting often on their own, with little control over the detachments responsible for smaller strongholds. The frontier society in the Balkans resembled the old gazi society as it was composed mainly of foot-loose warriors and not of regular military units, while in the Ukraine because of the wild steppe horsemen prevailed among these self-made warriors. In the Ottoman confines lived a relatively large number of converts or “loose” people who deserted from the Christian armies or flee from their villages, which calls in mind their Ukrainian counterpart, namely the Cossacks, but the presence of other nationalities, also from the Balkans was mentioned in documents (This issue was carefully studied by Plewczynski. He quotes for example a respectable group of Serb, Hungarian, Czech, Moravian and German origin officers in the units of the Crown Army, active in borderlands, especially in Podolia in the studied period from 1500 to 1574). In their behaviour they obeyed a kind of “frontier code” which was, in the Balkans, based on the gazi tradition and mixed with the local ones. In the Ukraine this “frontier code” was based on the Western European tradition of chevalier robbery mixed with the local one, which because of historical development had much to do with customs of Lithuanian origin. Long lasting confrontation between the Hungarians and Ottomans developed what Sugar (Sugar, Peter F. 1977. Southeastern Europe under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804. A History of East Central Europe, Vol. V, Seattle-London: n.p. 104-07) calls a border-guard mentality among Bosnians, Serbs, Hungarians, Romanians.

sejmiks (deities) of Piotrków (Greater Poland) and Warsaw of 1528-29 determined the number of units and their mode of service. This was presumably the time when the way these troops would be deployed was established, as it is shown in the popis registers for 1529-30. Most probably the final decision was taken after the tour of the marches by the Grand Hetman, Jan Tarnowski, ca. 1528/29. The scheme devised in that time was still in force after 1539, during Tarnowski’s second period in office as hetman, and following the accession to the office of Field Hetman (Pol. hetman polny) of Mikołaj Sieniawski, who would command the general defence cavalry for the next few years (until 1542?).

The Conscriptio custodie confinium dated 5 November 1529 gives a list of names of the individuals providing services as “guardians of the border” along with the location of their posts in the Bractslav area - a total of 25 men.

Wild Marshes and joining the Volhynian defense from the north, then displayed along the Dniester and its tributaries, which formed an alarm system; 2) The troops of immediate support in Podolia, dispersed between Kamenets’ and Khmelnyz under the command of the Castellan of Kamenets’, who traditionally was also a leader of noble forces of the so-called levy in mass; 3) The main forces in Red Rus’ (part of territory western from Podolia) in the area around Busko-Olesko-Załóżce with the chief commander of the ambient defense, who was obliged to keep there a fortified camp, hosting infantry troops and artillery, and to be in permanent touch with local commanders of the common defense and noble levy in mass. These forces refer to the Rus’ and Belz voivodes and Halych and L’viv starosts. Beginning from 1528, the area became more secure as borderland starosts and rotmistrzowie (captains of horse) began to perform offensive actions, often initiating raids into the Tartar-Ottoman borderlands. Their main goal was to secure the area between the mouths of the Dniester and Boh (Bog) in order to prevent future enemy intrusions; to seize booty and recapture the jasyr (captives). In short, their tactics consisted of four major points: 1) the reconnaissance of possible raids, realised mainly by watching main Tartars tracts, 2) the so-called prevention activity to disperse the gathering of enemy forces, 3) the destruction of an enemy on the march, 4) the destruction of small dispersed enemy forces acting deep in the invaded territory. See also Balzer, Oswald (ed.). 1906-10. Corpus iuris Polonicæ. Cracow: np., here 1906. Vol. 3: no. 232 (the Battle of Sokal).

KolankowskiRory, 1935: 1 (and offprint here 6-7 and notes 37-39, 8-9, 11, 12 [Bohusz]). As is claimed by Kolankowski Bohusz was in a direct communication with M. Sieniawski; PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 111, 112, 116 (here on the tour of the marches by M. Sieniawski in 1539); Tomczak, Andrzej (ed.) 1960. “Memorial Bernarda Pretwicza do króla z 1550 roku <PretwiczMemorial>," Studia i Materiały do Historii Wojskowości 6 (2): 328-59, here 342 and note 64. Accordingly to Tomczak the review of these popis registers shows the division of all forces active in the defence structure of the borderlands into 5 groups deployed exactly in the areas in the quoted above Conscriptio custodia confinium of 1529: 1) in Bratslav and its outposts on the Sawra River, in Czykczelnik, Zvinogrod and Kostyłowce [Koszyłowce], 2) in Kuczmarna and on the Murachwa River, 3) in Khmenlyk (Chmielnik), Koźuchowa and on Teterew River, 4) in Kopystrzeź, 5) non the River Slucz and „in themeny haj” [in the Black Forest]. The author made some small mistakes while interpreting geographical names, see the brackets.

It stated: Isti in Bracław custodiunt campestrem custodiam in Szawryny [Sawrań], in Czykczelnik [Czechelニック], in Swynyhadod [Zvinogrod], et in Koschilowszc [Koszyłowce]: Bohusz Szupica in 3 equis, Serhey [Oratowski?] 2, Bratkowicz [Bratkowski?] 1, Kozar
In addition, according to this source, the outermost defence line in the southeastern belt was garrisons in four more parts of the Bratslav region, at Khmelnik (Pol. Chmielnik) and Kożuchów on the Tetherow [Teterew River], at Kopystrzyń, Kuczmarn on the Murachwa, and on the Słucz and Themnyhay [at Czarny Las = Black Forest], which tallies with the picture obtained from other popis reports. The occurrence of Bohusz’s name, as the provider of three cavalrymen, in the first place of the 1529 list suggests that he must have played a rather important role in this structure. He certainly enjoyed the confidence of Bernard Pretwicz and Mikołaj Sieniawski the Younger, Guardian of the Field (Pol. strażnik polny), who maintained a company of 30-strong cavalry in permanent contact with the five aforementioned posts. In 1529 Prince Ilia Konstantynowicz Ostrogski, son of the great Constantine, was Starost of Bratslav. Perhaps he was the one who entrusted to Bohusz the command of the men sent from Bratslav for the field defences. However, it is hard to say since when and for how long, he was on guard duty along the border. It would seem that he operated within this defence structure from the early 1520’s at least to the late 30’s, and that he certainly served “in the field and on the inroads” around Bratslav on account of his feudal liabilities to the starost. Things might have been pretty similar for the remaining Słupica family members, but we do not have any direct information on this point. Also, there is no further information about the development of Bohusz’s military career apart from this mention.

Ownership of an extensive belt of hereditary properties along the borderland (in the early 16th century the Słupicas’ estates stretched up to the Sawrań and Kodyma River-basins); an established status in the local

---

[Oblinński] 1, Mythko 1, Carp [Iwanowicz Mikuliński?] 1, Dempko 1, Mysko 2, Stepan 1, Czarnysch 1, Ivan 1, Ostaroļ Sywkwowicz 1, Dmit Swychnogroczski [Zwinogrodzki] 4, Vasko Hystayowicz 2, Anton 3.

131 ZDz., 1894 20: 144. Plewcyński estimated these forces as follows: 25 horsemen in Bratslav, on the Sawrań River, in Czykczelnik, Zvinogrod and in Koszyłowce, 31 along the Murachwa River and in Kuczczman with the task to watch the Tartar Kuczmarn Trail, 49 in Kopystrzyń with the similar task, and finally 29 horseman along the Słucz River and in the Black Forest (Pol. Czarny Las) to watch the Black Trail (PlewcyńskiJazda, 1983: 112). Kolankowski names the following (apart from Słupica) as the commanding offices of the four other regions: Ławryń Białokur (Khmelnik and Kožuchów), Lenart Puskarz (Puszkarz) and Jan Cieklitki (Kopystrzyń), Jan Wężyk, Paweł Stabrowski, and one of the Karaczowskis [Koraczowskis] (Kuczmarn, Murachwa), along with Jan Baldwin (Czarny Las).
community; and presumably also the military experience serving in the units guarding the chief fords and inroads against invading Tartars, meant that Bohusz was a member at least once, of a provisional commission for the settlement of disputes along the borderland. Bilateral Polish-Ottoman committees were convened in the early 1540's and 1550's. This was an outcome of the endeavours made by the King of Poland and Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-66) to peacefully control the growing number of borderland incidents. In 1533 a peace treaty was signed in Istanbul also for the lands of the Khan of the Crimea, which had been a conflicting area of Polish-Lithuanian and Ottoman interest. Both parties wanted peace in the area, the

132 The threat hanging over borderland territories in the 16th century was of a double nature. It involved not only Tartars' forays, but also a hostile attitude of the Moldavian Hospodars, and especially of Wallachia who were vassals of the Ottoman Empire (Moldavia from 1456). Many of these rulers quite often have been installed on the throne by the Sultan's personal order and with Ottoman military support. Especially exposed to the Tartar and Wallachian assaults were the then scarcely populated territories stretching between the Lower Dnipro and Dniester, on the Dniester bank up to the Sawran River, and on the Dnipro bank as far as up to Tašmina. The first belt of Ukrainian settlements was to be found around 200-300 km away from the Ottoman Black Sea strongholds and fortresses. At the beginning of 1530's a few quite serious Polish-Moldavian clashes took place, among which the lost by the Poles battle on the Dniester ford in vicinity of Khotin against the Hospodor Piotr IV Raresz's forces (on 31 December 1530), or the Polish victory gained over Moldavians by hetman Jan Tarnowski after the Battles of Gwoździec near L'viv (19 August) and Obertyn (22 August 1531). The next intrusions of Raresz into Polish Pokucie area (western Podolia) took place in winter 1535 and in February 1536. In winter 1537 in turn the Poles made an irruption into Moldavian territories, and in January 1538 Raresz was back in Podolia. On 1 February 1538 the Poles inflicted a repulse in the clash with Raresz's forces on the Seret River, but on 7 August they laid the siege to the then belonging to Moldavia Khotin Castle. In the meantime Moldavia witnessed a coup d'état as a result of which Sultan Suleyman replaced Raresz with a new hospodor Stephan VI, who in 1540 signed a peace treaty with Sigismund I (KolankowskiiRoty, 1935: 12-13, 14-15; PlewczynskiJazda, 1983: 112-113, 114-15; PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 331; SieralskiAvantury, 1965: 100-03; here more on international situation in 1540-42 and its influence on Polish-Moldavian affairs). See also Veinstein, Gilles. 1986. "L’occupation ottomane d’Oçakòv et le problème de la frontière lituano-tatare. 1538-1544 <VeinsteinOchakiv>.,” In Passé Turco-Tatar présent Soviétique. Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen. Turco-Tatar Past and Soviet Present. Studies presented to Alexandre Bennigsen. Lemercier-Quelquejay, Chantal, Giffaut, Gilles Veinstein and S. Enders Wimbush, eds. Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters, Paris: Éditions de l’École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. 123-55. For the earlier period see as well Cazacu, Matei. 1986. "A propos de l’expansion polono-lituanienne au nord de la mer Noire aux XIVe-XVe siècles: Czarnigrad, la “cité noire” de l’embouchure du Dniestr." In ibidem, 99-122. 133 Within the framework of submitting the Danubian principalities Suleyman captured in 1538 the so-called Budziak, which earlier constituted a part of Moldavia. The furthest north on the Dniester Ottoman garrison stationed in Tehinia (renamed by the Ottomans to Bender). The extensiveness of the border belt between the Dniester and Boh remained undefined, due to the lack of official delimitation on state level. In consequence, the Ottoman Turks were de facto in possession of the areas round the estuaries of all rivers falling into the Black Sea, that is: Kujalnik, Teligol, Chadzybej and Berezan. See VeinsteinOchakiv, 1986. The Commonwealth used to keep peaceful relations with the Crimean Khan Sahib Girey I (1532-51) at this time. The unrest, despite the conclusion of the peace treaty of 1533, both on Lithuanian-Moldavian and Lithuanian-Wallachian border (with the exception of 1544 and 1549 when the Crimean Tartars performed their raids) resulted mostly from the activities of formally subordinated to
main trading route linking Istanbul to Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy. The immediate reason forcing this particular joint commission to be summoned, was a fairly forceful Tartar foray in 1541. Bernard Pretwicz, commander of the defence cavalry, chased the Tartars so vigorously, that by the close of the year he ended up in Ochakiv (Pol. Oczaków). Similar action he undertook also after the Tartar intrusion into Podolia in spring 1542, and once again ended up in Ochakiv. This infuriated the Sultan, who demanded damages and Pretwicz to be punished. Sigismund I responded by summoning a commission consisting of Wojciech Starzechowski, Castellan of Belz (Red Rus’), and Stanisław Podlodowski, who were to meet with the Sultan’s envoys at Bratslav.

the Ottomans, but acting usually without Sultan’s knowledge small Tartar units, being recruited in general from the Black Sea hordes. On the Tartars in relation to the Ottoman Empire and other countries in the region see Inalcık, Halil. 1986. “Power Relationships between Russia, the Crimea and the Ottoman Empire as Reflected in Titulature.” In Passé Turco-Tatar présent Soviétique. Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen. Turco-Tatar Past and Soviet Present. Studies presented to Alexandre Bennigsen. Lemercier-Quelquejaj, Chantal, Gilles Veinstein and S. Enders Wimbush, eds. Louvain-Paris: Éditions Peeters, Paris: Éditions de l’École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. 175-211, especially 186-89. Tartar raids had typically predatory character. The goal was to get booty and prisoners. The Ottoman officials and garrison members in the region often inspired themselves such forays having personal interest in participating in the plunder. However, keeping in mind the orders coming from Istanbul they tried to prevent the concentration of larger Tartar forces. For example in 1536 Pretwicz while following hot upon the Tartars who earlier had been looting the Bratslavshchyna managed to overtake and defeat them in Chadzibej (future Odessa) on the Black Sea coast. In 1537 Bielek Murza as a chief, with a band, which consisted of the Tatars representing the Bialogrod, Ochakiv and Dobrudja (Pol. Dobrudża) hordes devastated the vicinity of Vinnytsia. The Poles under Pretwicz and Jakub Scecygniowski caught them up and defeated them in Czapczaklej (also on the Black Sea coast) (PlewczynskiJazda, 1983: 114, 115, 116; PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 332-33). There are detailed registers of damages caused by the Tartars' forays in 1539-43, which throw some additional light on the affairs described above. Most of these intrusions concerned the villages in the Bratslav area. The registers are preserved in AGAD in Warsaw (AGAD: Libri legationum, sig. 11, f. 96-102).

Until the 16th century the shortest passage connecting Istanbul and Muscovy led either via Crimea or Ochakiv, and continued through the Wild Marshes (Pol. Dolkie Pola) along the Ingul (Ingulec) and Dnipro. As a result of the Tartar threat Ottoman merchants in the 16th century used to follow most often the main Polish-Turkish trade road which went through Trakia, Dobrudja, Moldavia to Kamenets', and farther eastward through Lithuanian territories of the Commonwealth. Imported this way products included among others the whole supply of spices consumed in the Commonwealth. See Dziubinski, Andrzej. 1997. Na szlakach orienta. Handel między Polską a Imperium Osmańskim w XVI- XVII wieku. Wrocław: n.p. 88-89.

Pretwicz’s own unit (Pol. rota) comprised in 1541 100 people. His raids to Ochakiv in 1541 and 1542 are to be known thanks to Marcin Bielski account (Bielski, Marcin. Kronika polska. Turowski, Kazimierz Józef, ed. (2 vols.). 1856. Sanok: n.p., here 2: 1085) and from the correspondence exchanged between Sigismund I and Suleyman (PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 330 and note 14, 334 note 26). Besides Pretwicz himself, who followed the right bank of Boh, S. Proński was was in charge of forces moving along its left bank. See also PlewczynskiJazda, 1983: 117 - here detailed account of both forays.

PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 334 note 28 = AGAD: Libri legationum, sig. 11, f. 80v.: Royal instruction issued to Starzechowski and Podlodowski. The commission members were to pay attention to the fact, that the Sultan’s envoy (Pol. czaszcz) had not mentioned the Tartars, but
The information on Bohusz's participation in the commission's preliminary work, and perhaps also as one of its members, comes from correspondence related to the 1542 commission, set up to resolve the dispute between Poland-Lithuania and the Duchy of Wallachia and the Horde of Bialogrod (Pol. Bialogród, Tur. Akkerman), the Sultan's vassals, over territories on the Rivers Sawrañ and Kodyma.\(^{137}\) Bohusz Słupica is mentioned in a letter of Sigismund I to Krzysztof Kmitycz, the current "tenant of Vinnytsia," whom the King thereby appointed to represent the interests of the Grand Duchy (alongside the royal courtier Bernard Maciejewski representing the Kingdom of Poland).\(^{138}\) The King wrote to Kmitycz to dispatch and make the letter known to Semen Babihski, so that he should set the entire business, and [order him to send] along with the deeds wherein we had earlier determined the matter of the mutual borders with Bohusz Słupica, landowner of Vinnytsia, as to how since ancient times the borders of our Realms with the lands of Wallachia and Bialogrod have run.\(^{139}\)

This would suggest that Bohusz had already been asked before to show the borderline. The monarch ordered Kmitycz to conduct an inquiry among the Sultan's subjects leaving in Ochakiv and its surroundings, so only to them indemnity had to be paid, provided that its amount was not to exceed 4,000 Zlotys.


\(^{138}\) Krzysztof Kmitycz as fulfilling in 1542 the duties of Vinnytsia Starost on behalf of Sigismund I. He is known only on the basis of a single document. He was appointed to Vinnytsia temporarily soon after the revolt of Bratslav and Vinnytsia burgers against the Starost Prince Semen Prohski in 1541 was over. On the revolt see below B/4: 131-37. However, he took this post not immediately after the mutiny, but probably in 1542, as the first temporal assignment for Vinnytsia starosty went ca. 10 April 1541 to Jan Chrszczonowicz, the Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów in 1551 (see below, note 164, p. 137). Earlier other members of the same family of Kmita (Kmitycz) Aleksandrowicz, among whose Krzysztof’s father - Kmita (Bohdan/Fedor) Aleksandrowicz acted as plenipotentiaries in the Vinnytsia starosty. See NykielBratslavStarots, 2004: Appendix A. See also wbove note 107, p. 115.

\(^{139}\) The Babinski family descended from Volhynia, from the Powiat of Lutsk, where not far from Horoszcza in the river basin of Horyň, where their family nest Babin has been founded. Nevertheless, they settled down mainly in the Kyivan territories, especially in the Powiat of Ovruch on the left bank of Dnipro. In 1520 Kamienne and Lenczyn alias Łuczyn estates situated on the right bank of Slucz River belonged to them. Also they have been endowed in the volost’ of Ovruch Castle. In the 16th century the Babinski were numbered among the most ardent supporters of Socinianism (ZDz., 1897 22: 104, 105, 152, 298, 516, 571, 615). On the turn of the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) century they used two coats of arms their individual and Bończa (IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 57). Accordingly to Jabłonowski Semen Babinski has to be identified with the Starost of Zhytomir (Pol. Zytomierz) in 1544, the one who rebuilt Zhytomir Castle, ruined earlier by Mengli Girey (ZDz., 1897 22: 78). Certainly it was also him, who, according to Iakovenko, raised 9 people for military service in 1528-45 (IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 125).
inhabitants of the Kyiv region, especially in the vicinity of Cherkasy (Pol. Czerkasy) and Kaniów, but above all among the “seniors and well-informed landowners of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, as to how the extent of the borders between those Dominions.” Subsequently the Starost of Vinnytsia was to present an account based on the collected information to Maciejowski and the Turkish envoy. Thereafter all were to meet at a selected venue in the borderlands and together with the Sultan’s envoy tour the border duct between the Grand Duchy and Wallachia and Bialogrod, pursuant to the evidence and data collected by Kmitycz. The King sent a separate letter to Semen Babiński, who was Starost of Zhytomir in 1544, ordering him to pass on to Kmitycz all those matters, and the documents for those borders; and we have solemnly and expressly commanded our letters to be sent to the holders of the Starosty of Bratslav [Jerzy Wojciechowicz Nasiłowski?] and of Vinnytsia [K. Kmitycz]; and that you are to instruct them that they are to choose one or two good men from Bratslav and Vinnytsia who are well-informed about the border; and that they are to send with you Bohusz Słupica; and if he be dead, then We [the king] would brought you [Kmitycz] Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, Tenant of Zhytomir to settle this matter.\(^{140}\)

The royal ordinance also involved questions the Sultan’s envoy might ask regarding the border with the Horde of Ochakiv.\(^{141}\)

The later developments on the border are known from a subsequent letter written from Bratslav to the King by the members of the commission on “Monday after the Feast of St. Mark the Evangelist” in 1542. They had been waiting in vain for 3 weeks (from 15 September to early October 1542) out in

---

\(^{140}\) The persons in question are the above mentioned plenipotentiary Starosts of Vinnytsia Jan Chrszczonowicz (1541) and K. Kmitycz (1542) (see also notes 145, p. 131 [Chrszczonowicz] and 138, p. 128 [Kmitycz]) and Jerzy (Jurij) Wojciechowicz Nasiłowski charged temporarily with the duties of the Bratslav Starost. Nasiłowski was delegated to Bratslav by the King in November 1541 after the revolt of Bratslav and Vinnytsia inhabitants against Proński. He was to stay in Bratslav until the case brought to the Royal Court would be closed. In reality he acted as Bratslav Starost until 1544, although Proński officially kept this post till he got promoted to the Kyiv Voivode (1544) and his place was to be occupied by Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki (NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A). Prince Bohusz F. Korecki before he became the Starost of Bratslav, Vinnytsia and Zwinogrod was until 1539 the Starost of Zhytomir. On his career see Polishchuk, Volodymyr. 2001. „Kniaz’ Bohush Korets’kyi iak zemlevlasnyktauriadnyk(1510-1576),” Kyivka starovyna 2 (338): 56-72.

\(^{141}\) BCzart.: Teki Naruszewicza, ms. IV/59 [307], no. 174, f. 714: “1542 [Król Zygmunt I] Zaleca i Naucza Krzysztofa Kmitycza azeby od ludzi starych wywiedzial siq o granicach miqdzy Pahstwami znosil siq w tey mierze z Dzierzawcami pogranicznemi i z Pane Matfejewskim i okaza i pe posaďcowi Tureckiemu azeby niemieszal granic WXLitewskiego i wyraznie ie okazal i oddzielnie od Korony oraz zakazuie aby Oczakowa granic nieokazywal iako należącego do WXLitewskiego”.
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the steppes between Sawrań and Kodyma for the Sultan’s envoy to arrive.\textsuperscript{142} Nearly half of the Polish regular colours, over 3,000 men, had been dispatched to protect the Polish commissioners.\textsuperscript{143} Finally, the matter of reparations and Pretwicz’s forays into Ochakiv was successfully resolved, as the Sultan’s envoy Chelebi, along with Starzechowski and Podlodowski informed the King.

\textsuperscript{142} BCzart.: Teki Naruszewicz, ms. IV/59 [307], no. 178, f. 731-738: “Sigismundo I. Regi Poloniae Joannes Mielecki Palat: Podolie, Nicolaus Siemiawski Palat: Belzensis, Albertus Starzechowski Castel: Belzensis, Gregorius Jarzlowicki = Commissari ad Regundos Fines inter Poloniam et Turcarum Ditionem Missi”. In Bib: Zalus[kich]: Ex MS Cancel: Jacobi Zadzik, No. 53. The document under consideration is a detailed account of the royal commissioners: Jan Mielecki, Voivode of Podolia; Mikołaj Siemiawski, Voivode of Belż; Wojciech Starzechowski, Castellan of Belż; and Grzegorz Jazlowiecki expedited to Sigismund I. Before making its way towards the steppes the Polish delegation under the military protection of Bernard Pretwicz and his men had been on watch in Vinnytsia for news from the Wallachian Hospodar and the Sultan. The Polish side agreed to the conditions of the Silistrian Sandhak bey (Pol. \textit{sandzakbej}, in the source „sedział”) [Osman Sah] offered through the mediation of „Musay wojewoda” [Wallachian Hospodar], which fixed the venue place on the Sawrań (in 12 miles from Bratslav) or on the Kodyma (in 16 miles from Bratslav). The Poles awaiting on the Sawrań were finally visited by „Farath Woiewoda” Tehiński i Bialogrodzki [= Farath, Voivode of Tehinia and Bialogrod, Ottoman official from Silistria] who brought the message that the Sandhak bey was not to come to the meeting place, and that commissioners were to show the border limits “as far as to Sawrań or Kodyma” to him. In response the Polish side sent with Farath to the Sandhak bey the royal captain (Pol. \textit{rotmistrz królewski}) Stanisław Tarlo [captain of cavalry unit in the ambient defence structure, in 1533 on charge of a company/colour (Pol. \textit{chorągiew}) <Plewczynski, 1995: 56 and note 249>]. He had to remind the principles according to which, in accordance with the Sultan’s will, the joint commission was to work and to persuade the Sandhak bey to come to the venue place. Tarlo was to offer the Sandhak bey the meeting point on the Kodyma (in 4 miles from Sawrań) where he could come with whichever retinue. Soon afterwards the Polish commissioners moved towards the Kodyma River with half of their retinue, leaving the remaining troops on the Sawrań. Meanwhile „Farath wojewoda sylisterjski” appeared once again in the former Kodyma meeting place, this time appointed by Sandhak bey with full authority to negotiate delimitation. In turn, the commissioners sent to the Ottoman official royal captain Leśniowski, who again referred to the Sultan’s orders and demanded the meeting to take place either in the Sandhak bey’s camp on the Lake of Teligol (Tur. \textit{Deligol}) or in the Polish camp on the Kodyma 8 miles from the lake. Finally, the Sandhak bey pointed out as a meeting place the meadow or rather wilderness (Pol. \textit{uroczysko}) of Maylia, 3 miles from the Kodyma. The meeting had to take place on 1 October 1542, but the Polish commissioners awaited there his arrival in vain, as in the meantime he withdrew to ward Bialogrod. For the failure of their mission commissioners accused the Wallachian Hospodar. According to their account he was blackmailing the Sandhak bey with the letters warning him against Polish treason and claiming that the Poles were to attack him. The information according to which Sigismund I had sent the troops to Hungary supported the Hospodar’s warnings. While describing these accusations the commissioners argued that their firm behaviour towards the Sandhak bey had resulted from so far territorial concessions made by the Polish side and the dangers, which might have occurred, if the concessions were to continue (PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 118 and note 22 – here identification of Sandhak bey of Silistria as Osman Sah). Finally, the Ottomans made concessions (they opted for the Sawrań) to the borderline being drawn up on the Kodyma, in accordance with the Polish suggestions. On participation of Jan Mielecki in the commission works see Przybyliński, 2003: 42. On these events see as well VeinsteinOchakiv, 1986: 137-46.

\textsuperscript{143} KolankowskiRoty, 1935: 22 and note 78. Kolankowski refers to the document in AGAD in Warsaw (AGAD: sig. 85 Ruchunki Wojskowe, book 42) that is a \textit{popis} (revue) of these units, which took place on the Boh River in the vicinity of Bratslav on 22 September 1542.
from Vinnytsia on 31 December 1542.\footnote{AGAD: Libri legationum, sig. 11, f. 106v., 108 v. and Archiwum Koronne <AK>, dział turecki, no. 193: the letter of Czebiji to Sigismund I, 31 December 1542 and “Contentatio damnorum Turcis per Magnificum Albertum Starzecowshi castellanum belsensem et Stanislaun Podolodowshi commissarios MR”; PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 334 and note 29. Fulfilling royal orders Pretwicz came to Vinnytsia in person and met with the Sultan’s envoy that he furnished with explanations prepared in accordance with the King’s instructions. His testimony was listened to, by hetman Mikolaj Sieniawski being in Vinnytsia too. At that time the city was also visited by many Tartars fi’om Ochakiv who have been looking for their relatives among the prisoners taken by Pretwicz. Finally, 14 men were handed over, and 7 Turks paid indemnities. See also PlewczynskiJazda, 1983: 118.} The King’s decision to entrust the borderland mission to Słupica and Babiński suggests that Bohusz might have had other merits to his name, which we do not know about, and that perhaps he met the King through his involvement in the borderland commission. However, it is hard to determine which commission he was a member of, or assistant to, escorting the commissioners along the border zone, which ran close to the Słupicas estates. It is interesting that when he was writing the letter to Kmitycz, Sigismund I was not sure whether Bohusz was still alive. The next section, which discusses the events of March 1541 in Bratslav and Vinnytsia will elucidate the King’s doubts.


We know about the 1541 rebellion of the landed gentry of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, only from a few mentions in the source material.\footnote{RadvisnikArchSang., 4 (1535-1547): 278-79, no. 223: the Queen Bona’s letter to Prince Fedor Andrejewicz Sangerzsko, on 23 March 1541 at Vilnius = APKr.: ASang., t. IV (original); ASangGorcza, 3: 40; Metryka Vialikaka Kniastva Litoyskaka. Kniga 28 (1522-1552). Kniga zapisai 28 (Kopija kantsa XVI st.) / Metryka Vialikaka Kniastva Litoyskaka (1522-1552) Knika zapaiai 28 / Metrica of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (1552-1552). Book of inscriptions 28 <ML Edition 2000>. 2000. Mensk: Athenaeum, here docs. nos. 9 (the letter of Sigismund Augustus to Jurij Wojciechowicz Nasilowski and the Powiat of Bratslav landed gentry, 10 April 1541 at Vilnius), 9.1. (the same letter to Jan Chrszczonowicz and Vinnytsia townsfolk, 10 April 1541 at Vilnius), 51 (the King’s letter to the Vinnytsia landed gentry, bailiff, townsfolk and castle manhood, 7 July 1541 at Vilnius), 52 (the same letter to the Bratslav landed gentry, bailiff, townsfolk and castle manhood, 7 July 1541 at Vilnius), 65 (the King’s letter to Prince Semen Hlebowicz Pronski, attesting his fidelity and good service as starost, 1541); AGAD: AK, dział turecki, sig. 260, 261 (16\textsuperscript{th}-century transcript of the memorial), part 1 (f. 90-96), part 2 (f. 97-104) = J. T. L. [Lubomirski, Teodor] (ed.) 1866. “Bernard Pretwicz i jego apologia na sejmie 1550 r.” (Bernard Pretwicz and His Apology Delivered on the Diet of 1550), Biblioteka Warszawskia (Warsaw Library) 3: 44-59 = PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 349-50; Pociecha, Waudyslaw. 1946. “Ślaski bohater Bernard Pretwicz <PociechaPretwicz>,” Ślask 1 (10): 6-13, here (p. 9) the quoted letter of B. Pretwicz to hetman Mikolaj Sieniawski, 22 March 1541 at Vinnytsia; Otamanovs’kyi, 1993: 193, 211, 327, 231, 327, 356, 359-60.} The revolt against Prince Semen (Siemion) Hlebowicz Proński, the Starost of Bratslav and
Vinnytsia, and his magistrates, erupted in March 1541. Officially the reason was Proński’s refusal to recognise the election of the wójt (bailiff) of Bratslav, which was an infringement to the powers of the municipality’s local government. Apart from claiming a right to interfere in the election of the municipal bailiff, Proński also rejected the postulate put forward by the landed gentry, vassals of his castle, to appoint another bailiff to the “estates”, in other words to exempt the gentlefolk who were his subjects from the starost’s jurisdiction, a demand eventually accomplished in 1545.\(^{146}\) We may assume that the dispute over the appointment of the bailiff(s) was just the last straw. The real cause was the frequent and inexorable demands to the local population made by Proński and his predecessor Prince Ilia Ostrogski (1529-39). Disregarding hardships emulating from the Tartar raids and the subsequent labour shortage, due to peasant fleeing, the two officials were intransigently demanding taxation and personal labour to restore and maintain the two castles.\(^{147}\) All these was coupled by abuses related to the guard-duty “of the fields and inroads”, and an increasing number of endowments, made (especially by Proński) out of properties formerly belonging to the castle volost’, often disregarding the rights of the two towns, as evidenced by the already-mentioned amendments of 1542.\(^{148}\)

\(^{146}\) One of the postulates brought in Bratslav to the royal accountant was the appointment of another bailiff for the “estates”, in other words to exempt the gentlefolk from the castle jurisdiction (ZDz., 1877 6: 124-25). The King’s letters of 1541 addressed to Nasilowski and the Bratslavians (no. 9), as well as to the bailiffs and townspeople at Bratslav and Vinnytsia (nos. 51, 52) and finally to Proński (no. 65) make it clear that both sides used to complain about the trespassing of their rights. The townspeople pointed out the lack of the starost’s respect for “oldness” what meant that the required by him amount of services and quantity of exemptions were going far beyond the old customs and written deeds (ML Edition 2000: 28).

\(^{147}\) The manifestations of discontent or mutinies of local community against the starost were not restricted to Bratslav and in this period they reoccurred in the whole of Ukraine. We have e.g. information on the conflict that broke in 1536/37 between Vasil Tyszkiewicz, Starost (Pol. namiestnik) of Cherkasy and the Cherkasy and Kaniów townsfolk regarding the inflicted by them from the said Starost „injustices and damages”. In 1545, the Zythomir townspeople expressed in front of the royal commissioner their discontent and accused the than Zythomir Tenant (and former Starost of Vinnytsia) Krzysztof Kmitycz of abusing of their rights. See lakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 163 (Zythomir), 169 (Cherkasy and Kaniów).

\(^{148}\) Prince Semen (Siemion) alias Fryderyk (Frydrych), after he converted to Catholicism, Proński (died in 1555) became the Starost on the turn of 1539/40. He succeeded Prince Ilia Ostrogski (1529-39), who also made in both castles extensive repairs and investment (NykzielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A). Under Ostrogski a tower was erected out of royal money in Vinnytsia Castle, out of wood and by forcing the local landed gentry to work (ZDz., 1877 6: 109). The castle of Bratslav was rebuilt almost totally, partly on royal expense (700 kopas Lithuanian groszs), partly by the starost himself „dwie czasti toho zamku” [two parts of this castle] and in one third by townsfolk and gentry „tretia czast”. The latter ones were to participate in the restoration works by force „gwałtem nakinul, kotoryi musili za newoleiu y za
The choice of timing to manifest their defiance to the starost was directly related to rumours of an imminent serious Tartar invasion. As we learn from Queen Bona's letter of 23 March 1541 drawn in Vilnius addressing Prince Fedor Andrejewicz Sanguszko, Marshal of Volhynia and Starost of Volodymyr, the rebellious gentry and townsfolk of Bratslav had apprehended the "senior landowner" of Bratslav, Bohusz Słupica, and drowned him in the River Boh; they expelled the Starost's magistrate from the town, and finally took possession of Bratslav Castle. Pronski managed to flee for safety in the Vinnytsia Castle. However, he soon found himself in the same circumstances there, under siege from the rebels supported by the people of Vinnytsia. According to the King’s letter sent to Jurij Wojciechowicz Nasiłowski and the Powiat of Bratslav landlords, dated 10 April 1541 at Vilnius, the mutinised Bratslavians had besieged in the Bratslav Castle not the starost in person but his welikim karaniem horodni y weży zarobiti] (ibidem, 117). In total they (means townspeople and gentry) erected out of their own supplies 11 horodnia constructions and two towers (ibidem, 119) as well as the main gate and drawbridge (ibidem, 118). In the period from the end of 1539 to March 1541, already under Pronski’s authority townspeople and gentry were forced to participate furnishing their own material and labour force in the following venues: Vinnytsia Castle - new locks to the castle’s gates (which were paid by the Starost), the castle tower (out of royal money), 3 horodnia “pospolite” [common] edifices (ibidem, 109, 110), a will (paid by the King), and around 10 carts of food and supplies for the castle brought from the Starost’s own villages (ibidem, 113), a pond on the River Boh together with a new mill (ibidem, 114); Bratslav Castle - main gate and drawbridge, probably as the final stage of Prince Ostrogski’s investment, a tower over the gate (i.e. gatehouse) erected from the foundation by gentry and their labour force, but the upper part and its furnishings came out of royal funds (ibidem, 118), 4 roofs on the 4 already existing towers (ibidem, 119), a new big bridge on the Boh with labour force and supplies of local gentry and townsfolk (p. 121). See ZDz., 1877 6: 108-16 (Vinnytsia), 117-26 (Bratslav).

In autumn 1540 Pronski acting with Pretwicz destroyed a band of Ochakiv and Bialogrod Tartars amounting to few hundreds, plundering under Bielek Murza the region of Khmelnik. They were defeated by the Poles close to Wierzchowiny Berezanske near Ochakiv (PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 116); Letters of Sigismund I to Prince Fedor Andrejewicz Sanguszko, Marshal of Volhynia dated 5 and 14 February 1541 from Vilnius, in which the King drew Sanguszko’s attention to the subject of supplies and armament of the Volhynian castles in the face of Tartar threat (ArchSangGorczak, 4). Sanguszko has been receiving royal orders to be ready in case the Tartars’ attack also in the following years: 1537, 1538, 1539, 1541, 1543 and 1544 (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 430).

Drowning was a traditional way of punishment in the Ruthenian society applied especially to traitors and “cumbersome” persons. When it comes to the term “senior landowner” (Pol. starszy ziemianin; Ruth. starshyi) Iakovenko notes that the source material of the 16th century from the Bratslav territory referred this way to the “nested gentry”, thus usually lords, in contrast to “lesser landlord” (Pol. podlejészzi ziemianin; Ruth. podleisshi) means lesser gentry. In Volhynia the same differentiation has been indicated by starszy (Ruth. starshyi = senior) and mniejszy (Ruth. menshyi = minor), while in the Kyiv area respectively by ważniejszy (Ruth. prlożnieszshi) means and równiesz (Ruth. rovneisshi) means equal (IakovenkoShilakhta, 1993: 182).
deputy (Ruth. *namesnik*). The same letter also adds that after capturing the
castle the rebels robbed all of the Proński’s movable assets, including silver,
armours and horses, which they partly left for storage with a Volhynian
landlord, a certain Janczyński.\(^{151}\)

On 28 March 1541 Hetman Mikołaj Sieniawski sent news to the King
that the besiegers at Vinnytsia had cut off Proński’s food supplies and were
calling for his departure from the Castle, threatening that otherwise they would
burn it down.\(^{152}\) Prince Fedor Sanguszko and Bernard Pretwicz (ca. 1500-61),
captain of the King’s border defence force, came to the Starost’s rescue.
Sanguszko was in the area to mediate in a property dispute in the Ostrogski
family. He was urged on by the Queen, worried that the rebels would really set
up the Vinnytsia Castle on flames, so he initiated negotiations with them.\(^{153}\) In
the already-cited letter Bona expressed her anxiety and ordered him
to round up forces from the whole of Volhynia for the relief of Vinnytsia and
Proński’s rescue, so that upon learning of his approaching army, the people of
Bratslav and Vinnytsia should abandon their plan to burn down the castle and
should be prevented to cross over to enemy territory.\(^{154}\)

Meanwhile Pretwicz, who was informed by Proński about the Tartars of
the Ochakiv and the Bialogrod Hordes approaching to eastern Podolia, chased
them in the Vinnytsia region, providing thus a stroke of good fortune. He did
not fail to narrate to the King and his privy council his involvement in the
rescue of Proński when he appeared in court in December 1550. On 22 March
1541 he bragged to Hetman Mikołaj Sieniawski, that if he had not intervened,
the rebels would have captured the Castle and burned it down with Proński


\(^{152}\) For M. Sieniawski’s letter addressed to the King see PociechaPretwicz, 1946: 9, note 10.

\(^{153}\) Pretwicz was endowed by Queen Bona with Woniaczyn near Vinnytsia, which he obtained
after the deceased in 1535 Ostafi Daszkiewicz (Dashkevych) Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów.
The endowment was a reward for his active support offered to Bona in her efforts to reassume
the Commonwealth’s possession of Silesia. This grant caused however the fierce objection of
Lithuanian Lords, who in 1538 protested against the favour showed towards a foreigner „one
Silesian Bernard Pretwicz” (PociechaPretwicz, 1946: 7). Prince Fedor A. Sanguszko played the
role of mediator in the conflict over the border limits of Równe and Stepań estates, which
aroused between Princess Beata and Prince Vasil Konstantynowicz the Ostrogskis. He acted as
arbitrator on King’s order and due to his administrative and jurisdictional duties. Of
significance was also the fact, that Sanguszko was a legal guardian to Prince Vasil
Konstantynowicz.

\(^{154}\) APKr.: ASang., t. IV (original) = RadziwiłłskiArchSang., 4, 278-79, no. 223.
inside. Most importantly though, neither Prince Sanguszko nor Pretwicz, both in possession of experienced troops, were sluggish over their defence of Proński, probably wanting to prevent the rebellion from spreading throughout the province. In practice Sanguszko limited his actions to sending out to the rebels on a conciliatory mission the Vinnytsia landowner Kostia Bubnowski. The besieging forces finally released Proński after forcing him to sign a written obligation, that he would not bring proceedings against them in the King’s court. The fear of the rebellion spreading is also apparent in the letter sent by the monarch, in which he attested Proński’s fidelity and good services at the starost office. None the less the King’s letters of 7 July made it absolutely clear that there was no escaping of punishment for the rebels, both at Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Sigismund I also added that after consulting the Crown Council, he decided to send his commissioners to find out at the spot the reason of rebellion and to bring justice. The King underlined that this was the best solution as the subject in question were “Ukrainian castles, thus it would be difficult for you, the subjects of Ours, to leave them [unprotected].”

PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 349: „The second year [1541; the date solved by Tomkiewicz as 1540], in autumn, came several hundred of the Ochakiv and Białogrod Tartars, among which the commanders were Bielek murza, Taxary, Bigocz, Isichodza, Dziansejt, and Toraj. And they took [captives and booty] on the Boh and near Khmelńik, and I was at that time keeping watch over the roads, where nowadays Lord Voivode of Kyiv, who then was the Bratslav Starost [Semen Proński], sent along to me [with the message], that the Tartars were taking [captives and booty] in the land [of Bratslav]. ‘And I request you, please come quick to me’ so he wrote and ordered me to come to Musorow [Mezyrow between Bar and Bratslav]”. Plewczynski puts it more precisely, and says that Pretwicz destroyed the Białogrod Horde’s unit under Kormonak and Sumak, which was on its way back from Vinnytsia with booty (PlewczynskiJazda, 1983: 116). Co-operation with the Voŭynian starosts, especially with the Starost of Bratslav played an important role, being also a permanent factor, in Pretwicz’s military activities in the defence structure. This is why, among his close associates in the fight against Tartars Proński, Korecki and Fedor Sanguszko are found. For the letter to Sieniawski see PociechaPretwicz, 1946: 9 and PretwiczMemorial, 1962: 350 note 103 (here quotation).

ML Edition 2000 28: 115-16, no. 65. The letter is dated in 1541, although from its context one has to assume, that it was certainly written after April 1541. While attesting the good name and conduct of the starost, the King referred not only to his services at Bratslav and Vinnytsia but also to his father merits. The starost, as we may deduce from the Sigismund I’s own words, must have explained his behaviour to the monarch, in relation to the rebelled Vinnytsia townsfolk, arguing that he had feared the widespread of mutiny into the whole of province. The Prince pointed to the further possible damage which might have been done to the castles, especially on the eve of an expected major Tartar raid into the area. He also must have excused himself not only because of granting this „safe-conduct” letter, but also because of denouncing the Vinnytsia townsfolk actions before the monarch despite the earlier issue of safety guarantees. The King stressed that he had been informed about the mutiny not only by Proński but also he got the messages from „many of Our landlords of the area”. Proński himself, similarly to the fear expressed in Bona’s letter, was afraid of the spread of mutiny into entire province too.

However, these commissions sent out to conduct an inquiry and issue the appropriate sentence had no executive power. Thus, as it was obvious from both letters the execution of verdicts would be carried out by... the starostial magistrate. Nevertheless, the King emphasised the large number of complaints against Proński brought before him by the townspeople and gentry of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. In his defence the Starost said that the rebels refused to pay him his lawful revenues and services. One of the Sigismund I's letters is cited in a transcript of the rights and privileges of Bratslav, dated 10 January 1792, though erroneously dated (7 July 1547 instead of 1541). It enumerates the transgressions of Proński towards the people of Bratslav including the “taking of taxes from the use of inns and other matters in which, as they had complained, he had acted against them in contravention of the laws and customs, appropriating their property.” The originals of the letters expedited from Vilnius on 7 July have been recently published as part of the Lithuanian Metrica registers books. Unfortunately the original document with the verdict (verdicts?) has not survived, and all what is known is that a few of the rebels were executed. From a relation made in 1560 by Hrehory Kajdasz, a servant of Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, the next Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, related to a new wave of unrest in the town, we learn that the people of Bratslav forfeited the right to elect their bailiff for good after the 1541 rebellion.

158 The digest of this letter is known from the corpus of privileges issued to the city of Bratslav, which has been collected on the occasion of the renewal by King Stanislas August Bratslav municipal law in a new charter on 10 January 1792 at Warsaw. Derzhavnii istorychni arkhiiv L'vivskoi oblasti <DIALO>: F. 201 op. 4, no. 3028, f. 1-8 (handwritten copy, 19th century). The document entitled: „Diploma, prawa y przywileje Miasta Wolnego Bracławia, w Woiwództwie y Powiecie Bracławskim, odnawiaiece” and written down to the land books of Bratslav and Nadbohski Districts on 25 May 1792. Here among others, the letter of Sigismund I, 7 July 1741 at Vilnius (f. 1v.-2).

159 DIALO: F. 201 op. 4, no. (provisional) 3084. It is another version of the 10 January 1792 act. The selection of quoted in the charter earlier documents is a bit different from the one referred to above. This transcript was produced in 1793 upon the request of Stanislaw Lubomirskii, Bratslav Voivode. In this selection was to be found also the royal letter sent in connection with the rebellion of Bratslav and Vinnytsia population against Prince Proński, however, erroneously dated 7 July 1547 instead of 1541.

160 ML Edition 2000 28: 99, no. 50 (to the Vinnytsia landed gentry, bailiff, townspeople and castle manhood), and 100, no. 52 (the same letter to the Bratslav landed gentry, bailiff, townsfolk and castle manhood).

161 Otamanov's'kyi, 1993: 359 (here as H. Kojdasz).
In April 1541 the King sent his courtier Jurij (Jerzy) Wojciechowicz Nasiłowski to Bratslav, who was to perform the duties of plenipotentiary for the starosty pending the hearing of the case before the King’s court. This is known from the King’s letter to Nasiłowski and to the landlords of the Powiat of Bratslav dated 10 April 1541 from Vilnius.\(^{162}\) He performed this duty certainly until November 1541. It is possible however, that he kept this post until 1544, when Proński had been officially promoted to the Voivode of Kyiv.\(^{163}\) As we know from the similar letter expedited under the same date to the Powiat of Vinnytsia landed gentry and Jan Chrząszczowicz, the latter played the same role, as plenipotentiary starost at Vinnystia, at least until 1542, when Krzysztof Kmitycz replaced him to the office, himself being promoted soon to the Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów (1551).\(^{164}\) Tension between the townsfolk, the gentry, and the starost continued, and every now and then surfaced at varying levels of intensity, under the next starosts, Prince B. Korecki (Bratslav, 1548/49-76; Vinnytsia, 1571-76), and Prince Roman F. Sanguszko (Vinnytsia, 1566-71).\(^{165}\) One of the consequences of the 1541 revolt was the review of the castles in 1545, which I have already mentioned several times, and which affected all the Volhynian castles.\(^{166}\)

Before I move on to other matters, I shall return to the person of Bohusz Słupica. There can be no doubt that he was killed before 23 March 1541, drowned by the rebels in the River Boh. But determining his role at Bratslav

\(^{163}\) See NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A.
\(^{164}\) ML Edition 2000 28: 57, 9.1 (10 April 1541, at Vilnius), 154 (Sigismund Augustus’s letter to Chrząszczowicz dated 21 October 1551 at Vilnius; here the latter as the Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów), 156-58, no. 116 (the King’s letter to Chrząszczowicz, dated 1551 at Vilnius). For Chrząszczowicz see also above notes 138, p. 128 and 140, p. 129. For Krzysztof Kmitycz see above notes 138, p. 128 and 140, p. 129. See as well and NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A.
\(^{165}\) Franyuk studied the conflicts of Korecki and Sanguszko with the local population in her article (see above note 124, p. 122). For the examples of accusations directed against the starosts see AYZR, VIII/5: 83, 463.
\(^{166}\) A review conducted by diak Lew Patjewicz Tyszkowicz and Jerzy (Juryj) Falczewski, Bishop of Lutsk and Berest dealt with the following castles: Volodymyr (4 June), Lutsk (15 June), Kremenets (21 July), Vinnytsia (5 August) and finally Zhytomir (2 September). The main goal of this action, which had been undertaken at Sigismund Augustus orders, was to settle down affairs, especially those of delimitation between the Crown and Lithuania. Another matter, but also of high importance was to determine real condition of the castles in question and the precise obligations of their vassals. Both reviews printed in: ZDz., 1877 6: 117-26 (Bratslav, 21 August) and 109–16 (Vinnytsia) = Kosakivskyi, V. A. 1993. “Revizia Vinnyts’koho zamku 1545 roku.” In Naukovyi zbirny Podil’s’ka starovyna na poshanu vchenoho i kraeznavtsia V. O. Otamanov’s’ko. Vinnytsia: Vinnyts’kyi oblasnyi Kraeznadvchyi muzei. 322-32. See also ZDz., 1877 6: 23-24; ArchSang., 3: 38-40.
alongside Pronki is not such an easy matter. The expression “senior landowner of Bratslav” may refer to an individual from a nested family with one of the most ancient histories of settlement in the locality, but it may also mean an advisor in the starost’s confidence that exercised a supervisory role. The remark in the Queen’s letter about the magistrate expelled from the town cannot refer to Bohusz. So what kind of magistracy could he have held on Pronki’s behalf? His career suggests he may have commanded the Castle’s garrison force. Perhaps he was even Pronki’s plenipotentiary, appointed prior to the latter’s flight from the town as suggested by the King’s letter of 10 April to Nasilowski, and killed by the townspeople as an act of retaliation when they captured the castle. But there is no explicit proof for such a hypothesis. According to a later source associated with the Shipica family, Bohusz was Pronki’s deputy starost (Pol. podstarości).167 Perhaps his loyalty to Pronki had an effect on the appointment of Bohdan Shipica [IV/1] to the office of starost’s plenipotentiary in Bratslav in 1551. The circumstances of Bohusz’s death and the fact that Nasilowski, whom the King appointed to perform the starost’s duties, did not arrive in the town until April 1541, could perhaps explain why at the time of writing his letter to Krzysztof Kmitycz the King was not sure of what had happened to him.

5. Bohdan Shipica: Decline and Treason? The Defence of Bratslav against the Crimean Horde of Devlet Girey in 1551.

The years after 1542 were not the most peaceful for Bratslav and its region. Tension continued to mount between Poland and Moldavia, and also Poland and the Ottoman Empire, especially after a rapprochement between Poland and the Habsburgs in 1543, through the marriage of Sigismund Augustus to Elisabeth of Habsburg. The recurrent Tartar invasions only aggravated the situation, particularly after 1544, when after a decade’s interval the Crimean Tartars re-appeared on the scene.168 In 1546 the Tartars of Ochakiv and

167 CDIAUK: F. 256 op. 1 [Zamoyscy], no. 123, f. 41: as Deputy Starost of Bratslav, no date offered.
168 In 1542 and 1545 Sigismund I renewed his alliance with the Crimean Khan Sahib Girey I (1532-51). See BCzart.: Teki Naruszewieza, sig. 59 no. 190, f. 787-794 (1542) and sig. 62, no. 65, f. 243-247 (1545). On Sahib Girey I and the Crimean Khanate during his reign, see İnalcık,
Bialogrod reached Ваг, whence the Ochakiv Tartars headed for Vinnytsia, where they defeated the Czeremis boyars. The ambient defence cavalry led by Franciszek Goślicki pursued and beat them at Berymboj. In 1547 a concentration of Lithuanian forces under the command of Hetman Mikołaj Sienicki developed in the environs of Bratslav, in connection with a Turkish attempt to rebuild the castle at Balaklej on the Boh near Czapczaklej, abandoned in the autumn of the same year, giving rise to the renewal of the peace treaty of 1533. In 1548 the Tartars took the Bratslav outpost on the Sina Woda. Forced by Pretwicz to flee, they were dispersed on Inguł, but the men of Bratslav, who were deployed along the Boh did not wait for Pretwicz’s return and many left and were captured by the Tartars. When he learned this, Pretwicz again chased the Tartars out of Sawran to the Teligol Lake, where there was a brutal skirmish. In October 1548 and February-March and August-September 1549 a number of captains of the king’s forces (including Proński, Prince Dimitr Wiśniowiecki, and Hieronim and Mikołaj the Sieniawskis) led retaliatory expeditions into the Ochakiv and Bialogrod area. Bernard Pretwicz and Prince Bohusz Korecki took part in most of them. In September 1549, in response to the Polish expeditions, the Turks and Tartars of Ochakiv and Bialogrod laid siege to Korecki’s force in Bratslav. They finally retreated from the town and were pursued into Ochakiv by the Sieniawski brothers and Sachmanczir, captain of the Lithuanian Tartars. In the same month, following orders of the Sultan, the Crimean Tartars commanded by İmîn Soltan laid waste to Podolia, Volhynia, and Red Rus’.

In 1548/49 Bohusz F. Korecki was appointed to the starosties of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, and in 1569/70 to Zvinogrod as well, as a reward for

---


The treaty in question was the one concluded in 1533 between Suleyman the Magnificent and Sigismund I. See KołodziejczykOttoman-Polish, 2000: 230-31, doc. No. 13 (The 'ahdname sent by Suleyman I to King Sigismund I – contemporary Italian translation, 18-26 January 1533), 232-33, doc. No. 14 (The royal confirmation of the treaty, 1 July 1533). See also İnalcık, Halil. 1994. The Ottoman Empire: the Classical Age, 1300-1600. London: Phoenix.


This raid was in connection to Sigismund’s I death, which automatically meant expiration of the 1533 peace treaty.
his services against the Tartars. As soon as he assumed his office, he set about repairing and fortifying the devastated castle at his own expense. Unfortunately, we do not have enough data to be able to tell to what extent this effort improved Bratslav’s defence capacities. In the light of the popis revisory report of 21 August 1545, the castle was in a pretty poor condition. It was no more than a rather small wooden and earthwork structure. A wooden drawbridge led up to it through a gatehouse and tower. Along the “walls” on the inner side between 6 towers there were 26 wooden horodnia structures. The castle did not have its own source for its water supply. The starost’s deputy kept two servants to attend to the castle gates. The inspector drew attention to the need to build a bastion on the hill over the River Pucewka, “which joined the Boh at the foot of the castle, and was not safe, as the enemy could climb the castle hill from it”; and also a bridge to enable the people living on the other side of the river to reach the castle for shelter in times of danger. The starost declared that all he and the local gentry could afford to do at their own expense was to build an inner wall of mud and wattle, but certainly nothing more than horodnia structures. In general, the popis inspection found the castle small, not big enough for the needs of the local population; not even one-third of them would find shelter in it with all their belongings in time of attack. The only hope for any improvement was a subvention from the royal treasury, which were as good as empty.

The castle’s munitions consisted of two large cannons and four guns used in the field, but most of them had poor bases and wheels. The “fortress” of Bratslav also had 28 harquebuses (Pol. hakownica) and three “ancient guns” (Ruth. try kii staroswieckich), which should have been melted down and cast.

173 ZDz., 1877 6: 117, 118.
174 The castle’s dangerous location for defence is described the review of 1552 (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 22, no. 7).
175 The well digging started under Pronski’s orders, but until 1545 the water level was not reached. „In the period of invasion and siege by the strong enemy, there will not be enough water supply from this only well” (ZDz., 1877 6: 119, 120).
anew. The castle’s artillery had at its disposal two barrels of gunpowder and a third one which was “far from full” (a total of 14 “stones” [Pol. kamień] of gunpowder), about half a stone of gunpowder for the harquebuses, and two barrels full and a third half-full (about one and a half stone) of saltpetre. 176 It also had 50 cannonballs, 200 rounds for the smaller guns, and a relatively small quantity of powder horns. The entire arsenal was in the hands of three gunners, Ławryn, Hawryło, and Hryn. 177 For comparison the than defences of Vinnytsia castle (of three towers and 30 horodnia edifices) consisted of two not very large metal guns, one of which had been mended after being damaged, 26 harquebuses, and “four ancient guns”, with a stone of gunpowder, two fairly small barrels of saltpetre, 19 “stone iron-coated cannonballs”, and 100 rounds for the harquebuses. These munitions were looked after by two gunners, Fedor and Michna, the latter of whom had been “leased out” from Bar Castle. 178 The royal commissioner, who also inspected the castles of Volhynia and Kyiv province, remarked, “that he had never seen such a simple and poorly equipped borderland castle”. The royal captains Prince Kuźma Zasławski and Bohusz Korecki attended the royal commissioner during the inspection of Vinnytsia Castle and helped him to select a site for a bigger and more secure stronghold. 179

Korecki’s involvement in the restoration of the castles (including Vinnytsia in 1571), and his duties in the ambient defence force, which offered opportunities for numerous abuses, gave rise to frequent protests and complaints sent to the King, usually delivered by the already-mentioned Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka of Woronowica, the Judge of the Territorial Court of

176 The Lithuanian „stone” equaled 40 of the Lithuanian pounds, what made 1280 of luts.
177 ZDz., 1877 6: 120-21. According to the royal commissioner three more gunners would improve the castle defence.
178 ZDz., 1877 6: 112, 113.
179 ZDz., 1877 6: 111-12. The new castle in Vinnytsia was built after 1510. Its construction started and was concluded mainly on the expense of Prince Constantine Ostrogski, the Vinnytsia Starost in 1529-39. This castle alike the previous one destroyed by the Tartars has been erected on the Boh’s left bank, about 1 km upstream. See Sekretar’ov, A. M. 1999. Mmisto nad Buhom 400 rokov tomu i po tomu. Istorychni narysy. Vinnytsia: TOB Anteks Vinnytsia, here 18. The popis of 1545 underlined also the Vinnytsia’s population request regarding the reconstruction of the Zvinogrod Castle, which was destroyed by the Tartars in 1541. The next survey of 1552 spoke still about the old Vinnytsia Castle (the one erected by Ostrogski), which a year earlier got a new wall (the then castle had already 30 horodnia constructions and 5 towers). Soon after 1552 the construction works for a new castle on the Boh’s right bank started. It was around this castle that a new town of Vinnytsia emerged in the 1560’s.
Bratslav, on behalf of the landed gentry of Bratslav area. One of the forms of protest was the refusal to escort the starost “into the field and along the inroads.” This is what happened in 1551, when Korecki received news from Bernard Pretwicz of Tartars approaching Bratslav. There were further refusals to serve in the general defence troops in 1552 and 1556, following the dispute with the starost. This matter, alongside the condition of the castle itself from the military and defence point of view, was of signal importance in the assessment of Bratslav’s defence potential in September 1551. This assessment in turn, was an important factor in the context of the role played by Bohdan Iwanowicz Słupica [IV/1], whom his contemporaries regarded as bearing the most blame for the hasty surrender of Bratslav Castle to the Tartars and the devastation of a large part of the province. Deemed a traitor, Bohdan disappeared from the source-material, and the Słupicas estates were confiscated in one of just two instances in the 16th and 17th centuries of forfeiture by escheat. This incident was to affect the history of the entire Słupica family for several decades to come.

Thanks to the Polish-Turkish-Tartar treaty, which had been concluded shortly before, 1550 was a relatively quiet year in Podolia, except for the Moldavian expedition to Bar prompted by the Sultan (13 February). Its aim was to capture Pretwicz. Later in the same year (14 December) he appeared before the King and Senate in Cracow and delivered his already-cited apology, in which he refuted most of the accusations put against him by the Sultan and his vassals, while at the same time giving a detailed account of the fighting along

---

180 See above, and ML Edition 2000 28: 189-91 no. 149 (27 November 1551, at Vilnius). Here (p. 189) the King in his letter to Korecki regarding his trespasses of starostial power mentioned Koszka and Ihnat Kleszczewski as the local gentry envoys. The same letter brings the most detailed account of accusations against the Starost by the local gentry as well as the royal solution of the problem.


182 Litwin, 2000: 72. Apart from the Bohdan’s case the author mentions also the Bratslav landlord Andrzej Szandyrowski, whose estates were not confiscated on the basis of perpetual forfeiture by escheat, but were given to be administered firstly by Stefan Russyan (1635-42), and then by Olbrycht Kochanowski. Bohdan apart from the hereditary estates was a co-owner of one of the Bratslav castle’s horodnia construction, which he had erected with Isaij Zabokrzycki and Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka. See ZDz., 1877 6: 118.

183 This matter will be discussed thoroughly in Chapter 5/B/2, 3 and 4.
the border. At the same time there was a change of hospodars in Moldavia, and Stephen VII ascended to the throne. In July 1550 the Poles (under Crown Field Hetman Mikołaj Sieniawski) intervened on behalf of the overthrown Hospodar Ivonia, which provided a pretext for Turkish hostilities against Poland-Lithuania the following year. This year to come (1551), there was also a coup d'état supported by Istanbul in the Crimea. After the murder of Sahib Girey I, who had maintained good relations with Poland-Lithuania, Devlet Girey came to power. The false sense of safety, a rare phenomenon in the Marches, must certainly have attenuated the vigilance of the “border-guardians,” and provided the local inhabitants with an opportunity to defy the starost’s authority and refuse to go out to patrol the inroads. As with the rebellion of 1541, the course of events in Bratslav at the beginning of September is known only from a few sources. The fullest account, closest to

---

184 On Pretwicz’s apology see above note 129, p. 124. The same year another Polish-ottoman commission regarding damages was to become operational, yet it managed to assemble in 1551. Its participants were Jan Mielecki and Andrzej Teczynski from Poland, and Sandhak bey of Nikopolis from the Ottoman Empire (PlewechynskiJazda, 1983: 122 note 46).


187 This lack of vigilance caused by political matters is portrayed also in the 1552 inspection account, underlining the luck of guards “into the field and along the inroads” as well as in the castle itself. The source points out as well to the lack of the starost’s presence in the castle (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 20). The matter of maintaining castle guards was the subject of controversy, too. In the survey of 1545 the Bratslav inhabitants asked the King to man the castle with a mercenary garrison, which should be paid out of the royal funds.

188 Orzechowski, Stanisław. Kroniki polskie. Turowski, Kazimierz Józef, ed. and transl. 1856. Sanok: n.p.: 89-90; Marcin Stryjowski, Która przedtem nigdy awiała nie widziała, kronika polska, litewska, żmudzka i wszystkiej Rusi, Malinowski M. ed., Warsaw 1846 2: 404; ML Edition 2000 28: 156-58, no. 116 (the letter of Sigismund Augustus to Jan Chrszczonowicz, the Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów regarding the matters of Cherkasy old and new castles, 1551 at Vilnius; here also information on Bratslav), 158-59, no. 117 (the King’s letter to Prince Vasil Konstantynowicz Ostrogski, the Marshal of Volhynia regarding Korecki’s letter to the king and news on situation in the Bratslav territory and in Vinnytsia after the Tartar siege, 1551), 171-72, no. 134 (the letter of Sigismund Augustus to Prince Bohus F. Korecki, the Vinnytsia Starost in matters related to the reconstruction work in the Bratslav Castle, to the losses affected from the Tartars and to the safety of the castle of Vinnytsia, 14 November 1551 at Vilnius). See also below note 189.
the actual events is in the inspection (Pol. *lustracja*) of the Bratslav Castle for 1552. My reconstruction of the siege, surrender, and its aftermath is based to a large extent on this source.

On 2 September 1551 the whole of Crimean (Pol. *Perekopska*) Horde surrounded the town and the Castle of Bratslav. The Tartars were armed with 25 cannons and were assisted by Moldavian forces and a company of Janissaries, to whom the artillery probably belonged. The presence of the latter left no doubts as to who stood behind this incursion. Contemporaries saw the involvement of the entire Crimean Horde – an unusual occurrence for those times – as a result of Habsburg intrigues intended to provoke a war between Poland and Ottoman Turkey, in order to draw the Ottoman forces away from Hungary (in 1551 the Turks captured Temesvár). The Podolians were completely taken by surprise, as evidenced in the accounts of the state of the castle’s defences and readiness (or lack of it), the fact that the starost was away and that there were no guards in the field, connected undoubtedly to the dispute between the Bratslavians and the starost.

---


190 There is no data offered by this source in respect to the numbers of enemy. However, one may assume that it must have been round 40 thousand men. Beauplan writing on the Crimean Tartars in the 1650’s, remarked that if they were to come in full force in their raids, the whole Horde would number up to 80,000 warriors, a rather exaggerated estimate: „Their king, the khan, having been commanded by the Great Lord [Sultan] to invade Poland, musters his troops with great care and attention. When he himself is in command, the army numbers 80,000 men, but ordinarily, when the commander is just a murza, their armies consist only of forty to fifty thousand [warriors]“ (Beauplan, 1999: 48).

191 In accordance with the 1552 survey the Tartars brought on the outskirts of Bratslav „poltretiadtsat“ [15] small and great cannons (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 21).

192 As states the *popis* of 1552, Bratslav townsfolk was obliged to keep guards in four spots: on the River Sokolec (Sokolets) 1.5 miles away from the castle, close to Swołoczyn Roh (Rog) at the same distance from the castle, on the Sielnica River 3 miles from the castle, and on the same river, but on its other bank in Stuhnow, which was 1.5 miles away from Bratslav. In order to sustain these guarding forces the burgers remunerated two guardians in each of the above-mentioned locations (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 22-23). One may assume that likewise two years earlier the guards should have been on their duties in the same spots. They were also obliged to offer free transportation upon the Starost order, but only in public matters (like driving royal or foreign envoys, fulfilment of guard duties) and not further than to Bratslav, Polonne and Krasilów. However, the starost, as is stated in the King’s letter of 27 November
In the absence of Bohusz Korecki, the plenipotentiary duties for Bratslav Castle, and perhaps also for Vinnytsia Castle, fell upon Bohdan Iwanowicz Shupica [IV/1].\(^{193}\) As we know nothing about his career up to that moment, we can only assume that as a relative of Bohusz Shupica [III/3], who had been killed in 1541 and a member of a wealthy and "ancient" family associated with the Prince Sanguszko for a long time, he must have seemed the right and reliable men for the job.\(^{194}\) We may also assume that he must have had the appropriate military experience in combat in the general defence forces, and/or other units active in the borderlands. At that time Korecki was of all likelihood out in the steppes.\(^{195}\) In view of the fact that most of the men from the Castle’s garrison had "dispersed into the grazing-fields and apiaries," the best Bohdan could do was to put up a force of 50 men who were "not worth much in terms of defence," not counting the women and children in the Castle. The inspector’s report states that only one of those 50 was a landed gentleman, and names him as Kudrianko.\(^{196}\) This document also highlights the leadership and encouragement Kudrianko gave to local men in the preparations for the

\(^{1551}\), forced them to go for his own matters as far as in Volhynia, and to Zhytomir where he was also the Starost in 1539-60, and other castles, including his own at Korzec (in Volhynia) (ML Edition 2000 28: 189-90, no. 149).

\(^{193}\) In the opinion of Gawroński supported by a document from the Sanguszko’s archives, Bohusz took over the duties of plenipotentiary starost in both castles. Meanwhile the *lustroczka* (survey) of Vinnytsia Castle of 1552, quoted by V. Otamanovskiy (Otamanovskiy, 1993: 69), states that the tenancy of the castle (and plenipotentiary starost duties) was then in the hands of one Holunka (Golunka) Aleksandrowicz, perhaps the successive representative of the Kmitycz Aleksandrowicz family, who "hereditary" occupied the plenipotentiary starost office in Vinnytsia. Quoting after Otamanovskys’kiy this source informs us that, "Holunka Aleksandrovych, the then tenant of Vinnytsia Castle took the village of Predurovstv <Parpurowce?>" (Otamanovskiy, 1993: 69; Holunka Aleksandrowicz is being omitted in the index). It is uncertain whether he assumed the duties prior to the Tartar expedition or after it was over. The 18th century transcript, which is to be found in the digest of legal proceedings between the Shupica and the Zaslawski families regarding Kuna estate, states that Sigismund Augustus charged Bohdan with the military command of the Bratslav garrison. The same transcript informs us as well, that Shupica was in charge of „the Castle of Bratslav [and] Vinnytsia, in which a garrison of soldiers under his command has been installed and different deposits of the Citizens of this Voivodeship have been secured” (APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23).

\(^{194}\) Ties with the Sanguszko are of importance in this context, as Bohusz Korecki’s first wife was Princess Anna Sanguszkoówna (of Sanguszko family), daughter of Prince Andriej Michajłowicz of the Koszyr line, Starost of Lutsk and Marshal of Volhynia. Korecki divorced from her in 1546 (PSB, XIV: 58-59; WolfKniaziowie, 1895: 174-75).


\(^{196}\) lakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 148 (here as Kudrenko). Jablonowski mentions the Kudrianko family among the „Lesser landed gentry” of the Powiat of Bratslav. The Kudriankos owned the village of Romanowee, located on the right bank of the River Uhorski Tylkic (ZDz., 1897 22: 647, 736).
Castle’s defence. But it is in stark contrast to the account given of the negotiators delegated to talk with the Tartars. At least three of these negotiators came from local gentry families.

The Tartars reached Bratslav at four o’clock in the morning on Wednesday, 2 September. They had spent the night in the steppe three miles away from the Castle. First they took the town, and then set about laying siege to the Castle, firing their cannons from four directions. They did most damage with the cannon positioned on the furthest barricade, on the other bank of the river. The shooting went on for three days (Wednesday to Friday). It was not exactly accurate, since the defenders lost only three men. After the preliminary artillery fire, the attackers started preparations to storm the Castle, but when they heard there was no water supply, they abandoned the plan. Thus, the defence of the Castle, under the command of Bohdan Iwanowicz Słupica, lasted for 3 days. But in view of the scarcity of supplies, the small number of able-bodied men, and the water shortage, it is doubtful that the defenders could have managed to withstand a storm, as planned chiefly by the Janissaries. According to the Stryjkowski’s account and the cited inspection, sticks had to be used to urge the Tartars on into action. The defenders took the opportunity offered by the end of artillery fire. Their council comprising of Roman [Iwanowicz] Krasnosielski (the brother-in-law of “Żdan” Hrehory Bohuszewicz Słupica [IV/3]), Serhiej Ornatowski, one Truszenko and Mitko Zolotar and headed by Bohdan as plenipotentiary, decided to send a delegation for a parley with Devlet Girey. The first to be sent to the Khan, on the afternoon of Friday, 5 September, were Zolotar and Truszenko. In the evening of the same day Bohdan Słupica went over to the Tartar camp to discuss conditions of surrender. On Saturday morning Devlet Girey came up to the castle gate to receive its capitulation. The Khan allowed the people in the castle to leave, but without their arms and gunpowder (4 cannon, 20  

197 Serhiej Ornatowski represented the nested gentry family of the Oratowskis of Oratório. Oratório was a settlement on the River Żywa, a tributary of Rośka, with which King Casimir Jagiellonian endowed Hryńko Jesmanowicz. The Oratowskis were in possession of this village yet in 1629, together with Czajłów on the River Żyd. Oratório was part of an estate by the same name, which bordered to the Kalnik estate southwards and Lipowiec estate northwards (ZDz., 1897 22: 629, 719). Perhaps Mitko Zolotar was related to the Vinnytsia burgher Kunasz Zolotar who is being mentioned by the sources in 1552 (Otamanovskyi, 1993: 145).
harquebuses, and one barrel of gunpowder). He also demanded a large sum in ransom from the town. The Tartars retreated from Bratslav on Sunday, 6 September, having burned down the Castle and town and taken most of the people off into captivity (according to the inspection only 200 individuals were spared). On their way they also captured those who were in hiding in the area and were not stopped or harassed by anyone — even Pretwicz’s colours stationed in the vicinity failed to react. They went off to Crimea with about 4,000 people into slavery.\(^{198}\)

From the royal letter of 1551, addressing Prince Vasil Konstantynowicz Ostrogski, the Marshal of Volhynia, it is clear that the Devlet Girey occurrence was a complete surprise. The king blamed local authorities for the lack of vigilance, pointing that such remissness “has never happened before”. He complained also of having no knowledge in regard to what exactly had happened in Bratslav, and what was the exact number and nature of the enemy.\(^{199}\) The first detailed account came most probably from Jan Chrzczenowicz, the former plenipotentiary in Vinnytsia (1541) and in 1551, the Cherkasy and Kaniów Starost. In the letter addressed to him from Vilnius also in 1551, Sigismund August mentioned the latter’s earlier detailed account on what had happened in Bratslav. The information was acquired thanks to Chrzczenowicz’s servant, Bohdan Kunicki, who was in Bratslav during the siege and later managed to escape from the Tartar captivity. After the Chrzczenowicz’s written report, Kunicki was sent upon the monarch’s request (most probably to Vilnius) to offer his own account of events.\(^{200}\) Unfortunately, there is no trace of both the Kunicki and Chrzczenowicz’s dispatches. Soon after, surely before November 1551, the King received from Bohusz Korecki a detailed register of the losses inflicted upon the castle, town and local population (both landed gentry and their subjects), which was delivered to the

---

\(^{198}\) PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 123. As the 1552 revision records the whole population settled down around the castle lived in 730 houses (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 20).

\(^{199}\) ML Edition 2000 28: 158-59, no. 117). In the same letter Sigismund August mentioned Korecki’s writing warning the King against the possibility of a next intrusion into the Commonwealth territory, this time coming from the newly installed Wallachian hospodar Stephan VII and the Bialogrod Sandhak bey Iliash. Stephan was definitely seeking revenge after the Sieniawski’s expedition to Wallachia in 1550. See above 143 and note 185, p. 143.

royal court by Semen Kmita, the Korecki’s servant.\textsuperscript{201} Similarly, this register is not available any more.

Also nothing is known about what happened afterwards to Bohdan, who was regarded as a traitor. His bad reputation surfaces in the anti-Słupica court digest related to the Zasławskis proceedings, presenting an entirely different version of the events. This document says, when the \textit{Perekopski} [Crimean] Tsar [Devlet Girey] could not take the Castle either in the preliminary artillery fire, or by storm, he decided to bribe the said Bohdan Słupica to betray his King into the hands of the enemy. After this, the said Bohdan Słupica broke his faith with his King and surrendered the Castle …\textsuperscript{202}

For the account, we get the impression that Bohdan assumed the part of the whipping-boy and took all the blame, since he was the plenipotentiary. This supposition becomes stronger, in view of the fact that the men who took with him the decision to surrender, Roman Krasnosielski and Serhiej Oratowski, later continued their administrative careers. In 1574 Oratowski was military curator (Pol. \textit{wojski}, Lat. \textit{tribunus}) of Bratslav, while Krasnosielski, who was a close kinsman of Bohdan’s, was appointed by Bohusz Korecki judge in the \textit{gród} (castle) of Bratslav in 1569.\textsuperscript{203} There were no repercussions for the starost, either, who was absent during the siege. Perhaps in anticipation of trouble, Bohdan left the country with the retreating Tartars. Perhaps he was killed. He definitely did not give himself up to the starost, or stay in place, expecting to stand trial in the King’s court. All that the sources mention is the confiscation of property, initially all of the Słupicas estates, but later limited only to Bohdan’s share. These properties the King reverted in 1552 to Prince Kuźma I. Zasławski in lieu of his preparatory work for the restoration of the Castle. However, this decision was revoked in 1566 and Bohdan’s estate returned to his son Semen [V/1].\textsuperscript{204} The consequences of the largest invasion of the 16\textsuperscript{th}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{201} ML Edition 2000 28: 171-72, no. 134, here 172.  \\
\textsuperscript{202} APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23.  \\
\textsuperscript{203} Litwin, 2000:126 note 20, 210 – here the appointment date to this duty is 8 January 1574 (S. Oratowski), 212 (R. Krasnosielski); NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.  \\
\textsuperscript{204} See Chapter 5/B/3: 253-56; HeleniusHeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 2: 535: APKr.: ASang., t. 141/1, t. 205/23, t. VII/80, 82, t. VIII/45, t. X/45, t. XV/1 – here there is documentation regarding confiscation and renewed endowment of these estates. ASang., t. XXII/49 (1596), t. XXIII/29
\end{footnotesize}
century turned out to be extremely aggravating and long-lasting both for the entire province of Bratslav, as well as for the Shipicas themselves, who for several decades waged a legal battle in diverse courts against the claims to the Shipicas ancestral estates put forward by the Princes Zasławski.

In the aftermath of the 1551 events a considerable number of the surviving gentry from Bratslav settled in Vinnytsia, although as the 1552 inspection said, most of them were waiting for the restoration of the Bratslav Castle, the destruction of which compelled the Kingdom of Poland to strengthen its fortresses in Ruthenian territories, while the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was now obliged to bring further changes into its defence system, by moving its Volhynian force (so-called zastawa wołyńska [Volhynian guard]) under Vasil Tyszkiewicz to the southern border. In a letter of 30 June 1552 the King exhorted Prince Dimitr Fedorowicz Sanguszko, Starost of Zhytomir, whose duty was to rebuild the Castle and town, to carry out the task as soon as possible. However, in view of the colossal scale of the destruction, Sanguszko encountered substantial difficulties, aggravated by the fact that the gentry of Volhynia were not very enthusiastic about the project, despite the King’s orders. They boycotted the royal instructions and the Starost was obliged to employ half the men of his garrison at Zhytomir (Pol. Żytomierz) for the job. The need for the rapid reconstruction of the Bratslav “Fortress” was

(1599) – here there are documents, in which the Zasławskis justify the righteousness of their claims to the estates forfeited from Bohdan for his treason.


206 APKr.: ASang., t. VII (original). Among others the King ordered Sanguszko to finish the restoration works without delay, not depending on royal expenses („ne litujuże ni na to pracy i nakładow naszych”) as the castle was of the greatest importance to the defences of the Commonwealth („onyj zamok brasławskij s tych stron neprijatelskich jest nam i Reczi pospolsitoj potrzebnyj i pożitoćnyj”). Prince Dimitr Fedorowicz Sanguszko was Starost of Zhytomir in 1548-1552. He assumed this office after Prince Bohusz F. Korecki, was promoted to become the Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. In 1552 Sanguszko became Starost of Cherkasy and Kaniów. He died in 1554 (U III/4, no. 1021f, p.138; WolffKniaziowe, 1895: 432-33; NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A).

207 APKr.: ASang., t. VII. It contains information on bringing to Bratslav half of Zhytomir’s manhood and upon the King’s instructions. Sigismund Augustus addressed a proclamation to the Volhynian landed gentry ordering them to send from their estates every tenth armed men to keep guard and peasants to do the job in the reconstruction of Bratslav Castle. The landlords were to send these men until the day of St. Elias (20 of July) 1552. These men were to surrender themselves to the exclusive disposal of Prince Vasil Konstantynowicz Sanguszko, Marshal of Volhynia. In the face of lack of discipline and boycott of royal orders Prince Dimitr
connected not only to the Tartar threat, but also with fears that there would be another Moldavian incursion into Podolia. However, it is not clear why the King showed no enthusiasm to the Korecki’s offer regarding the castle reconstruction in 1551, urging him in the same time to take more care of the Vinnytsia Castle. Despite the general situation, the major problem was, that the monarch could not answer the starost’s demands for money to be spent on the castle reconstruction. It is well known that on 21 October the monarch expedited two similar letters to his Ukrainian Starosts – Chrszczonowicz of Cherkasy and Korecki of Vinnytsia regarding military forces and provisions in the area. Korecki’s letter spoke about the 100 drabs infantry detachment, which under the royal captain Krzysztof Rudnicki was sent to keep guard in Vinnytsia. Eventually, in 1552 Sigismund August sent his gunsmith called Žoldak to handle the rebuilding of Bratslav, who promised to complete the task in 23 weeks, having 60 men for the digging and 40 craftsmen available. 3,000 cavalrymen and 1,000 infantrymen from the Volhynian general levy, Fedorowicz was forced to produce citations against the Volhynian landlords, his mother Princess Anna Despotówna included. The citation directed to her was dated 7 November 1552 and issued from Vilnius (APKr.: ASang., t. VII: original in Ruthenian script).

208 For details on this subject see Plewczyński (PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 124-25). See also the quoted latter of the King to Vasil Ostrogski from 1551 (note 188, p. 144).

209 The King’s letter of 14 November 1551 was a general answer to the previous Korecki’s questions regarding the Bratslav Castle, its reconstruction, and measures to be taken in regard to the defence structure in the area. Korecki requested royal permission to found „some kind of a new fortress” and also asked the King to give money and to order the local landed gentry, especially of the Powiat of Vinnytsia, to send their subjects to work. Besides he expected royal instructions as to the location of this new „fortress”, pointing the inconveniences of the previous castle location. The monarch did not agree to start any works in November arguing that the winter was to come soon, thus he could not force the local gentry to send their subjects to Bratslav at that time. He stressed as well that „now we are in the need to take care of Ours and the land greater and more important matters”. So the king asked Korecki to keep going with his work in Bratslav but in „a modest way”. Finally, he ordered him to take more care of the Vinnytsia Castle and be vigilant, as the enemy could come back (ML Edition 2000 28: 171-72, no. 134).

210 The full contents of this letter not quoted in the source edition was similar to the one sent on the same day to Jan Chrszczonowicz in Cherkasy. It regarded the way these soldiers are to be placed in the castle, and their living conditions so that they would fulfill well their duties. Besides, the letter spoke of provisions they should be guaranteed on their way to Vinnytsia, offering the price list for all alimentation products the soldiers were entitled to buy from the local population basing on this fixed prices list. Thus, for example they could buy a heifer or a pig for half of a kopa of groszs, a ram for 6 groszs, a goose for 1 grosz, and a chicken for 2 groszs (ML Edition 2000 28: 155-56, no. 115 [the letter to Chrszczonowicz, 21 October 1551 at Vilnius], 156, no. 116 [a digest of the letter to Korecki, 21 October 1551 at Vilnius]).

211 Balinski/Lipinski, 1844 2: 1399. Accounts in relation to this matter were preserved in the archives of Jost Decujsz, royal secretary in 1520, the Cracow’s town council member in 1528 and the director of the Crown and Prussian Mint in 1528-35. Žoldak was to receive 40 Zlotys per quarter. The attached to him diggers and craftsmen were paid 466 Zlotys and 120 groszes per quarter. The total sum spent on the reconstruction works of Bratslav Castle, including construction material amounted to 3177 Zlotys and 10,5 groszs.
Lithuanian mercenaries, and a Polish general defence force – a huge number of forces compared to the defenders of the Castle during the siege the previous year, protected the construction work. But before the gunsmith got down to the job proper, Prince Kuźma Iwanowicz Zasławska did the initial “repairs” at his own expense, bringing in also his own men to defend Bratslav.

Bohusz Korecki, Bernard Pretwicz, and Dimitr Wiśniowiecki along with the Sieniawski brothers organized in 1552 a vengeance attack into Ochakiv. In the same year the King warned the starost of Vinnytsia that the town’s inhabitants were no longer bound to guard the Castle nor perform repair and maintenance work in it. He also reminded the starost that the town bailiff (Pol. wójt) was to be appointed in a free election, an echo of the starost’s interference again, if we are to judge by yet another refusal by the people of the area in 1552 and 1562 to patrol the field alongside the starost’s men. Finally, also in 1552 a peace treaty with Devlet Girey was renewed on the same

212 KolankowskiRoty, 1935: 25 and notes 88 and 89. The military popis of forces sent to protect the reconstruction works of Bratslav Castle took place in L'viv on 27 June 1552; Plewczynski, 1995: 49 and note 135. On 28 June 1552 Sigismund Augustus ordered the royal captain Alexander Dmitrowicz [Kmitycz] to make his way together with all his retinue [most probably infantry of drab type = infantry] to Vinnytsia Castle were he was to replace captain Kmita in permanent guard duty for the above mentioned castle. This meant that after 1551 the castle guard was no longer the starost responsibility but it came under the royal garrison protection. Already on 30 June 1552 the King ordered the drab captain in Vinnytsia to send to Bratslav 50 men under their lieutenant (“50 drabów z porucznikom”), of all likelihood to act as its garrison (Otamanovskyi, 1993: 229).

213 APKr.: ASang, t. 205/23: „The Prince His Lordship Kuźma Januszewicz [Zaslawski] seeing that the matter was of highest importance decided in order to offer the refuge to the rest of local citizens to rebuild this castle as quickly as possible. And because at that time the Commonwealth was in conflict with the enemy of the Holy Cross [the Ottoman Turks] and was unable to sustain the repARATION work with money or to send people to man it, thus [the Commonwealth] agreed una Cum Consensu that the aforementioned Prince Kuźma Januszewicz Zaslawski would restore the castle on his own expense and man it with his own people. So did the Prince His Lordship Kuźma Januszewicz Zaslawski proprio paeculio ad pristinum statum reconstructing this castle, protecting it with the much solid walls and garrisoning it with his own men.” See WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 598-600 (Kuźma I. Zasławska). The author did not mention Kuźma’s participation in the restoration of Bratslav Castle.

214 KatalogdokTureckie, 1959 l/I: 132. Korecki was to kill then 18 Tartars, and take prisoner 87 with 196 horses. See also here an account of the Bratslav Castle seizure by an eye witness in Ochmański’s article (Ochmański, Jerzy. 1960. “Organizacja obrony w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim przed napadami Tatarów krymskich w XV-XVI wieku,” Studia i Materiały do Historii Wojskowości 5: 365 note 84).

215 Balinski/Lipiński, 1844 2: 1364-65. According to Otamanovskyi Korecki got then the message from Pretwicz about approaching Tartars, so he left Vinnytsia and went in the steppes for guard. This action, however, as it has been already been mentioned, was boycotted by local landed gentry. As Otumanovskyi claims the Vinnytsia inhabitants refused to go against the Tartars also in 1552-60 (Otamanovski, 1993: 233).
conditions as the former one during the King Casimir Jagiellon reign. In 1559-60 smaller Tartar invasion forces got as far as Bratslav. In 1563-64 (twice in 1564) and 1566 the Bialogrod and Ochakov Hordes were on the prowl in the neighbourhood of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Early in 1568 the Nogay Tartars plundered Bratslav and retreated unhindered to Ochakiv along the Wallachian inroad, taking off a large number of captives into slavery. After the Polish-Lithuanian Union of 1569 the royal treasury assumed the responsibility for the defence of the eastern marches, and there were more changes in the defence system. They included the bringing in of Cossack units into the system. We do not have any direct information on the participation of the Slupica family in the general defence force after 1551. It is reasonable to assume though, that Hrehory Żdan [IV/2] as well as Bohdan’s son Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] must have been engaged in military activities for the defence of the Bratslav territory.

216 The Yarlyk of Devlet Giray was sent to Sigismund Augustus from Bahcesaray in 1552 (Kniga posol'kaia VKL, soderzhashchiia v sebe diplomaticheskie sonsheniia Litvy v gosudarstvovanie korolia Sigizmunda-Avgusta (s 1545 po 1572 g.). 1843. Moscow: n.p. 65-70, no. 40. Original in RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 591, f. 100v-106v.).


218 PlewczyńskiJazda, 1983: 130, 131, 133. In 1568 the Polish part was in disposal of data on the impending raid, but due to the lack of sufficient force for defence, was unable to react.

219 On Cossack see below C/1: 160-66. Pretwicz nicknamed Korecki the Cossack assault (commander), because the Prince organised his own Cossacks for defence against the Tartars. They used to be mostly his servant boyars, among which a detachment of servants from the village of Mieziaków, the one belonging to the starosty of Vinnytsia. This unit served also to accompany through the steppes, royal and foreign envoys and messengers and to patrol the so-called Tartars’ trails. After Bratslavshchina became part of the Crown in 1569, these Cossacks took an oath and were named in the then written down register as Mieziaków atamans (“atamani meziakowscy”) - Jurij of Mieziaków with a dozen or so “responsible men” (“mężami statecznymi”) and Hryńko (Hryczko) Letynski [Lityński? of Lityń]. Most probably also from these Cossacks, Korecki recruited a cavalry colour, with which in 1567 he undertook raids as far as Wielkie Łuki. Bratslav was the enlistment point for this unit. The town, of which in 1545 the royal official wrote, that, it was beyond force to “capture“ the Cossacks for royal duties, unless reach people (“ludzie pieniężni”) used to live there (ZDz., 1877 6: 122). Korecki’s unit that stationed in Vinnytsia was of all likelihood of riflemen (Pol. rota strzelca). After the union was concluded the double starost (of Bratslav and Vinnytsia) had at his disposal in Vinnytsia an infantry detachment (Pol. rota piesza) of 50 drabs, which from 11 November 1569 automatically went on royal treasury maintenance. As infantry royal captain Prince Korecki was the commander of this force until 4 November 1573 (Plewczynski, 1995: 69 and note 252, 79 and notes 254, 267). Nevertheless, accordingly to Kolankowski after Korecki was forfeited on the Vinnytsia starosty, he took over the town defence responsibilities on 7 August 1569, obliging himself to sustain on his own expense the castle garrison. After 1569, there was also a garrison in Vinnytsia. It consisted of an infantry detachment of Prince Sokolnicki, which numbered 100 drabs. Next, as the same author claims, Bratslav was to be guarded by Semen Deszkowski with 100 drabs (infantry) and Szymon Ciolek with 100 infantrymen, at least until 1572 (KolankowskiRoty, 1935: 30-31, 32).
at least sporadically, especially as their property at Kuna lay “in the middle of
the Tartar Kuczmań inroad.”

6. Hrehory Ždan Słupica: the Struggle to Retrieve Prestige and an
Administrative Career in the Service of Ławryn Piaseczyński.

Hrehory Bohuszewicz known as Ždan [IV/2], was the man, the family had to
thank for the retrieval of their status after Bohdan Iwanowicz’s [IV/1] disgrace.
While Ivan Jermołajewicz Meleszko, guardian of the children of Bohdan
Słupica in their minority, took care of the economic restoration of the Słupicas
property, Hrehory Ždan did most to retrieve their forfeited lands and to
counteract the claims lodged by the Princes Zasławski (as I have already
mentioned). For two decades he waged a successful struggle and assisted
Bohdan’s son Semen [V/1] in the legal battle for the retrieval and tenure of his
ancestral estates, starting with a petition to the King himself (1555), and
continuing in a variety of courts, finally in 1575 resorting to violence to take
back the properties in question from the Zasławskis. Apart from this aspect
of his activities, which no doubt cost him a lot of effort and earned him the
hostility of the Princes Zasławski, Hrehory also made a name for himself as
deputy sub-chamberlain (Pol. komornik ziemski) and later judge of the gród
(castle) at Bratslav. He pursued an administrative career despite the air of
disgrace associated with his relative’s alleged treason, and thereby did much to
the restoration of the family’s prestige.

Before Hrehory Ždan embarked on his administrative career he built up
a public reputation for his contribution to a campaign by the gentry of Bratslav
on behalf of the Ruthenian language (a forbear of modern Ukrainian). When
they put their signatures to the Polish-Lithuanian Act of Union at the Sejm of
Lublin on 26 May 1569, Prince Roman Sanguszko, Voivode of Bratslav and

220 Apart from the episode discussed, there are no extant relations of Bohdan. All we know is
that he was the son of Ivan. Bohdan was married to Zofia Olechnówna (daughter of Olechno
Mikuliska (of the Mikuliski), who married the second time Jermołaj Meleszko in 1552,
confirming the suspicion that Bohdan died in 1551. There were two children from Zofia’s
marriage to Bohdan, a son Semen [V/1] born ca. 1546, and a daughter Marusza Bohdanówna
[V/1], who was married to Ivan Łysoborski, who came from the part of Podolia belonging to
the Kingdom of Poland.

221 See Chapter 5/B/2: 246-52 and 3: 253-56.
Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, representing the newly-created (1566) Voivodeship of Bratslav, saw to it that the document contained a clause guaranteeing religious freedom for Eastern (Orthodox) Christianity, and the right to use Ruthenian in official correspondence and administrative matters in the Bratslav territory. On 26 May 1569 Sigismund Augustus issued a charter giving the people of the Voivodeships of Bratslav and Volhynia the right to use Ruthenian in legal documents issued by the royal chancellery, in the gród (castle) courts of these Voivodeships. In this charter Sigismund Augustus also guaranteed the right of these two Voivodeships to use the provisions of the Lithuanian Statute (the I of 1529 and the II of 1566), especially with regard to summonses.222 Ruthenian retained its status as an official language in the documents issued by the castle (Pol. grodzi) and district (Pol. ziemi) courts more or less until the mid 1660’s. The exception was in the municipal (Pol. magistracki) courts, which always used Polish.223 Shortly after the Act of Union there was a popis of the nobility and gentry of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Those assembled took an oath of allegiance to the Commonwealth of Poland and Lithuania. Hrehory, at the time head of the family (Pol. rod) in view of the minority of Semen Bohdanowicz (Bohdan’s son), appeared before Wojciech Wolski the Royal Commissioner to take the oath on behalf of the Słupica family, and is mentioned in the list of landowning gentry for the Powiat District of Bratslav.224

The importance ascribed to the language guarantee is shown by a petition of 1576/77 addressing Stephen Báthory with the seals of 22 of the principal figures in Bratslav society, most of them representatives of the most ancient “nested” Ruthenian families.225 There are no signatures on this

---

222 Balkiński/Lipinski, 1844 2: 1336-37. It includes extensive quotations from the charter issued by Sigismund Augustus. Interesting phenomena are Latin interpolations in Ruthenian documents, most often legal terms or longer quotations from legal treatises, were written down in the Orthodox alphabet. In the books from the Bratslav territory, they are to be encountered quite often.

223 HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 509.


225 BCzart.: sign. 307, f. 15 (original). It seems the same petition has been published at least twice, but under two different dates, as expedited from Bratslav on 7 July 1576 and 1577 (Dziadulewicz, Stanisław (ed.) 1936. “List szlachty województwa bracławskiego do króla Stefana Batorego,” Miesięcznik Heraldyczny 15: 69-71 [here description of the document, its seals and date 7 July 1577] = Lipinski, Wacław (Lypynsky, Viacheslav) (ed.) 1912. “Echa
document, but the seals are readily identifiable as belonging to members of the following families: Curkowski, Kajdasz, Koszka, Komar, Kozar Obliński, Kublicki, Sutyski, Mormil, Nehrebecki, Noskowski, Obodeński, Oratowski, Sabarowski, Sawin, Skinder, Słupica, and Szandyrowski. They protested against the practice of the royal chancellery of serving summonses (writs) concerning them, written in Polish. Earlier, already in 1569, the language issue had been discussed at an unlawful convention of Volhynian gentry at Lutsk. They protested against the practice of the royal chancellery of serving summonses (writs) concerning them, written in Polish. Earlier, already in 1569, the language issue had been discussed at an unlawful convention of Volhynian gentry at Lutsk. Obviously this letter from the gentry of Bratslav has to be seen as something more than just a protest on summonses written in Polish and the defence of the Ruthenian language. It was evidence of their opposition to the ongoing process of Polonisation in the upper strata of the Ruthenian gentry and nobility.

Hrehory Żdan’s seal on this document will be discussed later in the next chapter. The following individuals who also put their seals to the letter as being identified by Piekosinski, were relatives or neighbours of the Słupica family: Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, Semen and Bohdan the Obodeńskis, Jurij Hrehorowicz Kozar Obliński, and Ivan Szandyrowski.

From the documents it is not clear when exactly Hrehory could have assumed the office of komornik (the deputy sub-chamberlain), nor what sort of komornik’s office it was. In the two documentary records we know of, one describes him as komornik of the gród (castle) of Bratslav (1584), and the other as komornik of the Voivodeship of Bratslav (1585). It has to be assumed that it was a komornik’s office in the territorial hierarchy (komornik ziemski), and was associated with the deputy sub-chamberlain’s office (Pol. podkomorz, Lat. subcamerarius). If so, then Hrehory may have been appointed by Lawryn


229 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI/48: 25 September 1584 (as komornik <deputy sub-chamberlain> grodzki bracławski = the castle komornik of Bratslav), t. XVIA/41: 1 July 1585 (as komornik woj. Bracławskiego = komornik of the Voivodeship of Bratslav). One should treat as erroneous the date, which Hrehory Żdan appears as castle justice in 1575, as it is in the paper by Rulikowski (Trusiewicz, 1870: 305). Litwin repeated without criticism this date (Litwin, 2000: 212). In 1575 Hrehory might have been in charge of komornik duties, but surely he could not
Gniecowszewicz Piaseczyński of the arms of Lis, who performed the duties of sub-chamberlain in 1583-1605, and was also a royal secretary (as of 1591).\textsuperscript{230}

A royal secretary’s duties required almost permanent present at Court in Cracow. Many of the extant documents suggest that Ławrywn was one of Sigismund III’s (1587-1632) most trusted secretaries, as evident of from the three important embassies he was entrusted with in 1601-03 to Kazi/Ghazi Girey, Khan of the Crimean Tartars.\textsuperscript{231} Thus, appointing a deputy sub-chamberlain (Pol. \textit{komornik [ziemiński]}) in Bratslav to deputise for the sub-chamberlain, who was frequently away on business would seem a logical move.\textsuperscript{232}

This seems to be a plausible hypothesis for two reasons. First, because of the individual who was Słupica’s successor to the office and the grounds given for his appointment.\textsuperscript{233} Secondly, because of family connections.\textsuperscript{234}

---

\textsuperscript{230} See PSB, 1980 XXV: 805-08 (Ławrywn alias Wawrzyniec Piaseczyński, by Ewa Dubas-Urwianowicz).

\textsuperscript{231} In 1602/03 Piaseczyński was on envoy duty to Crimea. He left a detailed account edited by Pułaski (Pułaski, Kazimierz. 1911. „Trzy poselstwa Ławryna Piaseczyńskiego do Kazi-Gireja [...] 1601-1603,” \textit{Przewodnik Naukowy i Literacki} 39: 135-45, 244-56, 358-66, 467-80, 553-66, 645-60, 756-68, 845-64, 945-60).

\textsuperscript{232} Litwin, 2000: 208 – here the appointment date 1 July 1583 and d. on 7 March 1605/06. See PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 133-41 (Ławrywn); Uruski, 1916 13: 311. In accordance with one version of the Piaseczyński genealogy Ławrywn was to die already in 1609 (APKr.: ASang., t. 119/29).

\textsuperscript{233} PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 135. The author quotes as source the excerpt from the Bratslav land books in form of \textit{Laudum} of the local gentry dietse (\textit{sejmik}) of Powiat District of Bratslav, however, without offering an exact signature. In the light of this source Piaseczyński being constantly occupied with his secretary’s duties at the Royal Court and in the Crown Chancery („bydąc zabawiony ustawicznymi służbami pisarskimi na dworze JKr. Mości w kancelarii królewskiej”) was “unable to fulfil” („dyszyć uczynić”) his obligations as subchamberlain, so he showed royal letters to the gentry gathered on the Bratslav dietse assembly in accordance with which he had appointed to the \textit{komornik} office “Lord Olesza Diakowski ancient men in this country, trustworthy and well settled down” („pan Oleszy Dyakowskiego [Oleksieja Diakowskiego] rodzica w kraju tutejszym starożytnego, godnego, dobrze osiadłego”). The audience took an oath of allegiance of Diakowski allowing him to assume the post on condition, that he would at place “handle and performe this office” („tym urzędem ma właścić i sprawować”) during the periods of Piaseczyński’s absence. The witnesses to the oath were the Bratslav Castle magistrates — deputy starost (Pol. \textit{podstarości}) Hrehory Czeczel, judge Konrad Kozar and notary Hrehory Bajbusa.
Hence it seems likely that Hrehory Zdan held the office of komornik already by the second half of 1583, that is the time when Ławryn Piaseczyński was appointed sub-chamberlain (1 July) until 1586, when Oleksiej (Olechno, alias Olesza) Diakowski became his successor in this office.

234 Jakub, one of the sons of Ławryn Piaseczyński and Magdalena née Dubiecka, cup-bearer (Pol. cześnik, Lat. pinzema) of Bratslav as of 1620 (d. 1633), was married to Anna née Krasnosiełska, daughter of Vasil. Anna's second husband was Vasil Rohożinski, thanks to which the Słupica family were the kinsmen of the Piaseczynskis through the Krasnosiełski family. Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosiełski, Anna's grandfather, had been justice in the gród of Bracław (1562-92), and husband of Iwona Słupiczanka [IV/4]. Jakub Piaseczyński’s brother Alexander (d. 1646) was the second husband (ca. 1617) of Halszka Rohożinska of Rohożno (d. 1623), daughter of Semen Rohożinski and Anna Massalska, widow of Iwan Jermyłajewicz Meleszko (APKr.: ASang., t. 119/29). The Piaseczyński genealogy dated 12 November 1639 and starting with Ławryn; an extract from the sub-chamberlain's registers for the Bratslav Voivodeship. Here are different versions of the same genealogy, also the one of the Krasnosiełski family in form of a tree starting with Roman]. Anna née Krasnosiełska was in the light of the aforementioned genealogies, daughter of Ivan Krasnosiełski and Marianna Czerlenkowska. However, according to Pułaski (Pułaski Kronika, 1991 2: 150) she was a daughter of Vasil. The same author claims that Halszka, wife of Alexander Piaseczyński was a daughter of Semen Rohożinski and one Masalska [Massalska] (Pułaski Kronika, 1991 2: 145), while Petrenko (Petrenko Luka, 1998: 21) considers her to be the daughter of Vasil Rohożinski. See also PSB, 1980 XXV: 800-03 (Alexander Piaseczyński). It was just Alexander who was sued by Halszka Semenówna in 1624, because of his unlawful privilege on the Kuna estate. See Chapter 6/D/4a: 371-74.

235 Diakowski was also connected with the Słupica family. In 1615, as legal guardian of Jurij alias Jeremiasz Juriewicz (son of Jurij) Słupica [VI/6], last in the male line, he acted on behalf of his ward, Hrehory Ždan’s grandson, in proceedings against Halszka Semenówna Słupiczanka [VI/1] and her husband Vasil Rohożinski (Pułaski Kronika, 1991 2: 135: here as Olesza Dyakowska). Oleksiej (Olesza, alias Olechno, Alexander) in the opinion of Plewczyński, Oleksiej, similarly to some others representatives of the same family performed military service in cavalry units of ambient defence structure in 1558, as towarzysz (Plewczyński, 1995: 27 and note 240). On 26 August 1583, he witnessed the official introduction into the Zalesie estate (later on known as Łuka Meleszkowska) of Zofia of the Mikulinskich, widow of Jermyłaj Meleszko and her son Ivan Meleszko, the later legal guardian of the young Słupicas, children of Semen (Petrenko Luka, 1998: 14-15). In 1594 Oleksiej was a representative (Pol. deputat) of the voivodeship of Bratslav in the Crown Tribunal in Lublin (Boniecki, 1902 5: 123). On 1 May 1602 at Lublin acting as one of shareholders in the Ostołopów grounds (Ostołopów in the Powiat of Bratslav; the part in question was the 8th portion in this estate which Oleksiej inherited after the late Vasil Czećzel) he managed to secure a court verdict forcing the new delimitation of the estate borders. The parties were his neighbours Prince Joachim Boluszewicz Korecki and castle notary of Vinnytsia, Hrehory Bajbuza, both of whom had sued earlier that appropriated the part of his grounds (DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28, f. 39v.-70). On 2 May 1603 also at Lublin the Tribunal issued a decree, which confirmed Oleksiej’s title of ownership to all parts in Ostołopów estate, which might have been transferred to his sons Semen and Ivan (CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, f. 21). On 3 August 1612, in the Crown Tribunal, Oleksiej got another verdict, which occurred on 3 May 1613 and 29 July 1615 concerning the foray performed on the grounds of Ostołopów. The act was directed against the then Bratslav Starost Walenty Alexander Kalinowski (DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28, f. 39v.-70). On 18 October 1617 at Vinnytsia Oleksiej witnessed the document of Ivan Romanowicz Krasnosiełski, Bratslav’s master of hunt (Pol. łowczy, Lat. venator) in which the latter resigned on behalf of his son Bohdan Iwanowicz, half of the village of Krasne comprising a manor house in Krasne (APKr.: ASang., t. 115/38). Diakowski was Jeremiasz’s guardian in his minority perhaps because his mother was Marusza Mikołajewna of the Diakowskich, who married in her second marriage Stefan Dzuśa as her second husband (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59 [81, 82 – original and a copy of extract from the Vinnytsia castle
It is not known whether Hrehory Zdan resigned his office out of his own will and whether his resignation was connected with his promotion to the office of judge of the gród (castle) in Bratslav. He is recorded in the documents in the latter office for 1592-95; from 7 July 1592 to 29 January 1595. It cannot be ruled out that he held the office of justice until 1596, when he presumably died while on a military expedition with his nephew Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. Both of them suddenly disappear from the source materials at around the same time (before 8 December 1596). On 2 July 1592 the office was still held by Kozar Obliński, who had succeeded to his father Konrad (Kondrat), who had held the office of judge in 1572-86, or perhaps until the year of his death, 1599.236 There was probably a family connection behind Hrehory Zdan’s succession following Kozar father and son in the office.237 In 1596 the office of judge of the gród was held by one Michajło (Michał) Olechnowicz Łasko Woronowicki of Woronowica, promoted from the office of the territorial (Pol. ziemski) deputy judge for Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Both Hrehory’s immediate predecessor as well as his successor and he himself owed their appointments to Jurij Struś of Komarów, Starost of Bratslav, Vinnytsia, and Zvinozgod, who in 1600-04 resigned from all three offices in favour of his son-in-law Walenty Alexander Kalinowski.238

Hrehory’s signature and seal on a deed of attestation issued by the local gentry of Bratslav for Lawryn Piaseczyński on 3 November 1590, shows that his close association with the Piaseczyński family continued during his magistracy. This document, the idea for which came from the sub-chamberlain himself, was to serve as court evidence on his behalf in his litigation against Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav.239 The others who signed and

court registers], t. XXX/92 [131, 132 – original and a copy of extract form the Crown Tribunal registers]. ZDz., 1894 20: 107 [Marusza]).
236 See NykiełBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.
237 Krykun/Piddubniak, 1999: 138 (1592-95); BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolińscy], no. III/4108, f. 13; after 25 February 1592, f. 31 and 33v.: 25 and 29 January 1596; CDIAUK: F. 49 op. 2 [Potoccy], no. 120, f. 112: 7 July 1592; ASang., t. XIX/60: 13 and 16 December 1592, t. XXII/49: died before 8 December 1596.
238 See NykiełBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.
239 Since the Piaseczyński family seat, Zorniszche (Zhornische), neighboured on the Niemirów property owned by Prince Zbaraski. In the spring of 1590 Zbaraski’s men made an armed foray on Zorniszche, wounding or taking many of Piaseczyński’s servants. The damage due to the looting amounted to 1000 three-scores of Lithuanian graxs.
sealed this deed alongside Hrehory were Semen Obodeński (to whom Ławryn later showed his gratitude by annexing some of his (Semen’s) property neighbouring on Żorniszcze), the territorial deputy judge of Bratslav Michajło Łasko, notary in the gród of Bratslav Hrehory Bajbuza, and Oleksjej Diakowski, who was still performing the duties of deputy sub-chamberlain (Pol. komornik [ziemski]) of Bratslav, along with the landowners Bohdan Jakuszyński, Ivan Żabokrzycki, Ivan Bajbuza, Vasil Czeczel, Alexander Chraszcz [Łaszech?], Antoni Kublicki, Andrzej Żukowski, and Józef Kublicki. Hrehory’s appearance on behalf of his patron is not surprising, especially as in the following years the Słupicas estates also fell prey to Zasławski wilfulness.

On 7 July 1592 Hrehory Ždan, judge of the gród in Bratslav, entered in the oblata register a legacy made by Owdotia Komarowa Sutyska, ceding her inherited property in the Voivodeship of Bratslav to her husband Jan Wereyski, viz. the village of Sutyska along with the manor house (Pol. dwór), the adjoining settlements and lands. Michajło Januszewicz Dołżyki [Dołżski] Hulewicz, Juchno [Iwanowicz] Krasnosiecki, Awram Soszkowski, Bohdan Kozar [Obliński] (still signing as justice of the gród of Bratslav), Andriej Hrybunowicz Czeczel and Semen [Bohdanowicz] Słupica, Hrehory’s nephew were witnesses to this deed. There are no more testifying of the public career of Hrehory Bohuszewicz, whose chief concern was to retrieve his own, and subsequently Semen’s estate from the hands of the Zasławskis.

C. The Seventeenth Century: The Decline of the Słupicas:

---

240 PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 138-39. The author does not offer the signature of the document. After long lasting and unsuccessful court proceedings in different courts the case was finally settled down in 1596 in the course of friendly/arbitrary agreement (Pol. ugoda „przez przyjaćl̄”).

241 CDIAUK: F. CDIAUK: F. 49 op. 2 [Potocey], spr. 120, f. 112-121 (Genealogy and digest of the Komar Sutyski family privileges from the 16th century onwards), here f. 112-113v. The estates under consideration encompassed of the village of Sutyska with its manor house and the following settlements: Witawa, Jankow, Tywrów, Szersznie, Borsuków, Majanów, Woroszyłowce. The deed enumerated as relatives of Owdotia – her paternal uncle Nikifor Komar and her aunt Maria Komarówna Nikiforowa Tyszczyna, wife of Nikifor Tyszka [Bykowski]. See also Chapter 5/B5: 264 and note 117, p. 64.

242 CDIAUK: F. CDIAUK: F. 49 op. 2 [Potocey], spr. 120, f. 113v.
1. Kuna and the Kuna Estate and the Cossack Question (1607-52).

We do not have direct information on Cossack activity around the Kuna estate as from the late 16th century to the 1640's. One can hardly believe that, living in the voivodeship which in the late 15th century was the cradle of the Cossack movement and from the mid-16th century the playground of so many of the Cossack riots and mutinies, the Stupicas could never have faced acts of defiance from their own subjects, or Cossack raids. They must certainly have been affected in one way or another by the disturbances in the Bratslav area led by Seweryn Nalewajko (d. 1597) in 1594-95. None the less, I did not manage to find any mentions of this subject in the sources. Only Rulikowski, who must have had access to an original document from the no longer extant the Jaroszyński archives, records the unique incident in his article.

One of the numerous displays of opposition to the starost’s authority by the townspeople of Bratslav occurred in March 1607. This time they expressed their defiance of Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, who held the offices of Voivode of Bratslav and Starost of Vinnytsia. We do not know the exact cause of this incident, but may assume that, like on previous occasions, what lay behind the people’s discontent was abuse of starostial authority. An account of the developments in the town is given in the report made by Maciej of Husiatyn, court beadle, entered at the Voivode’s request in the court registers of Latyczow and Trembowla Castles (in the Crown Podolia). The townspeople had staged an armed incident against the Voivode on 7 March 1607, while he

---

151 From September 1594 the mutinied Bratslav townsfolk and Nalewajko’s Cossacks took the full control of the Bratslav Castle, town and the whole of the Powiat of Bratslav, forcing the local gentry to offer them maintenance (Pol. stacja) in their properties and ravaging them in the same time. See Huslystyi, K. 1943. “Do istorii bratslav’s’ko ho povstannia v 90-kh rr. XVI stalitstha.” In Naukovi zapysky Instytutu istorii i arkeholohii Ukrainy. (Vol. 1) Kyiv: n.p. 151-57. There are three articles by Ukrainian researchers compiled in last years and consecrated to these events, of which the best source basis seems to possess the one by Krykun. Krykun, Mykola. 1993. „Do istorii povstannia Severyna Nalyvaika,” Ukraina’s’kii arkeohrafichnyi shchoricynyk 2: 153-60; Lepiavko, S. A. 1991. „Pol’s’kii khroniky I. Bel’s’koho i R. Heidenshtca pro povstannia 1594-1596 rr. na Ukraini.” In Ukraina i Pol’shcha v period feodalismu: Zbirnyk naukovikh prats. Kyiv: n.p. 60-73. See also Hrabovets’kyi (see note 147). Recently Kempa offered some attention to those events in the Polish literature (KempaOstrogski, 1997: 214-18).

152 Trusiewicz, 1870: 315 and note 85.


was entering the town with a large retinue of gentry. The townsfolk mounted barricades erected in a part of town they had occupied and all day long kept firing at the castle and courthouse. A few of Kalinowski’s men were injured during the fighting, including the leader of his troop of hayduks, who died of his wounds shortly afterwards. Kalinowski himself, had inherited some unsettled business, the source of discontent, from his father-in-law Jurij Stuš, the previous Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. He, however, found a way of dealing with the rioters. He got a legislative act, which accorded him well-nigh unlimited powers through the *Sejm* of 1607. The rioters were deprived of all means of appeal against Kalinowski’s verdicts, and they were left completely at the mercy of his jurisdiction.\(^{149}\) Also in 1607 the *Sejm* voted further restrictives acts on “borderland wilfulness” and “the Cossacks of Zaporoże,” aimed to curb social mobility in the Marches and to control possible protests at the grass-roots level.\(^{150}\)

In 1608 Michajło Krysa, captain of the Zaporozhe (Pol. *Zaporoże*) Cossack troops, who was later known for his pro-Polish sympathies in support of the gentry cause, issued an appeal to the subjects of Kuna to remain loyal to their rightful masters.\(^{153}\) Nothing is known about the reasons behind the dissatisfaction of the people of Kuna towards their lords, and the way it was manifested. In 1608 Kuna was being administered by Ivan Meleszko on behalf of...
of Tychon Semenowicz, who was still in his minority. Meleszko was pursuing a dynamic colonisation policy; the town of Kuna had been granted a municipal charter in 1605, and a castle was being erected in stone and brickwork (1605-12). Perhaps the people had voiced their discontent to increased workload the entrepreneurial administrator had imposed upon them. Tychon’s elder brother Matiasz Semenowicz [VI/2], the lawful heir to the Kuna estate, was in Hungary or perhaps had already died by then (and definitely before June 1609), giving thus, his subjects an excellent opportunity for disobedience and disorder.

Much more is known about the Cossack disturbances associated with Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi (Pol. Chmielnicki)’s movement in 1648-52, which spared neither Kuna itself, nor the entire area of the old Słupica estate. Recently Dan has presented a comprehensive account of the Cossack and Tartar campaign in the Bratslav territory in 1648-57. I shall therefore concentrate only on information concerning the Kuna properties and their immediate environs, referring to Dan’s source materials.

The siege and capture on 22 June 1648 of nearby Nesterwar, a property of the Princes Czetwertyński, originally a Kalinowski foundation and later known as Tulczyn, as well as the capture of Vinnytsia (1 July) provide evidence that Kuna was in the eye of the Cossack storm. Further testimonials came in the declarations by the gentry of Bratslav of the loss or destruction of their documents, land deeds and charters. These papers have been destroyed in 1649 or in the subsequent years in consequence of the Cossack and the assisting Chmielnicki Tartar units activity in the area. The Horde entered the Bratslav territory in June 1648. One unit set out for Khmelnik, another passed Vinnytsia in the direction towards Bratslav. The Tartars burned down Hajsyn,

155 This work consecrated to the history of the Cossack in the Bratslav territory in 1648-67, however conclusions require to be somewhat verified by other publications. See Dan, O. Y. 2004. Kozatstvo Bratslavshchyny u bort’bi za svobodu i nezalezhnist’ (1648-1676) <DanKozatstvo>. Kyiv: n.p. Especially Chapter III (69-122) of this book is worth of attention as it brings a rather detailed description of actions undertaken by the Cossack forces in the Bratslavshchyna in 1648-57.

156 Pamiętniki o wojnach kozackich za Chmielnickiego przez Nieznanego Autora, wydane z rękopisu – Hisotyja o buntach Chmielnickiego, o wojnie z Tatarami, ze Szwedami i z Węgrami za króla Władysława IV i za Jana Kaz... <Pamiętniki o wojnach kozackich>. 1842. (2nd ed.) Wroclaw: n.p., here 8-9; Trusiewicz, 1870: 314; DanKozatstvo, 2004: 71, 73-74 (Nesterwar), 75 (Winnica).
Kiślak, Huńcz, Radiny, Werbiec, and Żywotów, while their main force set up camp near Przyłuka.\textsuperscript{157} According to Samule (Samojlo) Kalinowski's estimate, 200 thousand people were taken off into captivity.\textsuperscript{158} On 27 February 1653 the brothers Dimitr and Andrzej the Diakowskis submitted a declaration concerning the destruction of their documents, which had been deposited in their Ostrołopów properties not far from Nosowce. They wrote that “in 1648, after the Pilawa War [20-22 September], the Cossack rebels and the peasants of the village of Ostrołopów carried off the chest containing all the documents of the Diakowskis, from the house of the said Gentlemen. The chest, which held all their papers, dispositions, sundry charters, original deeds, legacies, pledges [...] , verdicts issued by the courts, both in the district and castle as well as the tribunal, and all the documents for their legal proceedings [...] , had been buried for safety when the Diakowskis had fled for their lives to Poland. It was dug up by the rebels, who made off with it to an unknown destination.”\textsuperscript{159} A similar declaration, by Tychon Mormil, another neighbour, that peasants from Hubnik who joined the rebels robbed him of his money and movable assets, confirms the hypothesis that Kuna was in the middle of the area affected by the rebellion.\textsuperscript{160}

Nonetheless, Kuna was lucky, as it was used, in 1648, as the abode of the Kalnik Cossack Regiment.\textsuperscript{161} It counted in 1649 2,050 men and was made up of 21 \textit{sotnia} units of varying numbers of men.\textsuperscript{162} One of these units, which

\begin{footnotes}
\item[157] DanKozatstvo, 2004: 70.
\item[158] DanKozatstvo, 2004: 70.
\item[159] DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28: It is a delimitation decree setting borders between the Bratslav Starosty and Ostrołopów estate, f. 39v.-70, here f. 53v. = CDIAUK: F. 242, op. 1 [Chołoniewscy], spr. 21, f. 65 (digest of the same document based on its entry in Bratslav court registers dated 15 September 1781).
\item[160] Trusiewicz, 1870: 315.
\end{footnotes}
according to the *Rejestr wojska zaporoskiego* [Register of the Zaporozhe army] of 1649 consisted of 77 men under the command of Iliash (Iljasz) Radulenko, was stationed at Kuna (at "Kunians'ke" in G. Gaietsky). This was probably the time when the Cossack Colonel Bohun sent an address similar to the one described above to the subjects of Kuna. At least, this is what Rulikowski claimed, but gave more information to help us to identify the date and content of the document. It seems likely that Bohun could have issued such an address, since according to Gajetsky's data Ivan Fedorowicz Bohun, who died in 1664, was the commanding office (colonel) of Kalnik Regiment in 1648-49, 1650, 1653-55, and 1658. It would have been natural for him to address a letter, not necessarily similar in content to Krysa's letter, to the inhabitants of

---


164 Trusiewicz, 1870: 315 and note 85.
Kuna, who were entirely at the mercy of the Cossacks. The unit of 77 men stationing there at the time was big enough to impose its will on the local people. An indirect proof of this comes in the declaration made by Ewa Postołowska, née Bubnowska, widow of Michał Postołowski before the territorial court of Bratslav on 31 January 1664. Until 1648 she and her sister Marianna Gromadzka (by then deceased) had held part of Kuna Stara and Kuna Nowa leased out to them on a pledge by the brothers Alexander and Adrian the Rohoziński. According to her testimony, in 1649 the Cossacks seized their tenancy. Her declaration concerned the loss of the documents for the pledge due the “disasters of the time.” Also the fact that the Rohoziński brothers were serving in the Polish army (at least in 1652) against the Cossacks means that from 1649 until at least 1652 they had lost Kuna and its adjacencies to the Zaporozhan forces.

In 1651 Stefan Czarniecki, commander in-chief of Polish forces “lay waste the lands of Bratslav by fire and sword, to such an extent that from Pohrebyszcze to Berszada [Berszadź] and Chumon [Humań] it was left well-nigh desolate.” This was also the time (2/10 – 11/23 March), when Vinnytsia, defended by Bohun, was besieged. But before the Polish forces started the siege, Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko, who was in command of a cavalry regiment, persuaded Hetman Marcin Kalinowski to put down the rebellious peasants of Sutyski and Łuka Meleszkowska. The campaign ended on 2 June 1652 with a battle, followed by a massacre of the Polish forces at Batoh, in which six of the Rohoziński brothers lost their lives — still more evidence that Kuna was not spared, but indeed deprived of its proprietors.

---

166 CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1 [the Bratslav territorial register book], no. 26, f. 53-54.
167 Pamiętniki o wojnach kozackich, 1842: 115.
169 Petrenko Łuka, 1998: 24. Meleszko drowned in the Boh on 11 March falling down into one of the air holes, Bohun had ordered to dig in the frozen river to prevent Polish assault on Vinnytsia.

Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] does not appear in this chapter, as his activities focused on the family sphere. After he and Hrehory Ždan retrieved all the family estates in 1575, he set about their restoration. The only instance of his activities outside his economic and housekeeping duties was his military service, but about this there is no accurate information. The eldest son of Semen Bohdanowicz and Owdotia née Krasnosieliska was Matiasz alias Mikołaj Semenowicz [VI/2], about whom we know very little. The name which occurs in the sources more frequently, “Matiasz”, was a Hungarian rendering of “Mikołaj” (Nicholas). Most of the information available on Semen’s elder son comes from a document dated 8 August 1612 at Lublin and issued by his younger brother Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], in which Tychon relieved Ivan Jermołajewicz Meleszko of guardianship duties over himself and his brother. This is the only source providing a few items of information on Semen’s sons, especially the life of Matiasz, mentioned as the elder brother of Tychon and the lawful heir to his father’s Kuna estate. At the time this document was drawn up, Semen Bohdanowicz was no longer alive. By this deed Tychon, following the death without issue (“po zeszłym sterilité”) of his brother Matiasz Słupica sole heir (“unicus haeres”) left to the properties Kuna and Husakowce “which lie on the Tartar trail,” absolves Meleszko of his wardship duties. As may be surmised from the document, Semen had died intestate, or in fact he was killed, in 1596, during a military campaign of which no further detail is given. As a result his issue was left without the support of a legally appointed guardian(s),

dead of the Rohoziński brothers was to serve as a punishment for the crime their father Vasil had committed on Tychon Semenowicz.

243 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 15, f. 7-9v.: the 18th-century copy; ZDz., 1894 20: 107 (digest, here the date 18 August 1612). The same document quotes Gawroński, but under an erroneous date of 12 August 1612, which in reality was the date of oblata in the Crown Tribunal registers (Gawroński, 1915: 225).

244 Gawroński made a mistake by attributing Marusza as Matiasz’s daughter, although later on, he himself used the document of our interest given an exact quotation „po zeszłym sterilité Matyaszu” (Gawroński, 1915: 224). Marusza, whom he claimed to be the daughter of an older Semenowicz was in fact Marusza Bohdanówna [V/2], sister of Matiasz’s father Semen Bohdanowicz, married to Ivan Łysohorski (see Chapter 6/D/1: 323-28, especially 323-24). In all likelihood Andriej Pilawski of Pilawce (Piljawce), who in the castle court of Vinnytsia on 16 April 1614 sued the widow of Semen and her children, including among the addresses of the summonses Matiasz, was not informed of his death. The case was about his subjects, which run away from his estate and settled down in Kuna (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/25).
and was therefore in the care of their mother, Owdotia née Krasnosielska, or in practice their grandmother, Zofia née Mikulińska. This state of affairs continued until ca. 1605, according to earlier writers, on the Šlupica family.²⁴⁵ But Ivan Meleszko was already acting on behalf of his wards, the Šlupica minors, in December 1596 and June 1599, appearing in the Bratslav territorial court (Pol. sąd ziemski) on their behalf.²⁴⁶ He, too, “Saw to Our Education never sparing on our learning.” We do not know exactly how long Meleszko paid for their education, and what sort of “learning and exercises” it involved; most probably it was typical for the period, training in the arts and sciences needed by a knight and gentleman.

This is precisely the career Matiasz chose to pursue. He became a mercenary soldier. Perhaps his decision was influenced by the fact that even before his father’s death (1596?) the ancestral estate was completely laid waste by Tartar raids and for several years Kuna was “left uninhabited.” When Meleszko became guardian of the Šlupicas properties they were in a state of total ruin, due not only to Tartar raids, but also unlawful conduct by relatives and neighbours. This is what we learn from Tychon Semenowicz, who wrote that Meleszko “took over our Patrimony which had been decreased by Sundry Persons and reduced well-nigh to naught.” Thereafter Tychon registered the fact that Matiasz had died in Hungary, having served there for well over a decade. We can only speculate how he reached Hungary, but it must have happened in the mid 1590’s. He died before November 1606, since by that time Meleszko was representing only one ward, Tychon.²⁴⁷ Military service in Hungary was quite common in those days. Just as mercenaries from Hungary, Moldavia, Bohemia and Moravia came to Poland, similarly men from the Commonwealth, especially the marchland voivodeships, went into military

²⁴⁵ See Gawroński, 1915, Podolyanin 1886, and Trusiewicz, 1870.
²⁴⁶ APrKr.: ASang., t. XXII/49, t. XXIII/59.
²⁴⁷ ZDz., 1896 21: 405: In the case regarding the restitution of subjects running away to Kuna brought to the court in 1598 by Ivan Curkowski against the minor Supicas (a verdict of the Crown Tribunal issued on 1 May) Meleszko still was referred to as if representing Matiasz. The information on Matiasz’s death in Hungary repeated Iwanowski (HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 536). However, Matiasz reappeared in the following summonses, for example in the one of 1609 (APKr.: ASang., t. XXVII/83). His presence in these documents was due to lack of information shown by the parties behind the cases brought against the Šlupicas.
service abroad. The Jagiellonian dynastic connections linking both countries were still fresh in Polish and Hungarian, minds when Matiasz entered Hungarian service. Moreover, they had been reinforced by the martial personality of another soldier on the throne of Poland (1575-86), Stephen Báthory, who came from Transylvania in Hungary.

248 See Plewceżyński, 1995: 100-16 (Serbs), 117-35 (Hungarians), 136-58 (Czechs and Moravians), 159-80 (Germans).
CHAPTER 3
The Słupicas – Symbols of Family Status: Arms and Seals,
Castle, Clientage. Religious Creed.

1. The Słupica Family Arms and Seals: a Reflection of Ruthenian Origins and a Status Symbol.

Nothing is known of the origins of the surname Słupica alias Słupicz, and not much about the family's arms and seals.\(^1\) We must assume that they used their own armorial device (Pol. \textit{herb \mbox{\'{\i}sny}} – an individual device, not a \textit{herb \mbox{\'{\i}sny},} viz. one carried by all members of a \textit{\mbox{\'{\i}s}} (clan) or large group of families sharing a common ancestor, a characteristic feature of the Polish heraldic tradition) on their seals, though we cannot be absolutely sure of its physical appearance. Individual armorial devices developed from the devices used on seals in the Ruthenian heraldic tradition going back to the early 14\(^{\text{th}}\) century.\(^2\) Most probably the Słupicas device was similar to the one on the seal of Hrehory Bohuszewicz known as Zdan [IV/2]. However, the representation on it is fairly late, since it was used to seal a deed dated 7 July 1576 [or 77], the original of which is in the Princes Czartoryski Library, Cracow.\(^3\) In 1936 Dziadulewicz carried out a provisional analysis of the seals on this document, with reference to the work of Piekosiński and Semkowicz.\(^4\) Since then there has


\(^2\) In Bratslavshchyna territory an individual device was used among others by the following families: Baybuza, Bohdanowicz, Chodowski, Komar Sutyski of Sutyski, Kajdasz, Szaszkiewicz, Tomkowicz, or the newcomers from Volhynia, the Iwanickis, who have been using the Pawnia arms, which, accordingly to the family tradition, they received in 1349 from the Lithuanian Prince Lubart Gedyminowicz.

\(^3\) BCzart.: sig. 307, f. 15.

been much progress in the study of Polish medieval and modern heraldry and heraldic devices on seals, with a number of fundamental publications accruing.\(^5\) However, there is little interest to Ruthenian armorial devices. Thus, the work of the earlier researchers still holds considerable value. Neither, the Russian nor, Ukrainian literature, present a fully satisfactory account on the Shipica family, and therefore the following remarks are to a large extent hypothetical.\(^6\)

The beginning of Ruthenian heraldry as practised by the nobility and gentry go back to the 1330’s, being connected with the first endowments of land for the “nested gentry” in Eastern Podolia and Volhynia. Thus, we might


assume that already Pawel [V/1], the founding ancestor of the Slupica family, used his own device on his seal, although we have no evidence for this. The admittance of the Ruthenian gentry and nobility (boyars) to the Polish knighthood resulted in gradual adaptation of the "western" model and subsequent unification of Ruthenian heraldic practices with Polish heraldry.\(^7\) The process was spread over a long period, and was not as rigorous, if compared to the adaptation of Western European norms to Polish heraldry. As Iakovenko observes, we cannot speak of any serious signs of the establishment of a heraldic tradition for the Lithuanian and Ruthenian boyars and gentry until the mid-16\(^{th}\) century, a conclusion also confirmed by the Slupicas case.\(^8\) Not until the 17\(^{th}\) century was the majority of the Ruthenian noble families using Polonicised armorial bearings, mostly the Korczak or Sas devices, in a number of variants. Thus, since the family’s male line became extinct in 1615-18, most probably the Slupicas, either did not manage to follow the changes, or only some of them did (e.g. Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]).

Of the families in the Slupicas’ extended family circle, the Korczak device was used by the Jesmans (ancestors of the Krasnosielskis) and the Meleszkos, as well as the Jaroszyński skis, the 18\(^{th}\)-century successors to Kuna. None of the families used the Sas arms. This in turn, confirmed their Volhynian

\(^7\) In the case of adoption of the Ruthenian nobility into Polish heraldry and later on of its unification process with the Polish arms, which had been already arranged in accordance to the Western European heraldry, of special importance was the Polish-Lithuanian Union of Horodło in 1413, and the acts from 1432 and 1434, 1563 as well as the Union of Lublin in 1569. In 1413, of a symbolical meaning reflecting the “fraternisation” of Polish and Lithuanian gentry, was the act of adoption by Polish families of some Lithuanian ones into their own family arms. The Horodło act enumerated 47 such Lithuanian families. The privilege of Vladislas Jagiello dated 15 October 1432, among other issues, dealt with the question of adopting Polish arms, actually taking place in 1413, in the case of Lithuanians. The latter understood as Ruthenian princely families, boyars and gentry adopted to their arms by the “proper” Lithuanians (hand in glove with Poles and after the example of Polish arms). The act of 6 May 1434 issued by the Grand Duke Sigismund repeated almost entirely the deed of 1432. However, in the case of heraldic adoptions more attention was drawn to the necessity of acquiring Polish nobility licence. In 1563 Lithuanian and Ruthenian gentry using still individual devices, were allowed to adopt Polish arms. As a consequence of this unification in the 17\(^{th}\) century the majority of families belonging to the most ancient ones in Volhynia and eastern Podolia, used as family arms two particular Polish devices – the Sas and the Korczak arms. In the case of the Bratslav territories, the Sas arms appears among the migrants from Lithuania proper and Red Rus’ (in the Crown) – over 50 families, while the Korczak arms is typical for immigrants from Wallachia and Volhynia proper (e.g. western Volhynia) – ca. 40 families. Jablonowski and Hrushëv’s’kï noticed this regularity. See also KoskowskïMonografie, 1870 2: 194-99 (Korczakowie). The author offers specification of the families using the Korczak arms, enumerating 119 family names (ibidem, 198-99).

\(^8\) IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 55.
provenance (the Jaroszyńskis), or via Volhynia migration to the Bratslav area from the Lithuania proper (the Jesman and Meleszko families). Most of the Słupicas’ immediate neighbours, and they themselves, retained their individual armorial bearings, perhaps to emphasise their Ruthenian origins and their antiquity.

We have information about individual seals used by five members of the Słupica family, Hrehory Żdan [IV/2], 1577 and 1590; Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], 1590; Marusza Mikołajewna [VI/4], wife of Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki, 1607; Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], 1612; and Halszka Semenówna [VI/1], 1621. However, records of the actual representation on the seals are available only for Semen and Hrehory Słupicas. In the case of Halszka Semenówna, all we know, is that, for well over a decade she was obliged to appear regularly in court in a number of proceedings, attending her husband Vasil Rohoziński, and that she used her own seal, which was not identical with Vasil’s. Marusza Mikołajewna and Tychon also had personal representations on their seals, but we have no information as to their design.

The oldest seal was used by Hrehory Żdan on a deed in 1576 [or 77], especially as the deed is the only original document in the group. A transcript made in 1590 (3 of November), and known only from Pułaski’s summary, tells us that Hrehory put his seal to the document. According to Dziadulewicz’s diagram, the device consisted of a centrally positioned circle with two Latin

---

9 Information on Marusza Mikołajewna and her husband Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki’s seals applied on a document dated 19 December 1607, in Kyiv, was mentioned in its obłata (entry) in the Crown Tribunal registers on 29 May 1609 (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 1v.). According to the act the couple had produced the original deed bearing their own seals and Zabłocki’s signature („[they] lied down their Own Free Letter Deed under their seals and with a signature of his own hand of Lord Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki”), allowing us to presume that Marusza was, similarly to Halszka Semenówna, illiterate. Some evidence underlined Halszka’s illiteracy. This explains why she wanted to authenticate her deeds, at least, through seal. In 1621, while renewing on her own and her husband’s behalf, the restitution of an obligation, the Słupicas had made with Stefan Kierdygenowicz Dzisza [second husband of Marusza of the Diakowskis, the former widow of Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica <V/6>] Halszka presented in the castle court of Vinnytsia, the deed signed and sealed by her husband, and sealed by her, as she herself was unable to write („herself being not able to write”) (BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 97-98v.).

10 See above note 4, p. 169. See also Chapter 2/B/6: 154-55 and note 225, p. 155.

11 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 3 (Marusza), F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 9 (Tychon).

12 See above note 4, p. 169. See also Chapter 2/B/6: 154-55 and note 225, p. 155.

(four-armed) crosses adjoining each other in a horizontal arrangement, their horizontal arms protruding beyond the circle. A vertical line dissects the circle, and its lower end protrudes beyond the circle, finishing in a leftward sickle-shaped bend. The description does not provide much information, especially as the diagram is schematic and does not give a full picture of the original, which itself is nowadays indecipherable. Nevertheless, if one compares it with other diagrams by this author, one can reach a definite conclusion. Most of his representations are just as “primitive” and are reminiscent of trademarks, brand marks or owners’ marks.\footnote{Piekosiński has been trying to prove that, the oldest devices on Polish nobility seals were quite similar to Scandinavian runic signs. Similarly, this scholar claimed that Ruthenian heraldry was much more abounding to this type of arms than the Polish one (Piekosiński Źródlą, 1899:1). In the later period one may not underestimate Tartar or others steppe tribes’ influences, which immigrants transferred to the Lithuanian territories of the Commonwealth from the East, like for example Armenians. See Dziadulewicz, Stanisław. 1929. Herbarz rodzin tatarskich w Polsce. Vilnius: n.p.; idem. 1931. „Pierwiastek tatarski u szlachty ukraińskiej,” Miesięcznik Heraldyczny 10: 133-40. On the Turkic origin Ukrainian nobility see also IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 170-74. The author points to the fact that in the 1545 revisory register of the Bratslav Castle as of Turkic origin were listed there the Czeczel, Kordysz, Kozar, Korzan and Mormil families. See also Chapter 5/B/6b [the Kozars], Chapter 2/B/3: 112 note 100 [the Mormils]. What is more the royal commissioner was to report there that the Koszkas, Słupicas and other lords families “had not been calling them brothers, or even claimed not to know them, where from they had been coming” (ZDz., 1877 6: 126).}

The “arms” of Miszko Bohdanowicz Oratowski ("original" = representing of all likelihood the oldest family device) and the “secondary” (= variation of the above-mentioned “original”) of Ždan Nikonowicz Oratowski differ only in a small detail. The latter had two symmetrically arranged dots applied to the “original” insignia, which suggests that at least in this family, each individual added a small detail to make up his personal device. The situation is similar with the “insignia” of Semen and Bohdan Obodeński, again differing only in a minor detail. There are no more such pairs of individuals from the same family on the 1576 [or 77] document, so it is hard to tell whether this was a regular custom or not, with the noble families of Bratslav. Piekosiński shows that it may well have been the case earlier.\footnote{Piekosiński Źródlą, 1899: 2-3.} Certain analogies may be observed between the arms of Hrehory Ždan and the arms reproduced in the work of Iakovenko, of the princely families of Zasławski, Zbaraski, Ostrogski, and also Iwanicki, and Fiodor Korybutowicz. The Iwanicki device, known as the Pawnia, which according to tradition they
received from Prince Lubart Gedyminowicz in 1349, is the nearest to the “arms” of Hrehory Ždan. This confirms additionally that both families had to establish themselves in the area under Vitold and his followers thanks to their endowments.  

The occurrence of at least two different stamp devices for members of the same family, at more or less, the same time, is another indication in favour of the hypothesis that Ruthenian armorial bearings developed out of the devices used on seals as if their owners’ monograms.  

Iakovenko claims that there was a tendency in the turn of the 16th century and during the 17th century, for members of the same Ruthenian family to use different armorial devices, only one being the family arms and the rest borrowed from the Polish heraldic resources. The Sļupicas appear to be a perfect example of this trend, assuming that Hrehory Ždan retained the family arms, while Semen, the junior member of the family at this time, borrowed his device from a Polish source. Gawroński appended a description of Semen Bohdanowicz’s arms to an account of a document from 1590, wherein Semen granted privileges to new settlers in Kuna. It is as follows: “a table, with a cross on the table, and next to it an arm bent at the elbow, holding a sword.” The original, given at Kuna, on 1 May 1590, and kept there in the form of an entry to the Crown Metrica registers until 1919, was lost. Gawroński made a snide remark that Semen’s arms “seem to have been a product of his own imagination.” However, since Semen and Hrehory represented two lines deriving from Ivan [II/1] and Bohusz [III/3], we cannot rule out the possibility, that they used different armorial bearings. Unfortunately, this can only be an assumption and likewise for the individual devices for other members of the family. The device used by Hrehory Bohuszewicz, a typical original device, might be considered as a proof of the family’s “antiquity.”

---

16 IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 56.
19 Podolianyn, 1886: 564 = Gawroński, 1915: 221-22. Gawroński repeats almost in entirety the extract copy published before, by Podolianyn, and interprets the device as a product of Semen’s own imagination. He describes the seal’s device as follows: “A cross might have represented the oath to adhere the conditions of contract, while a sword symbolised the dominial authority” (ibidem, 222).
Equally, one cannot rule out the possibility that the arms on Semen Bohdanowicz’s deed, were, in fact, the insignia of the Kuna estate, although this hypothesis is not very strong. It was not until 1605, that Tychon Semenowicz, obtained a municipal charter for Kuna, meaning the adoption of the German (Magdeburg) municipal law requiring also a municipal coat of arms.  

2. Kuna Castle: Symbol of Family Prestige.  


We have very few information on Kuna Castle. It cannot be ruled out that there was a small “fortress” (Pol. fortalicjum) here already in the times of Ivan [II/1]. We must assume that there was a castle at Kuna already in the 14th century, uniting features distinctive of residential and defensive architecture. Most probably it was a structure of wood and earthworks typical for the marchlands, with defence features such as a palisade surrounding it and perhaps also a moat. There might have been a 16th-century castle here in the time of Bohdan Iwanowicz (d. 1551) [IV/1] and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. There are many signs to indicate that it was destroyed as a result of Tartar raids, well before Semen’s death in 1596; and again in ca. 1600/05.  

We may assume that like the edifice erected later on, under the supervision of Ivan Meleszko, it must have been situated in the fork between the Rivers Kublicz and Sob. One of

---


21 UrbańskiPodzwoime, 1928: 42. The author without proper references claims that the Tartars destroyed Kuna Castle, and Meleszko restored it. It is highly probable, as Kuna was in 1596 a depopulated settlement, possibly as a result of prior Tartar raids. For the date of ca.1600/05 speaks the deed of privilege on sloboda (“free settlement”) in Kuna. See Chapter 4/1: 199-203.  

22 The so-called Stara [Old] Kuna, was according to Podolianyn situated on the right bank of the Boh, in the fork of the Sob and its right bank tributary the Kublicz, but on both banks of Sob. It was closer to Hajsyn than Nowa [New] Kuna. Whereas the Nowa [New] Kuna, was according to the same author, located on the right bank of the Sob. In the mid-17th century as claims Podolianyn, the Stara Kuna was renamed to Marjanówka, and it’s owners reassumed in
the documents, which describe the location of the castle, is the account of the foray of 22/23 January 1615. It says that the attackers “approached Kuna Castle from the back, from the Sob riverside, scaled the palisade with ladders, and broke into the hall, where the late Lord [Tychon] Słupica was sound asleep, fearing no danger”. The extant sources clearly define the Castle's defensive structure and the nature of the enemy. The threat was coming from the Tartars, frequent visitors in Kuna, due to its location on the Kuczmań (Kuchman) trail. The entire Kuna estate laid in the “restless” Lithuanian-Wallachian borderland.

There are no surviving records describing the Kuna Castle, however similar castles were in existence in the Powiat of Vinnytsia at about the same time, allowing us to reconstruct it, and assure its appearance, size, and defence characteristics. There are, though, two references to reflect the state of the

the 1650’s possession of the wilderness of Kladowe Mogiłki, which earlier belonged to Kuna and had been seized by Piotr Świrski, the tenant of Hajsyn in 1604 (see chapter 4). Next, the village of Marjanówka was transferred under its second name to the left bank of Kublicz, which as states Podolianyn, was due to the quarrel between its owner and lease holder of that time. In accordance with the Beauplan’s map of the Bratslav Voivodeship from the 1650’s Kuna [= Kuna Nowa or Wielka <Great>] was located on both banks of Sob in the fork of Sob and its both tributaries Kunka and Kublicz, but with its major part stretching on the left bank of Sob. Meanwhile, on the same map the village of Kuna Stara is presented upstream of the Kunka, more or less in the mid distance between Kuna and Nosowce (on the map as Nosyfla), while the latter is located also upstream of Kunka, but higher than Kuna Stara. There is also no trace of Marjanówka, thus the latter must have been founded under this name most probably in the 1660’s. What is more important, contrary to Podolianyn, Beauplan places Kuna Stara not on Kublicz but on the Kunka, which has to be interpreted as the latter’s mistake, especially while all the 17th century sources related to Kuna mention the Sob and its right bank tributary, the Kublicz. Nowadays there is no trace to be found of Stara Kuna, which in the 19th century was already an area occupied by peasant gardens and fields, while Nowa or Wielka Kuna is to be identified with modern village of Kuna (Podolianyn, 1886: 563, 569). It is exactly where in the late 18th century the Jaroszyński family palace was erected. See Figs. No. 4 and 5.

APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58 (Polish copy) and t. XXX/59 (original in Ruthenian): a complaint made by Oleksiej Diakowski in the castle court of Vinnytsia on 29 January 1615 related to the foray on Kuna and murder of Tychon Semenowicz.

On the Tartar danger and Trails see Chapter 2/B/1: 91-103.

There is a description of a castle or rather a country house (Pol. dwór) of the Kmita family of Czarnobył in Wieledniki near Ovruch in the Kyiv Voivodeship. In 1595 it was endowed to the later’s husband Prince Drucki-Horski by the last hairness of Kmita family. „First — the main gate, doubled on both sides — with two cellars, and a tower on the top, on which four haurnquebuses and a chain are placed. On the right hand a huge house. Under its roof two old halls, one store-room, and the third newly erected hall; doors and shutters iron hinged, with hinges casted in fire - 15, white stoves - 3. Near the house a newly erected smaller storage building, not far from which a gate. Close to this gate a room with sub-chambers: a white stove, window glass - 2, hrydnia [an edifice] with kitchen, cubby-hole, and cellar. The whole construction on wooden unworked pillars, hrydnia with kitchen, and a big stable [...] Of all tables in the house, small and big ones — 9. Going out of the house towards a pond — a wise baths, brewery with a beer kettle…” (ZDz., 1897 22: 269).
Kuna Castle in the late 16th century under Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], and on the eve of the outbreak of the Khmel’nyts’kyi (Pol. Chmielnicki) Rebellion (1648), when the sons of Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] and Vasil Rohozński were masters of Kuna. These two sources relate to structures in the neighbourhood of Kuna erected for defence and residential purposes by representatives of the wealthy and fairly affluent nobility, enjoying a similar economic and social status to the contemporary proprietors of Kuna. Furthermore, a number of individuals, from the Koszka, Meleszko, Szandyrowski, and Krasnosielski families, mentioned in these documents as witnesses, neighbours, or parties to the transaction, were as well relatives or neighbours of the Shxpica family. The deducted information on the appearance and defence of the structures is complemented by the invaluable data on the expenses incurred during the building and the maintenance of castles.

The first document, dated 23 May 1586, was in the archives of Podhorce Castle of the Rzewuski family. It is an account by Fedor Bratkowski, the court beadle (Pol. woźny) of the Voivodeship of Bratslav, who on the date of issue, before the Bratslav gród (castle) court, gave a conveyance

26 For the above-mentioned individuals see e.g. following acts. On 22 August 1568 at Vinnytsia local landed gentry represented by Jermolaj Meleszko, Ivan’s father, Stanisław Komorowski and Michał Szandyrowski carried out delimitation of their own grounds from the ones of Vinnytsia townspeople and municipality (Otamanov’s’kyi, 1993: 172; PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 10). On 26 June 1585, at Worobijówka Dimitr Szczekliczyński, the court beadle of Bratslav Voivodeship carried out delimitation procedures on behalf of Jurij Struś, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Afterwards he wrote down the act describing a new borderline (the document was written down on 7 October 1585 in the territorial court of Lutsk). The document concerned estates Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, territorial justice of Bratslav (Pol. sędzia ziemi bractawski) had secured to Prince Constantine Ostrogski in 10 thousands three-scores of Lithuanian groszs. These constituted a part of his paternal hereditary estates, together with a part from the share of his younger brother Andriej Koszka, which the latter had ceded to him. As Ostrogski’s representatives in delimitation procedures with the Koszkas acted Eliasz Szaszkowicz [Szaszkiewicz] and Hrehory Curkowski. Among owners of the grounds bordering the Koszkas’ estates the document listed Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav (Strzelczyńce, Ostrówek and Żywołot); the Żabokrzycy (Žabokrzycz and Torków); [Matiasz] Ziałowski (Łuka); a certain Kleszczezowski; one Obodeński; Juchno Krasnosielski (Olbaczów) and one Oratowski. The witnesses were: Olechno Daszkowski, Matjasz Ziałowski, Andriej Juszkowski and Dimitr Szandyrowski (APKr.: ASang., t. 130/5).

27 In 1599 hetman (commander-in-chief) Stanisław Żółkiewski recommended chancellor Jan Zamoyski, who recently had bought spacious deserted area on the borderland between the Crown Podolia and Bratslavshchyna, to send over to Szarogród as soon as possible the necessary military equipment, especially at least 100 harquebuses (ZDz., 1897 22: 122). See ŻółkiewskiListy, 1868: 97.

for Wierzchniaki, a newly founded town, the Nowogród Castle, and the village of Kopystrzeń in the Powiat of Vinnytsia on the right bank of the River Murachfa, near Szarogrod, on the voivodeship boundary between Bratslav and the Crown Podolia. The new proprietors of these estates were Jasiek Wierzchniacki, Hrehory Gładki (Hладки?) and his wife Tatiana daughter of Danko Kopysteński, and Agafia, Vasil, and Waśko Braliowicz the Kopysteńskis. The Kopysteńskis are also mentioned in the 1545 review of Bratslav Castle (as the Kopstasyński of Kopysteryn) among the “lesser gentry.” Nowogrod and its castle belonged to Mikolaj Jazłowiecki, Starost of Śniatyn, who founded the town of Nowogrod and its castle. The beadle conveyed to Wierzchniacki and the Kopysteńskis “the buildings of the newly erected castle along with the guns and munitions therein,” estimating the value

---

29 Mal’chenkoUkripeni poselienia, 2001: 172 (Kopystryń [Kopsyteryn]). According to the author Kopystryń was in the 14th century a village and it became a town with a castle in the 15th century thanks to the Jazłowiecki family, which enjoyed almost magnate status and was settled down in the Crown Podolia. The town and castle were devastated in the mid-15th century as the result of a Tartar raid. They were reconstructed prior to 1529, as Kopysterin [Kopystryń] is listed in the dated on that year Conscriptio custodie confinum being one of the places in which the “borderers” kept guards acting in the framework of ambient defence forces (ZDz., 1894 20: 144). Mikolaj Jazłowiecki of the Abdank arms, the Starost of Czerwonogrod in Western Podolia, in 1585 obtained the Hetman Jan Zamozynski’s consent to erect a castle in Kopystryń (PSB, 1964/65 XI: 125, by Zelewski, Roman). Nowadays it is the village named Kopystryń. Nowyńrod might be identified as the modern village called Nowe Miasto [New Town], situated westward from Kopystryń, close to the village of Krasne. See also note 27, where there is a reference to Szarogrod. Mikolaj Jazłowiecki alias Monasterski (before 1490-ca. 1559/63) represented the upper gentry family settled down in Halych (Red Rus’) and Western Podolia. He was the royal courtier in 1513, the royal captain in 1542 and the Castellan of Kamenets’ in 1543-59 (U III/l, 207, no. 198). His grandson also Mikolaj (d. 1595) was in turn the royal captain, Starost of Śniatyń in 1576, of Czerwonogrod in 1582 and finally of Sokal in 1585/86 (PSB, 1664/65 XI: 123-24).

30 ZDz., 1877 6: 126. The inspection register mentions also Iwaszko Kopestyński among the co-owners of one of the castle horodnia structures (ibidem, 118).

31 The official introduction of new owners into the above mentioned estates was carried on the uncultivated filed near Nowogród, not only with the customary presence of witnesses, in this case the then castle magistrates of Bratslav: Hrehory Czeczcel, deputy starost (Pol. podstarość), Kondrat Kozar, judge (Pol. sędzia) and Hrehory Bajbuza, notary (Pol. pisarz), but also in the presence of all the gentry of the Powiat of Bratslav summoned for levy in mass. Apart from the mentioned above court magistracies the official act was countersigned by additional witnesses, Maciej Leński, the beadle of the Powiat of Kremenets, and royal landed gentry of Bratslav province represented by Matiasz Ziałowski, Dimitr and Bogdan the Szandyrowskis and Hrehory Curkowski. In the absence of Jazłowiecki, Starost of Śniatyń, the court beadle Bratkowski urged Jazłowiecki’s administrators in Kopystryń to allow him to proceed with the intromission. On behalf of Jazłowiecki acted the Nowogród mayor (Pol. burmistrz) Jan Smorzewski and Piotr Baczysiński, the latter using the title of bailiff (Pol. wojt). They declared that Jazłowiecki’s magistrate Andrzej Kuchowski had left the town a few days earlier, choosing as his deputy his servant Stanisław, however the latter despite his function also went somewhere. None of Jazłowiecki’s representatives were in disposal of any instructions from the master, thus formally they were not in power to stop or negate the procedures on behalf of the new owners. The placement of new village’s owners in Kopystryń was assisted by the local ataman Andruszko Turczyn [the Turk] and the whole village community.
of “first the structure of the castle’s double palisade around the hill, with an
earthwork embankment on either side, and in the middle the residence with the
white hall [master’s quarters] and its chamber and rooms, and opposite it the
black hall [residential quarters], three store-rooms, and a tower half-built, and
two gatehouses” at 400 kopas [three-scores] of Lithuanian groszs, and the
castle’s defences, that is “two metal cannons, a hundred and twenty
cannonballs, seven sznygownice [catapulting devices?], forty-seven shooting
posts distributed around the earthwork, two for four harquebuses, two for three
harquebuses, one with two sznygownice and another for two harquebuses, with
half a big barrel and three-and-a-half small barrels of gunpowder,” at 800 three-
scores of Lithuanian groszs.\textsuperscript{32}

One may assume that Kuna Castle had a similar structure, that is, an
earthwork with a double palisade surrounding it. A gatehouse must have led
into its court, with a tower over it. The main body of the castle was divided into
two parts: the ceremonial/official “white hall” and the residential “black hall.”
In all likelihood a vestibule or antechamber (Pol. \textit{sien}) and corridors leading off
to smaller rooms and adjoining storage facilities separated them off from each
other by. According to the document, the value of the Nowogród Castle itself
was 400 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (= 24,000 Lithuanian groats), and its
defences amounted to 800 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (= 48,000 Lithuanian
groats).\textsuperscript{33}


A new, “brick” castle was built at Kuna during the minority of Tychon
Semenowicz and his guardian, Ivan Meleszko, was responsible for the building
project. Secondary literature, though, mistakenly sets 1617 as the starting date
and 1620’s as the completion date.\textsuperscript{34} However, these dates are contested by the

\textsuperscript{32} APKr.: APodh. (Lack of signature, collection in the listing process): original in Polish, f. 1 v.
\textsuperscript{33} For the sake of comparison, we should mention that the sum allocated by Sigismund I to
Prince Iliia Konstantynowicz Ostrogski for the restoration of the Bratslav Castle was 700 kopas
[three-scores] of Lithuanian groszs (= 42,000 Lithuanian groats) (ZDz., 1877 6: 117).
\textsuperscript{34} SlownGeogr., 1883 IV: 873-75 (Kuna). Perhaps on the basis of this entry some of the authors
picked the date of 1617 as the beginning of castle construction. This entry includes also some
sources. And more appropriate dates would be ca. 1605-12 when Meleszko was of all likelihood still the guardian of Semen Bohdanowicz's son Tychon [VI/3]. A municipal charter dated 18 February 1605, was issued at the request of Tychon Semenowicz (possibly by Meleszko still acting on his behalf), whereby King Sigismund III consented to the foundation of a town in Kuna and the building of a castle there. This charter states clearly that Tychon was requesting the monarch to "allow him by the grace of our majesty to erect a castle on his hereditary lands in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, for the defence of the country against our enemies, and found a town there pursuant to the rights accorded by general law." We also know that when Tychon discharged Meleszko of his guardianship duties he mentioned "the building of the castle" as one of the latter's achievements.

As one may conclude from the documents, apart from the minor Tychon his elder sister Halszka Semenówna [VI/I], who soon afterwards married Vasil Rohoziński and moved with her husband to Ziatkowice was also resident of Kuna. Tychon lived in the completed and well-appointed castle, when in a foray "Kuna Town and Castle" were looted. In his complaint of 29 January 1615, Oleksij Diakowski wrote that the aggressors had illegally taken and looted "his [Tychon's] movable assets and the chest with the deeds [related] to his property, Kuna, his ready cash and bills [...], as well as his silver, gold, garments, carpets and tapestries, his arms and weapons, his riding and draft horses, and all his equipment whatsoever." The new castle, too, was defensive in character in view of the Tartar menace. It was under the guise of a Tartar

---

35 CDIAUK: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 204, part 2, f. 92v-93. The original of the royal deed was issued in Warsaw. See also Mal'chenko, Ukripłeni poselennia, 2001: 182. The scholar claims that in 1617 the legal curator of the minor Słupicy, one Mełczyński [sic] erected or renovated Kuna Castle and armed it well. In the opinion of the same author the last of the Słupicy (in reality the last but one, Tychon) was killed in 1625, and the Kuna estate and the castle passed to the royal treasury disposal, to be next endowed to Alexander Piaseczyński. Thus, it is clear that the author while writing on Kuna was relying heavily on an article by Gawroński and on entries in SłownikGeogr., without verifying or amending their inaccuracies.

36 CDIAU: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 8.

37 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58, 59.

38 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
attack that Tychon's slayers, led by his brother-in-law Vasil Rohoziński, assailed the Kuna Castle in 1615.\(^{39}\) Interestingly enough, the expression used in the numerous court documents referring to this foray, describe it as being conducted “in the Tartar manner”. This expression appears to be in use only for the Bratslav territories.\(^{40}\) I have not encountered any similar expression in the numerous court documents related to similar assaults (by local gentry) in the neighbouring regions (Podolia, Volhynia, the Kyivan territories).

The general appearance of the castle the Rohoziński took over from the Ślipicas, must have resembled the small castle located in Kopczyńce in the Powiat of Vinnytsia, near the eastern boundary of the powiat in the vicinity of Daszów not far from Kuna. As described in a complaint presented in the castle court at Lublin in 1649 and next entered in the court register of the gród at Vinnytsia (12 December 1650). It concerns a foray against the Kopczyńce Town and Castle, then owned by Jan Kopczyński.\(^{41}\) The assailants were Kopczyński’s neighbour Ivan Oratowski of Oratów (a nearby property), and his uncle Jerzy Żytynski, a representative of a family with a cliental relationship with the Ślipicas.\(^{42}\) In October 1645, with numerous attendants, they attacked Kopczyńce, which Kopczyński had named “after his noble title.” The latter had established the town two years earlier (1643), on a site, which was “particularly desolate and had belonged to the Town of Oratów since ancient times,” on lease for life from Vasil and Seweryn the Oratowskis. There at his own expense he had set up dykes and ponds in the fields around the said town and erected a castle . . . and a small town encircled with a palisade (Pol. ostróg).\(^{43}\)

Ivan Oratowski and Jerzy Żytynski held the town and castle, along with its estates and lands, enjoying all the profits until June 1648, when the “wilful Cossacks” took the entire property.

---

\(^{39}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX /59; „Encircling this room Lord Rohoziński in person impersonating the servant of the late Lord Ślipica, one Kozłowski called out the Lord Ślipica using the following words: <My Lord, good gracious! Fear, Tartars are forcing the town!>.” The summary of the foray most probably based on one of the copies of this manifesto used by Rulikowski (Trusiewicz, 1870: 311-12).

\(^{40}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX /59.

\(^{41}\) CDIAUK: F. 28, op. 1, spr. 144, f. 1008v.-1009.

\(^{42}\) On the Żytynski see Chapter 6/C/2: 313-15.

\(^{43}\) CDIAUK: F. 28, op. 1, spr. 144, k. 1008.
The plaintiff protested, saying that, apart from the buildings, his movable assets [...] which he had acquired thanks to his own work and effort and purchased with his own money, to wit, six Polish and German muskets and their flints and tinder, each at ten zlotys; two Turkish guns (Pol. janczarkas) for shooting, iron or metal-wire pellets, at a hundred and twenty zlotys; and three harquebuses, each bought for forty-five zlotys; a metal field-cannon bought for one hundred and thirty zlotys; and gunpowder and bullets for these munitions to a value of one hundred and fifty zlotys.^[44]

He went on to list all his household goods and farm equipment, coaches and carriages, horses, cattle etc., with current prices for all the assets he had lost, the income and rents from his inns, fish-ponds, apiaries etc. The grand total of the losses Kopczyński had suffered was estimated at 15,000 of Polish Zlotys, “not including the said town itself.”^[45] A comparison of the defences of the Nowogród and the Kopczyńce Castles shows that they must have been similar in size and their military equipment must have been more or less the same, necessary to defend their residence in the Marches. These estimates allow us to determine the degree of affluence of the upper echelons of the middle gentry.

We can only assume as to the time when Kuna Castle was finally destroyed. It is likely that this happened during the Khmel’nyts’kyi (Pol. Chmielnicki) Rebellion (1648-52). It was probably looted in 1649 by the Tartars assisting Chmielnicki (who himself resided in Vinnytsia for a while), and brought to ruin in the course of the fighting with the Cossacks, perhaps in the aftermath of the Battle of Batoh on 1/2 June 1652, which ended in the

---


^[45] CDIAUK: F. 28, op. 1, spr. 144, f. 1009v. See also spr. 366, f. 1010-1111. Sylwester Kopczyński transferred later on an entry (oblata) from the Vinnytsia castle court series (12 November 1650) to the castle court in Volodymyr (15 September 1699). The act in question was the complaint of Jan Kopczyński, deposed in the castle court in Warsaw in 1648. The latter reported the loss of deeds, privileges and legal documents pertaining to his estates in the Powiat of Vinnytsia, that he had lost in the Bratslav Castle („At this time of Interregni the well known to everybody Cossack Rebellion united with a pagan force of the Tartars encompassed all of the Bratslav Voivodeship, thus as others Citizens of the place also the above mentioned compliant lost being ravaged and extinct all the estates and assets belonging to him as donations from the late Lord Konstanty Kopczyński, his brother and Lord Jan Komar. These estates were bearing the following names — some parts in the village of Dymidowce, the village of Sid[?]awa, the village of Nowy Curków. The [complaint] was as well in possession of Rzezanowce, of a part in the town of Nowy Potok, of the town of Kopczyńce [Kopczyńce] which had been founded on the ground of Oratów with their country houses, folwarks [farms] and their adjacencies”).
defeat of the royal forces. Six of the seven joint proprietors of Kuna, sons of Halszka Semenówna and Vasil Rohoziński, were killed in this battle.

2.c. Other Słupicas Residences: Nosowce Manor House, and Town Houses in Bratslav and Vinnytsia.

There is even less information available on the second residence, the Nosowce property, where the “junior” Słupica line lived. The sources speak of a dwór (manor house) country residence near the river. These mentions are dated 1596 and 1599, and appear in the accounts of the court beadle. The latter served summonses on the sons and widow of Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3] for proceedings lodged against the Słupicas by Prince Janusz Zaslawski. From them we learn that Hrehory’s sons were under their mother’s care and lived in a dwór gentleman’s country house at Nosowce. On 19 December 1607 the daughter of one of them, Marusza Mikołajewna Zablocka (her first husband was Paweł Prysowicz Zablocki), sold Prince Janusz Zbaraski her share in Nosowce, along with the dwór, which was situated “on the River Korytna and Hruszka, near Tołpaczowy wood.” Unfortunately the information provided is not enough to enable an estimate to be made, either of the time, when the Nosowce manor house was built, or of its appearance.

There are also mentions extant of the urban dwór properties owned by Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3] and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] in Bratslav. In the context of other accounts, one may infer that Hrehory was at least temporarily resident in Bratslav, in connection with his assumption of the duties of

---

46 In 1649 Bratslav landed gentry en mass wrote down complaints regarding losses of their deeds and privileges, either in fire or during the campaign against Tartars ("enemies of the Holly Cross") supporting Khmel’nyc’yi’s Rebellion (Trusiewicz, 1870: 314). For details see Chapter 2/C/1: 160-66 on Cossacks and their activities in Kuna and its surroundings.
47 Batog (otherwise known as Batóg or Batoh) belonged to the Słupicas’ Trościaniec estate, which their successors had sold to the Kalinowski family shortly before (SlownGeogr., 1880 I: 117 (Batóg alias Batoh, Batów).
48 APKr.: ASang., t. XXII/49 and t. XXIII/59 (summonses dated 8 December 1596 and 17 June 1599: copies in Polish; the beadle’s accounts dated 13 December 1596 and 25 July 1599: one Ruthenian original and two Polish copies).
49 ZDz., 1894 20: 106 (digest) = ZDz., 1896 21: 549: the repeated obłata (entry) of the above mentioned transaction written down on 25 May 1609 in the Crown Tribunal registers, among the cases of the Bratslav Voivodeship; Gawroński, 1915: 227. See also Chapter 6/A/4a: 219-94 and B/1: 299-301 as well as the Beauplan’s map Fig. no. 4.
komornik ziemski (district deputy sub-chamberlain) of Bratslav in ca. 1583/84, during the more or less continual absence of Ławrym Piaseczyński, the sub-chamberlain (Pol. podkomorzy). The information related to his residence is, in an account delivered by Fedor Bratkowski, the court beadle of the Voivodeship of Bratslav, who appeared before the court on 26 September 1584 and said he had served Prince Janusz Januszewicz Zasławski’s summons on Hrehory “in his house in the Town of Bratslav.” The information on Semen’s house is dated 5 December 1584, and comes in another statement by Bratkowski, who delivered Prince Janusz J. Zasławski’s summons on Lord Semen Shipica in his own house which he has in the town of Bratslav; the summons was delivered to his [Shipica’s] servant Ławrzyn Carzenko [Carienko] in the said house.

Perhaps the devastation of the Kuna estate by the Tartars was in connection with Semen’s temporary move into town. A similar predicament befell the Koszka family. Around 1600 they moved to Vinnytsia and Bratslav for good after their lands in the country had been laid waste. The fact that the descendants of Semen and Hrehory moved back to the country – Semen’s children at Kuna, and Hrehory’s sons and widow at Nosowce (1596-99) – makes this hypothesis plausible. From a much later document, a taxation schedule issued for 1 February and 1 October 1765 by the starosty of Vinnytsia, we learn that in 1647 Halszka and Vasil the Rohozinskis owned some plots of land in Vinnytsia, which they had inherited from the Shipicas. Unfortunately

---

50 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI (original in Ruthenian and its Polish copy).
51 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI.
52 See Neiman Koszkowie, 1889: 532-47.
53 AGAD: ASK, dz. XLVI, sig. 7, f. 1-50v., here f. 13: „Taryffa Starostw y krolewsczyzn w Woiewodztwie Braćławskim sytuowanych przez Urodzon.’ Lustratorow Seymem Convocationis Anni 1764 do Tegoz Woiewodztwa Postanowionych y przed Aktami Grodu Winnickiego Die 1 February 1765 Anno Przysięgłych...” In front of the inspectors working in the Starosty of Vinnytsia appeared then Mikolaj Terlecki, the cupbearer of Vitebsk (Pol. czesnik, Lat. pincerna) who was acting on his own as well as on behalf of his brothers as successors of Helena of the Shipicas and Vasil Rohoziński. As a result the Vinnytsia Starosty revision of 1647, Terlecki requested the restitution of ownership of some plots of land in Vinnytsia, which belonged to the Rohozińskis and passed on their successors (thus, under the current Revision the building lots after the aforementioned Born Lords the Rohozińskis being located in His Majesty Town of Vinnytsia, which passed on the Boreyko family successors Jure Naturae, are to be mentioned in the said Revision Specifice and are not to be regarded as belonging to the municipal lands...”). The right of succession to which Terlecki revoked applied to Helena, the only daughter of Prudence [Pudencjanna] Wolska, who married to Jan Boreyko, the Volhynian cupbearer. The couple had 6 daughters and a son Felicjan, who married with Petronela Jaroszyńska. One of the abovementioned daughters became the wife of
there is no further information available, but the very fact they were proprietors of sites in town suggests that the Słupica family may have also built a house there.

3. The Słupicas Clientage in the Late 16th- 17th Century. Servants in Town and Castle, Proxies and Plenipotentiaries.

Very little information has survived on the persons associated with the Słupica family through patron-and-client or master-and-servant relationship. The scanty source material provides data on only a handful of individuals out of the definitely large circle of Słupicas administrators, servants in the castle, plenipotentiaries and proxies. Moreover, information is mostly on individuals related to the last stage in the family history and often does not allow to determine the exact nature of their relationship with the Kuna masters, thus the function performed on their behalf. Here I have excluded information on witnesses to a variety of legal and business transactions, since the nature of their relationship with the Słupicas was quite different. As, they were mostly members of the equestrian (gentle/noble) estate, equal in economic status, neighbours or relatives.

Among the Słupica servants and administrators, whose role it is also difficult to be determined due to the terseness of sources, the predominant group, in the late 16th and early 17th centuries were Ruthenians from the lower ranks of the gentry, settled in the area since the early 16th century, which suggests that their links with the Słupica family must have gone further back in time, to what is actually documented. Names typical of the Polish petty gentry do not appear among them, until Tychon Semenowicz’s time as master of the Kuna (1612-15). Perhaps his choice of Poles from the Kingdom for his servants was the outcome of Ivan Meleszko’s influence, or perhaps it was a result of his Polish education (in the Crown?).

Terlecki. Prudencja Wolska in turn was the daughter of Adrian Rohoziński, the youngest of the sons of Halszka Semenówna and Vasil.
The only servant of Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] whose name and surname are recorded is Ławryn Carzenko alias Carienko. On 5 December 1596 the court beadle (Pol. woźny sądowy) Fedor Bratkowski had served a summons on Semen Bohdanowicz related to a complaint brought against him by Prince Janusz Zaslawski before the castle court in Bratslav. The beadle said that he had handed the summons over to “Ławrzyn Carzenko, his [Semen’s] courtier at his house” in Bratslav.\(^\text{54}\) The Carienko family most probably belonged to the Bratslav petty gentry or even burghers; there is no exact information on them to be found in source material.

Most probably the Stefan, administrative servant at Kuna mentioned in the account presented on 1 February 1614 by Jacek Szinaliowski [Szykajlowski], the court beadle, was Stefan Mszański vel Olszański recorded the following year as an administrative servant to Tychon Semenowicz at Kuna.\(^\text{55}\) Tychon Diakowski acting on behalf of Oleksiej Diakowski, mentioned him as Mszański in a complaint lodged on 29 January 1615, against the foray on Kuna and the murder of Tychon Słupica.\(^\text{56}\) Similarly, he was mentioned as Olszański in a complaint brought by Alexander Kruszelnicki and his wife over the same matter.\(^\text{57}\) Since both plaintiff parties were very close relatives, it is impossible to say which of their versions is wrong. In the light of Uruski’s book of armorial bearings both possibilities are realistic and likely. The Mszański were present in the 18\(^{th}\) century in the Powiat of Latychow (Pol. Latyczów) in the western part of Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland, while the Olszański (of the arms of Jastrzębiec?) were residents of Volhynia in the mid-17\(^{th}\) century.\(^\text{58}\)

In 1615 one Kozłowski was an administrator in Kuna. He was the individual impersonated by Vasil Rohoziński during the foray (22-23 January),

\(^{54}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XVI A (the 16\(^{th}\) century Polish copy of the document).
\(^{55}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXIX/80 (Polish copy, 1 February 1614).
\(^{56}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59. It is noteworthy to underline that both complaints stressed on Mszański alias Olszański’s participation in organisation stage of the foray. According to them it was him, who provided Vasil Rohoziński with the data concerning Tychon’s habits and conduct as well as the most convenient time for the aggressors to attack Kuna Castle.
\(^{57}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74 (100, 101 – original in Ruthenian script and its Polish copy).
\(^{58}\) Uruski, 1914 11: 337 (Mszańcy), 1915 12: 317-19 (Olszańcy).
as he forced his way into Tychon Semenowicz's room. According to Litwin the Kozłowski family was of Orthodox Christian gentry and had come to the Bratslav territory from the Polish part of Podolia. Hrushevskyi had a record of the Kozłowski family in his paper on the Starosty of Bar, and included them among the most ancient settlers of Podolia, from the times of Svidrygiello's endowment. The Kozłowskis owned Kozłów on the Dnister, and vast lands in the triangle marked out by the lower course of the River Murachfa and the Dnister. In the late 16th century their properties included "the wilderness Łuka [Meadow] below Białe Brzegi [White Banks]" at the Murachfa's confluence, and some land on the River Busza. In 1552 Wańko and Hwedor [Fedor] the Kozłowskis equipped two cavalrmen from their estates. In 1584 Kozłów was in the hands of Iwaszko and the heirs of Fedor. In the same year Iwaszko sold his share in Kozłów and Łuka to Olechno Radziewski. Ivan Kozłowski, son of Oleksy sold the last part of Kozłów, which yet in 1616 was in the family hands. The Kozłowskis were still in the Polish part of Podolia in the latter half of the 17th century, but had lost their former status. In the Voivodeship of Bratslav the Kozłowskis became part owners of the village of Dziunków, after the Komar family. In 1627-29 Krzysztof Kozłowski held a share in Dziunków and the village of Kozłów.

As relations between the Słupicas and the Żytynskis and the latter's part in the foray against Kuna in 1615 will be discussed in details further on, here the Żytynski family members recorded as Słupicas' clients and administrators in Kuna will be omitted. The "servants of our late master" who came out with threats against the murdered Tychon's relatives and friends, when they tried to reclaim his body, included a pan [Lord] Zaleski, Staś Skrypka, and Siemon Repiecki. Stef an Zaleski and other members of the Zaleski family will be

---

59 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59.
61 AYZR, 1890 VII/2 : 271.
62 Hrushevs'kyiBar, 1894: 186.
64 On the Żytynskis see Chapter 6/C/2: 313-15.
65 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58, 59.
thoroughly discussed further on. Staś Skrypka or Skripka, originally from Zaleski’s retinue, which he brought to Kuna was probably a member of a family of the Vinnytsia townsfolk. The 1647 register of Vinnytsia inhabitants listed an Ivan Skripka. Siemion Riepecki, who is also mentioned as a servant of Stefan Zaleski, probably came from the local townsfolk or boyars. Unfortunately, I did not manage to find more information on them.

Tychon’s attorney in the Crown Tribunal in the proceedings of 10 May 1613 against Prince Jerzy Zbaraski was Ivan (or more properly Jan) Kędzierski. The Kędzierskis of the arms of Belina had Lesser Polish origins (in the Crown), and according to Litwin, they arrived in the Bratslav territories around 1600 in a group of at least 8 Polish Crown-rooted families. The most widely known of them, Michał Kędzierski, “made a living as a leaseholder”, including some estates owned by the Princes Proński in the Kyiv territory. Like his patrons, the Proński family, Kędzierski was a Protestant. He married Owdotia Bohuszówna (?) of the Kopeć family, widow of Seweryn Kropiwnicki, the notary in the territorial court of Bratslav (1580-88), thanks to which he could settle and start out on an administrative career. After this marriage, he became the Słupicas close neighbour, as the Kropiwnickis’ family nest the village of Kropiwa bordered with Nosowce. It was most probably soon after when his relative Jan started to represent Tychon’s affairs in the public administration. Around 1604 M. Kędzierski purchased also the village of Wielki and Mały Komarów [Great and Small Komarów] from Alexander and Michał the Kropiwnickis, his first wife’s sons, and held it until 1617.

According to Litwin, Michał Kędzierski was the first Pole to make a career in the Bratslav territorial (district) hierarchy, attaining the office of cupbearer

---

66 On the Zaleskis see Chapter 6/C/2: 309-13, see also Chapter 6/A/1: 278-79 and note 4, p. 279.
67 Otamanov'skyi, 1993: 164.
68 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 11-12.
69 Litwin, 2000: 64, 74, 143, 159. On 7 August 1612 appeared the widow of Seweryn Kropiwnicki, Eudoksja Kopciówna accompanied by her sons Mikołaj and Alexander the Kropiwnickis, by then in her second marriage with Michał Kędzierski (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1341, f. 5). The same Owdotia of the Kopeć family was recorded as widow of Bratslav cupbearer Michał Kędzierski, on 7 October 1624 (CDIAUK: F. 223, op. 1, part 1, spr. 36, f. 1-2).
70 ZDz., 1896 21: 507 (Komarów, bought prior to 1604, and not in 1606 as sttes Litwin); Litwin, 2000: 183, 209 (here Michał as Bratslav cupbearer from 12 July 1617 [16] to 22 April 1617).
(Pol. cześnik, Lat. pincerna) ca. 1617. De facto he had already been performing the duties of this office since 1607, and continued to do so until 1618, when he was promoted to judge of the territorial court in Bratslav. In 1619 he was the Bratslav deputy (Pol. deputat) to the Crown Tribunal, and most probably died in the same year. I have not managed to establish the exact relationship between him and Jan Kędzierski, but it might have been Michał who introduced Jan into the Słupicas social environment thanks to the mediation of the Kropiwnicki family. The second of Tychon’s attorneys – Andrzej Radlicki, who represented him on 17 February 1614 at Lublin in the case brought by Andrzej Pilawski also must have been of Polish origin from the Greater Poland in the Crown and used the Korab arms.

Michajło Bratkowski, the beadle of the Powiat of Bratslav, mentions on 14 December 1596 a Waśko Kotowicz, as being a servant of the widow and sons of Hrehory Zdan residing at Nosowce. Kotowicz must definitely have been a local Ruthenian, as evidenced by his name and surname. Iakovenko enumerates the Kotowicz family among the local middle gentry and boyars in the mid-16th century. By the close of that century for some reason (perhaps Tartars?) the Kotowicz family had become impoverished. On 8 May 1617, before the Crown Tribunal Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] heiress of part of Nosowce and her husband Alexander Kruszelnicki were represented by their attorney Tychon Żydkiemiewicz otherwise known as Żytikiewicz. The Żytikiewicz

71 As Bratslav cup-bearer recorded, among others, on 20 December 1607 (APKr.: ASang., t. XXVII/43, 44) and 12 July 1617 (Boniecki, 1906: 9: 393). He became the territorial judge before 22 August 1619, when he was mentioned with this title among the deputies in the Crown Tribunal in Lublin (APKr.: ASang., t. XXXIII/18).
73 APKr.: ASang., t. XXII/49 (original in Ruthenian script and its Polish copy).
74 IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 126, 148, 187. Yet, in the middle of the 16th century Jan Kotowicz was husband of Princes Biłuchna Michaljówna Hołownia-Ostrożecza, while the first wife of Jurij Wasilewicz Tyszkiewicz (d. 1579), a representative of an almost magnate family, was in turn Anna Kotowiczówna (IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 165, 278). In 1611 the bailiff (Pol. wójt) of Zhytomir in the Kyiv Viovodeship was Marein Kotowicz, suggesting considerable impoverishment of the family and shrinking of its status (Matvienko, A. M., and V. M. Moicienko (eds.) 2002. Aktova knyha Zhytomyrs' koho hrods' koho uriadu 1611 roku (Register Book of the Zhytomir Castle Court of 1611). Zhytomir: n.p. 284 [in original no. 35, fol. 103v.].
75 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 18v. The case was against Marusza née Diakowska, by her first marriage Słupiczyna (wife of Jurij Słupica [V/6]) and by the second Dziuszyna (wife of Stefan Dziusza) over the conveyance of her share in Nosowce to the Princes Zbaraski. See Chapter 6/A/4b: 295-98.
family was one of the most ancient in the Bratslav territory, and they were co-owners along with the Kublicki, Mazepa, and Woyna families in the Kublicz estate, which was bought up from them piece by piece by Adam Hieronim Sieniawski (1607-19), and Mikołaj Sieniawski (1619-36), who finally sold the entire estate to the Kalinowskis. In the meantime (1609) the Żytkiewicz family managed to buy back part of Kublicz from the Kierdanowskis, Poles who had come from the environs of Kyiv. In 1610 the Żytkiewicz family (alongside the Kopczyński family) were part-owners of Kamionka on the River Kamienica in the Powiat of Bratslav. In 1570 Tychoń Żytkiewicz is noted as the owner of two villages, Wójtowce on the Boh, and Nowosiółki. In the mid-17th century these two villages were in the hands of his grandsons, Łuka (Łukian), Danilo, and Fedor. In 1639-45 Fedor (Teodor) held the office of judge of the gród (castle) at Vinnytsia, and died before 9 December 1649, murdered by the Cossacks together with his wife Zofia née Szandyrowska (sister of Fedor Szandyrowski, the deputy steward [Pol. podstoli, Lat. subdapifer] of Bratslav) and their two daughters.

In a decree dated 8 August 1622 the interests of the Kruszelnicki family in a case against the Zbaraski over subjects (peasants) who had fled from Nosowce to Berszadź were represented by Jurij (Jerzy) Steblewski alias Stryblewski. In the previous year (before 25 May 1621) Steblewski and Aleksander Tyrawski, deputy starost for provisions (Pol. podstarości prowentowy) in Vinnytsia, became the proprietors of part of the village Kunka which had been leased out by Vasil Rohozinski, and subsequently sold by Vasil and his wife Halszka Semenówna [VI/1]. On 25 May 1621 Tyrawski entered

---

78 ZDz., 1897 22: 724. It is rumoured that they were also in possession of a meadow or wilderness (Pol. uroczyszcze) in the vicinity of Żabotyn in the starosty of Cherkasy. It was said, that Vitold had endowed them with the latter (ZDz., 1897 22: 697). However, Kurtyka (KurtykaRepertorium, 2004) does not mention such an endowment in his register of Vitold’s charters.
79 Otamanovs’kyi, 1993: 171, 343, 355. In the period of the Khmel’nyts’kyi Rebellion Łuka and his son Ivan went into exile to the Crown; Ivan returned in Ukraine in 1692 with the Crown Army being in the rank of colonel.
80 Litwin, 2000: 212 (from 31 December 1639 to 1645). Due to his murder, a compliant was made in Warsaw by his nephew Daniel Żytkiewicz, the Crown investigator or procurator (Pol. instytgator koronny) (AGAD: MK, sig. 190, f. 364-364v.).
81 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 108, f. 22v.
in the Vinnytsia castle court register two documents. The first one regarded his hereditary ownership of Kunka, which was accompanied by the next deed, by which the rights to this village had been ceded earlier to him (Pol. zapis wlewkowski = cession of legal rights to a property) by his co-proprietor Jerzy Stryblewski. The new owner of this estate was Tyrawski’s brother-in-law, Łuksz Kruszelnicki. Despite extensive research, I was unable to establish the latter’s relation to Fedora Dmitriewna’s husband Alexander. The Stryblewskis were no doubt an offshoot of the ancient Ruthenian family of Strybel from the Kyivan territories.

Yet another attorney representing Kruszelnicki and his wife in the proceedings against Prince Jerzy Zbaraski, before the Lublin Tribunal on 11 June 1630, was Jan Niegrzebecki alias Niegrzebicki, most probably from the Kingdom of Poland. On 26 March 1639 Niegrzebicki and his wife acquired a dwór (manor house) in Vinnytsia from Ivan Podwerbny and his wife Hanna, the local townspeople. The deed was witnessed by the bailiff (Pol. wójt) P. Omeljanowicz and an unidentified deputy starost for provisions in Vinnytsia (Pol. podstarości prowentowy). The document itself was not registered in the castle court register at Vinnytsia until 18 May 1649. In 1640 Niegrzebicki and his wife gave the precinct adjoining their manor house and an undefined plot of land in Vinnytsia to the Dominican Convent, which neighboured on their property.

On 7 June 1644 in a case against Ludwik Lisiecki all the sons of Vasil Rohoziński and his wife Halszka were represented in the territorial court of Bratslav by Szymon Świątkowski (Świątkowski). Also this attorney must certainly have belonged to the petty gentry from the Kingdom of Poland, but his exact origins are unknown.

---

83 B.Stefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 120-121. The second oblata on 12 January 1624. The witnesses of Tyrawski’s deed were Jerzy Curkowski, Jakub Poniatowski and Andrzej Szandyrowski.
84 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 35v.
85 Otamanovs’kyi, 1993: 333.
86 Otamanovs’kyi, 1993: 337.
4. The Religion of the Słupica Family and Their Successors at Kuna.

Even less information is available on the religion of the Słupica family.*\(^8\)\(^8\) In the abundant legal and administrative material related to their property – there are practically no direct testimonials, though it is pretty certain that, like the majority of the Ruthenian noble families, they were Orthodox Christians.*\(^8\)\(^9\) The evidence to support this claim is indirect, but strong enough to leave no doubt. This applies both to the entire Słupica family as to its individual members. Their immediate successors, the Kruszelnicki and Rohoziński families do not offer more information. The opinion prevalent among researchers is that, after 1569 the Ruthenian nobility and middle gentry converted to Roman Catholicism on a mass scale, whereupon large numbers of them turned at least temporarily Protestant.*\(^9\)\(^0\) However, according to Litwin’s computations, up to 1596, the year of the Union of Berest (Pol. Brześć; the establishment of the Ruthenian Uniate or “Greek Catholic” Church in communion with Rome), 90% of the noble families of the Kyivan and Bratslav territories were “fully” Orthodox, despite the very fact that it was Roman Catholicism, which from the Christianization of Lithuania in 1397 was an official state religion.*\(^9\)\(^1\)

It was not until 7 June 1563 that the Orthodox nobles were granted the equal rights to the Roman Catholics, which has to be seen more in terms of

---

*\(^8\) An outlook of the complexity of the whole issue of religious relations in the Ukraine in the 16th and the 17th century has been offered recently by Iakovenko (Iakovenko, Natalia M.. 2002. „Orthodox, Catholics, Protestants: Religious Coexistence in Ukraine in the 16th to 17th Centuries <iakovenkoOrthodox>.” Lecture offered in the series of Maria and Vasyl Petryshyn Memorial Lecture in Ukrainian Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge USA on 22 April 2002, 1-18). The author traced these relations from the point of view of married unions concluded within one religious believe or between persons representing different religions. She was also interested in the subject of creed professed by children from „religiously mixed” marriages. The source base she used were mainly last wills and funeral eulogies of the gentry of different religious background); LitwinKatolicyzacja, 1985: 58-70.

*\(^9\) No record survived of religious foundations or founds spent for religious practices. We are not also in possession of last wills, which in general offered detailed data on religious creed and practices by their authors.

*\(^0\) The majority of older scholars took this statement for granted without making an attempt to document the phenomena through the sources. It was Viktorov's'kyi who first supported this view based on solid evidence (Viktorov's'kyi, P. 1908-11. “Zapadnorusskaiia dvorianskiia familii otpavshiia ot pravoslaviia v kontse XVI i XVII v.,” Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii 9-12 (1908), 6 (1909), 3, 11 (1910), 2, 6-8 (1911).

*\(^1\) LitwinKatolicyzacja, 1985: 61. Actually nobody seemed to pay much attention to the formally existing from ca. the end of the 15th century ban on erecting new Orthodox churches and on mixed marriages between the Roman Catholics and Orthodox. See BłaszczykLitwa, 2002: 254, 255.
politics than religion.\textsuperscript{92} What is more as this union triggered the fierce rivalry between Orthodox and Roman Catholic and Uniates it is almost certain the Shupicas and their proxies had to declare themselves in a more visible way, for which we have no proves offered by the extant documents.\textsuperscript{93} After the Union of Berest (1596) was concluded one may observe in Ukraine a sort of well-established alliance of Orthodoxy and Protestantism against Catholicism and Greek-Catholicism.\textsuperscript{94} The Jaroszyński family, owners of Kuna estate in the second half of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century were entirely of the Roman Catholic creed. They founded (1773) the Capuchin church and a monastery in Kuna, and the church became in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century their family necropolis.\textsuperscript{95}

For the Shupica family there is no record on any religious foundations made by them. Neither do we have any of their last wills – documents, which usually provide invaluable information on their compilers’ religion (creed, burial place, religious foundation and funds spend on them, etc.). None of the members of the family entered the ministry or a religious congregation, at least as recorded in the extant sources. Still it is beyond doubt, that the Shupica family were Orthodox. It is not merely a question of their belonging to the Ruthenian community of “nested” gentry, which by definition were regarded as

\textsuperscript{92} In practice this meant the same rights granted to Ruthenians, which so far had been the reserved to Lithuanians. Especially the Ruthenians could from that moment onwards be vested with the highest magistracies in the Grand Duchy, which was forbidden to them since the privilege of Horodło from 1413.

\textsuperscript{93} For example, as it is coming out from the Volhynian sources until 1596 both sides, means Orthodox and Roman Catholics, as well as other creeds represented in the Ruthenian lands, did not pay much attention to the sacred sphere of such an act as marriage being very diligent when it came to its legal aspects. Thus it was required to register the marriage and connected to it property issues, such as dowry and its guarantees in the judicial registers and to organize a wedding party, not necessarily remembering of the church blessing, which was a rule disregarding the creed of the future spouses. When it came to divorce, especially if the cause was differences in characters, it was also sufficient to register the very fact it in the court books, setting on this occasion the property issues and declaring with which part children were to stay. See Jabłonowski, Aleksander. 1917. „Stosunki rodzinne na Wołyniu na przełomie XVI-go i XVII-go wieku,” Przegląd Historyczny 13 (1): 57-66 (Part I), 13 (2): 203-14 (Part II), 13 (3): 347-61 (Part III).

\textsuperscript{94} Beauplan offers the following characteristics of the Ruthenian nobility in the 1640’s: The few members of the nobility among them are of Polish lineage. The nobles seem ashamed to be of any religion but the Roman [Catholic], to which more of them are converted every day, even though all the great men of wealth and all those who bear the title of prince, issue from the Greek [Orthodox] religion (Beauplan, 1999: 14).

\textsuperscript{95} Catholic was the Bratslav branch of the Jaroszyński. Their Volhynian ancestors yet on the turn of the 17th century were counted among the followers of Orthodoxy. Round 1674 Stefan Jaroszyński was a member of the Lutsk orthodox brotherhood, and Niesiecki listed Fedor in 1702 among ardent supporters of Orthodoxy (Niesiecki, 1839 2: 687-88).
adherents of the Orthodox religion. Their language and the names they used provide evidence to their Orthodoxy Ruthenian identity. In principle, individuals who spoke and wrote (especially their signatures) in Ruthenian, and used a Ruthenian first name and patronymic, are regarded as Orthodox. A brief glance at the Słupica family tree in the annexes is enough to observe that the majority of the family had typically Ruthenian first names and patronymics: Ivan, Tychon, Stečko, Bohdan, Bohusz, Semen, Hrehory/Żdan, Dimitr, Mikołaj, and Jurij for the men, and Żdana, Marusza, and Fedora for the women. The exception was the ancestral founder Paweł, about whose origins not much can be said with certainty, and Matiasz Semenowicz, who spent most of his adult life in Hungary and used the Hungarian equivalent of his originally Ruthenian version of the name “Nicholas.” We cannot know however, whether he changed his religion, too. Helena or Halszka is a name equally common amongst the Ruthenian as well as the Polish gentlewomen, so one can assume that Semen’s daughter was Orthodox at least until her marriage. She may have changed her religion under the influence of her husband, Vasil Rohoziński, whose father was said to be among the Arians (Anti-Trinitarians) in Volhynia. But there is no proof for such a supposition.

Probably, like the majority of Ruthenian nobility enjoying prominent social and economic status, the Słupica family founded orthodox churches on their estates, at least in Kuna. Most probably, too, the Kuna Church was the family’s burial-place, though again there is no proof in the extant sources. In the two documents related to the foundation of Kuna, Semen’s of 1590, and Tychon’s of 1605, there are no mentions of any religious buildings or of religious freedom. We may regard the already-described letter of 1576 [or 77] from the nobility and gentry of Bratslav, with Hrehory Żdan’s signature, in defence of the Ruthenian language, as evidence of their Orthodox religion, although strictly speaking the document should be seen as a political statement, not as a religious one. Of the families, which intermarried with the Słupicas (cf. the family tree), the Krasnosieński, Mikuliński, Łysohorski, Meleszko,
Diakowski, Dziusa, and Piaseczyński may be regarded as Orthodox. Of the last-mentioned family, until the 17th century, all except for Alexander.\footnote{In the case of the Piaseczyńskis the first and only one in the 17th century to turn to Catholicism was ca. 1648 Alexander. He founded two churches, one in 1637 in Uladowka for Bernadine order and other in 1664 in Nowogród Siewierski for the Jesuits. See LitwinKatolicyzm, 1985: 65; PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 143; Uruski, 1916 13: 311.}

Thus, not until the family’s last generation, in the early 17th century, and in the female line, do we observe marriages with a heterodox partner: Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] to Vasil Rohoziński, Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] to Alexander Kruszelnicki, and Marusza Mikołajewna [VI/4], who married Wojciech Birkowski in her second marriage. Kruszelnicki and Birkowski were Roman Catholics, from Red Rus’ and the Kingdom of Poland respectively.\footnote{Boniecki, 1899 I: 269 (the Birkowskis), 1908 XII: 351-56 (the Kruszelnickis).} It is difficult to make any definitive statements about the sons of Halszka and Vasil, too, though judging by their names (Matwiej alias Maciej, Adrian, Mikołaj, Alexander, Szymon, Wawrzyniec, and Konstanty), some retained the Orthodox faith, some probably were more inclined to ward Arianism or Roman Catholicism. Significantly, none joined the ranks of Khmel’nyts’kyi rebels, what would suggest their “Polonisation” by that time. Similarly, out of the numerous progeny of Fedora and Alexander Kruszelnicki, the majority, and certainly the male lines, used Polish names (Andrzej, Augustyn, Stanisław, Jan, Franciszek, Ludwik, and Wawrzyniec) and were Roman Catholics. Only the daughters had names, which could be considered Ruthenian (Aleksandra, Helena, and Maryna). Perhaps this was an outcome of an arrangement between the couple to bring up the girls in the Orthodox religion and the boys as Roman Catholics like their father. Iakovenko has already pointed out such a likelihood.\footnote{See note 88, p. 192. IakovenkoOrthodox, 2002: 4. The author based on her own research enumerates examples, like the one of the Ostrogski family, to make a statement, that in the religiously mixed marriages sons followed their fathers creed, while daughters took it after their mothers. There were of course exceptions to this rule. In a marriage contract this question has been fixed in advance determining the religious creed of an offspring to come.} She has also stressed the “peaceful coexistence” of different religions within the same family. The registers of the castle and territorial courts bear witness to that. Others in the Ślusicas milieu who may be regarded
as Orthodox include the Koszka, Kropiwnicki, and Obodeński families (the last-mentioned only until the mid-16th century).  

In general, Protestants did not start to appear in the Ukraine until after the Union of Lublin (1569). The information that the Rohozinski family were Arians, or in fact members of the Polish Brethren or Socinians, considered the most radical branch of Protestantism on Polish-Lithuanian territory, has been confirmed by Lewicki (Levitskyi) and Jablonowski. The Polish Brethren or Arians were a sect of marginal significance, operating chiefly in Volhynia. Most of its adherents were recruited from the aristocracy. It appeared there in the latter half of the 16th century, chiefly thanks to an immigrant from Muscovy, Prince Andrzej Kurbski (d. 1586). Officially the Arians lead by Szymon Budny separated in 1565 from the Lithuanian Calvinists. The Socinians among the Volhynian middle gentry settled in the Ukraine included the Chołoniewski, Hojski (Hostki), Rohozński, and Babiński families. Their only co-religionists in Bratslav to be enumerated were the Obodeński family.

---

99 One of the most ardent protectors of Orthodoxy in the Bratslav territory was Michal Kropiwnicki, Vinnytsia territorial deputy judge (Pol. podśedek ziemski), the founder of the Wozniesienski priory in Vinnytsia, next to which functioned a brotherhood, printing house, and a school known under the name of the Vinnytsia Academy. In 1639, despite the efforts from the then starost Kalinowski, a Catholic who tried to defend the school against the Jesuits (they appeared in Vinnytsia in 1612 thanks to the foundation of the Kalinowski family), the others succeeded in abolishing this orthodox Academy, which seriously competed with them in the field of education (Shipovych Ohranitsakh, 1914: 14).


101 Kurbski was one of the followers of the so-called ludaisantist movement, which came into existence in the mid-16th century in Moscow and Novogrod. The main ideologist of this sect was Teodosius Kosoi (Kosy). In the 1550’s he run away from the Muscovy with the group of followers and took refuge in Lithuania. Hisiews were close to Arianism, and in the last yers of his life (the 1570’s) he was active in Volynia.

102 Kossowski, Aleksander. 1933. „Zarys dziejów protestantyzmu na Wołyniu XVI-XVII w. <Kossowski>,” Rocznik Wołyński 3: 233-59, here 245-46 (the Hojskis and the Babiskis). Accordingly to the document of 1633 Vasil Babiński turned back from Orthodoxy and joined the Socinians, after which he turned the Orthodox Church in his family nest in Babin, near Horoszczsa to a protestant chapel (ibidem, 247-48); Litwin Katolicyzm, 1985: 67; Lewicki, 1923: 13-14 (the Babińskis), 19 (the Hojskis).

103 ZDz., 1897 22: 571; Litwin Katolicyzm, 1985: 67.
Vasil Rohoziński’s adherence to the Socinians was perhaps connected with his Volhynian background.\textsuperscript{104} The Rohoziński line from Volhynia split into two groups with regard to religion. In majority they remained Orthodox, while some of their representatives, probably under the influence of the Niemiercz (especially Jerzy) or the Czaplic (especially another Jerzy) families adopted the new religion; this was probably the case of Vasils’ father and him.\textsuperscript{105} At the Convocation Sejm (Diet) of 1632 Vasil Rohoziński was one of the 165 signatories calling for a new statute to protect the Non-Catholic religions. The group reiterated its postulate at the Sejm for the Royal Election.\textsuperscript{106} But the Ultra-Catholics lodged an appeal to the castle court in Warsaw that the law passed by Sejm could not apply to non-Christian religions, including Arianism. Other heterodox groups lodged a counter-protest in defence of the Arians, which was signed by the contemporary leaders of the Polish Protestants, Krzysztof Radziwiłł, hetman of Lithuania, and Rafał Leszczyński, Voivode of Belz, along with Maciej Iwanicki, Mikołaj Obodeński deputy to parliament for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, and Vasil Rohoziński.\textsuperscript{107} The problem is that we have no way of identifying the Vasil in question as the one in the Kuna story, since he appears in the documents without his patronymic.\textsuperscript{108}


\textsuperscript{105} Of Orthodox creed were most probably almost all the Rohozińskis who retained in Volhynia in the family nest of Rohoziń. They were recorded in 1634 as followers of the Orthodoxy (AYZR, 1867 IV/1: 24). On the Niemiercz family see Lewicki, 1923: 21-29; Iakovenko, Natalia M. 1996. „Vytoky rodu Nemrychiv.” In Mappa Mundi. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats na poshanu Jaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody ioho 70-richchia. L’viv-Kyiv-New Nork: n.p. 156-77.

\textsuperscript{106} Lewicki, 1923: 16.

\textsuperscript{107} Lewicki, 1923: 15-16; AGAD: Castrensia Varsoviensia, libri relationum (1632), Liber 6, f. 982; AYZR, 1876 VI/1: 649-650; CDIAUK: F. 28, op. 1 [Volodymyr castle court registers book, 1632], no. 999, f. 1025. Next to dissenters their signatures set to the Volodymyr manifesto the leading representatives of Orthodoxy in Volhynia: Ławryn Derewiński, master of hunt of Volhynia (Pol. łowczy, Lat. venator), Jerzy Puzyna and Prince Mikołaj Czetwertyński.

CHAPTER 4

The Słupica Family and Their Property in the 16th and 17th Centuries. Social and Economic Aspects.

As I have already mentioned, there are no surviving documents on economic aspects, which could be used to reconstruct a clear picture of the way the Słupica estate functioned from an economic point of view. The vestigial and rather fortuitous data, which may be gleaned from the court proceedings – do not provide sufficient grounds for any reliable comparisons or statistical results. Moreover, there is no analogous material extant for the neighbouring families of an equivalent social and economic status, which might allow for a comparison. The only figures available for the whole of the Bratslav territory are the podymne (“chimney” or “hearthside”) tax registers on households for 1629 and 1664.\(^1\) Anusik and Litwin have researched both these sources for the entire population of the szlachta (nobility and gentry) in the Voivodeship of Bratslav.\(^2\) According to Krykm’s computation on the basis of these two documents and a few publications, there were 635 small, large towns and villages in the Bratslav territory prior to 1648.\(^3\)

However, for the Słupica family, which like several other families of the “nested gentry” became extinct in the male line by the 1620’s-1630’s, this estimate is only of limited relevance. The time-span between these two registers further reduces their significance for particular landowning families


\(^3\) Krykm, Mykola. 1991. „Dynamika kil’kosti poselen’ Brastlavskoho voevodstva v XVI-XVIII st.” In Problemy istorychnoi heohrafii Ukrainy: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats’. Kyiv: Akademia Nauk Ukraïns’koi RSR, Instytut istorii Ukrainy. 33-42, here p. 33. On the basis of published and archival sources prior to 1629 the author enumerates 179 settlements, and of these 162 reappear in later sources. The podymne register of 1629 lists in total 324 settlements (of which 94 with earlier origin), the German or Polish Law municipal documents from 1630’ and 40’s – 297 settlements (among which 103 older ones), and general revision register of 1648 as well Beauplan’s map of the Bratslav Voivodeship – 370 settlements (70 of older origin).
and their property, in view of the structural changes that ensued in this period, chiefly in property relations, in this community, and of the intervening civil war (1648-52). Neither do the fairly frequent 16th- and 17th century economic reviews and inspections carried out in Bratslav and Vinnytsia Castles and in their corresponding starosties provide data detailed enough to offer sufficient information on the economic affairs of a family whose links with the starosty had become looser already in the 16th century. The information I present in this chapter is rather like a mosaic that gives an insight into the development of the Kuna estate, its peak period and its decline, along with some aspects of its social and economic affairs, but certainly makes no claim to supplying a complete picture.

1. Semen Bohdanowicz (ca. 1546-96) and the Sloboda – “Free Settlement” at Kuna (1590).

During that time [1640's] I [Beauplan] laid the foundations for more than fifty important slobody, very much like so many colonies, which in the space of but a few years have grown to more than a thousand villages through the expansion of the new settlements. The groups of colonists, having devoted themselves entirely to the well-being of your [King John Casimir] realm, have greatly extended its frontiers, and have taken such pains in the cultivation of the unproductive lands they found on their arrival, that today the greatest revenues of your kingdom are drawn from their wondrous fertility.

The charter Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] personally issued under his own seal at Kuna, on 1 May 1590, appeared to have been the only original 16th-century

---


5 Beauplan, 1999: 4.
document preserved in the Kuna archives until 1919. Its content is known from the Podolyanin’s account and quotations from it, and the summary given by Gawroński. In this deed addressing prospective settlers, Semen Bohdanowicz guaranteed newcomers willing to settle in Kuna, a series of exemptions and “freedoms” (franchises) for a period of 35 years, which must certainly have been one of the longest terms of exemption granted in the sloboda (“freedom”) type settlements in the Bratslav territory and neighbouring regions. This long period of time must no doubt have been dictated by the ambient conditions, and the desperate position of the landowner, who was willing to bring new settlers into his estate at whatever cost. The key factor must have been the Tartar raids, which had seriously affected the Vinnytsia and Bratslav areas in the previous years. Their frequency and range had left its mark on the entire vicinity, where the problems were similar. New settlers who would be willing to run the risk had to be offered with incentives. Significantly, Shupica did not require “good reputation” as one of the conditions of settlement, thereby acquiescing to the accommodation of all sorts of people in his colonies.

6 This information I base on the statement made by the Kuna archives and collection inventory author Ryszard Mienicki (Mienicki, 1927: 215-19). On Semen’s seal see Chapter 3/1: 172, 174-75.
7 Podolyanin, 1886: 564. One may not exclude, that Podolyanin might had access to the Kuna original deed. There is no data confirming its entry to any of local courts’ registers. It is however highly possible that because of the rank of this document Semen might have registered somewhere this charter (if not at Vinnytsia, where the court might have not assembled for certain period due to the Tartar presence in the area). See Gawroński, 1915: 221-22.
8 Editors of Beauplan’s A Description of Ukraine offer the following characteristics of sloboda settlement areas: In the aftermath of the Union of Lublin (1569), Sigismund III granted vast tracts of land in Ukraine to various magnates. Since these areas were sparsely populated, the magnates enticed settlers there by offering them various concessions, such as exemptions from tribute and duties for lengthy periods of time. In return for such concessions, the settlers were required to provide defense against Tartar incursions. Upon the expiration of the periods of „free settlement,” individuals were obliged to pay only moderate tribute and rents to their masters. This was the state of affairs, even in 1640’s, on the left bank of the Dnieper. At the same time, however, conditions worsened for the settlers who were living in certain districts on the right bank (Beauplan, 1999: 123-24).
This explanation is fairly accurate apart from the mention on the Tartar impact, as from the Kuna’s charter it is clear that both sides bound themselves to anti-Tartar protective measures. On the grounds of source material Jabłonowski offers a general characteristics and specific of settlement trends in Kyiv and Bratslav territories (ZDz., 1897 22: 120-351). He assigns the period of the most often offered freedoms (Pol. wolnizna, Ruth. sloboda) for 20 years, although there were also 30 years freedoms, as for example in Skwir or Kryłów. The longest ones of them, 30/40 years, or like in the case of Kuna 35 years were to be found only in Bratslavshchyna. This was observed especially after the devastation of the Bratslav Starosty in 1610-15, due to the Tartars. From 1616 onwards the longest periods of freedoms were to be found here (ZDz., 1897 22: 122). See also Petrenko Luka, 1998:17.
Settlers in Kuna were permitted to run an inn selling beer, mead, and spirits, as well as other products. This concession seems to have been an indispensable condition for the successful growth of a settlement.  

Shipica also guaranteed that in the event of a settler's death or abduction by the Tartars, any movable assets the deceased or kidnapped man had in Kuna would be passed on to his widow and children, and if he was unmarried and childless, his nearest relatives would have the right of inheritance. Semen also waived his right to "blood money" (Pol. główszczyzna) in the event of the manslaughter of any of his colonists. In general the fundamental principle governing the foundation of new settlements in the Ukraine was to help the colonists as much as possible, especially in regard to defence – a particularly important point in the context of the Tartar threat. Semen also gave all his subjects the right to fish in the River Sob using nets and baskets. In return, he expected them to pay a hearth or chimney (= household) tax of 6 groszs after the 35 years of tax-free inhabitation expired. They would also pay another 6 groszs for the use of the pond on the Sob, where there was a mill. Their duties included looking after the pond and protecting its banks against flood damage, and also manuring the dike around the pond. Semen Bohdanowicz reserved the right to charge a redemption fee of 12 groszs from any of the settlers who wanted to leave before the expiry of his 35 years of “franchise,” and obliged the leaver to sell the buildings he had constructed. If a subject who wanted to leave fulfilled these conditions, Semen promised to allow him free departure.

---

10 Note e.g. Beauplan’s remarques on drinking habits of the Ukrainian population, especially the Cossacks: In contrast, I know of no people in the world that resembles them insofar as indulging in drink is concerned. Indeed, no sooner are they out of one state of inerriation, than they set about drinking again, as before. However, this is the practice [only] during times of rest, for when they are at war or occupied with some [like] undertaking, they observe strict sobriety (Beauplan, 1999: 12-13).

11 The matter of “blood money” (Pol. główszczyzna) in the case of non-noble persons or „ordinary people“ (Pol. ludzie pospolici), means artisans, peasants, etc. has been regulated by the chapter 12 of the II Lithuanian Statute of 1566 (Statut1566 Edition 2003: 182-186). In the case of craftsmen, accordingly to their professional qualifications the fine amount was 13 or 20 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (ibidem: 182). See also Chapter 6/D/3a: 358 and note 300, p. 358, 360 and note 306, p. 360. Beauplan made the following remarque regarding this matter:
In addition, a noble cannot be condemned to death fro killing the peasant of another noble, but instead, he is ordered by law to pay a compensation of 40 grzywnas to the heirs of the decased, in order to be absolved [of the crime] (one grzywna is worth of 32 sous). In such cases, as proof, the testimony of two nobels is sufficient to condemn a peasant, but fourteen peasants must testify to convict a noble (Beauplan, 1999: 107).
As we know from other sources, the campaign failed and after 1596 Semen's descendants inherited depopulated villages. However, already by 1598, most probably following the suggestion of their guardian Ivan Meleszko, they might have issued another deed guaranteeing exemptions to new settlers wishing to come to Kuna. By 1599 Kuna was already being described in summonses and court ushers' reports as a town. On 25 July 1599 Andrzej Trzembecki (Trembecki?), the court beadle for the Powiat of Bratslav, testified in Vinnytsia that on 15 July he had been in the town of Kuna, where he served a summons by inserting the writ in the municipal gate and "informing Lord Żityński, the magistrate of Kuna, of the service".

Apart from the already described deed, we know of no other documents, which provided information on the agricultural and other feudal services the villagers living in the Słupicas' estates were to provide. Presumably they were no different in extent from the standards established by Jurkiewicz for private estates in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 16th and 17th centuries (although his study was based on data for Lithuania proper). The liabilities involved were agricultural and other services, their amount determined by the number of households ("chimney" or "hearths"), and rent, calculated on the basis of area of land cultivated. After the end of the 16th century, as time went on, there was a distinct shift away from services to money payments. The typical duties in

---

12 There is however no direct prove of such deed being issued.
13 APKr.: ASang., t. XXIII/59 (Polish copy).
14 Jurkiewicz, Jan. 1991. Powinności włościów w dobrach prywatnych w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w XVI-XVII wieku <JurkiewiczPowinności>. Poznań: n.p. The publication enlightens first of all methodological difficulties and luck of accord among the researchers when it comes to terminology and the ways in which source material has to be analyzed. It should be underlined as well that it only in a very narrow way takes into account the sources out of Lithuania proper. Thus, I am entitled to accept without any doubt its extremely interesting conclusions as statistic ones and reflecting some general trends.
15 After the „drag“ reform of 1557 (see Introduction Part 2, note 45, p. 41) an average norm of peasant obligations from 1 drag in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was as follows: the so-called działo (Pol.) – a compulsory loan in natural products: 1 barrel of rye, 2 barrels of oat, and a of hay; natural products as 1 goose, 2 chickens and 20 eggs which might have been exchanged for the payment of 2 groszs and 7 coins; czynsz (Pol.) – a rent, the amount of which depended from the category of peasants, the settled ones used to pay ca. 30 of groszes, while the villein ones ca. 14 of groszes; osada (Pol.) – a payment for exclusion from panszczyzna (Pol.) = the corvée/soccage in the amount of 30 of groszes; other lesser obligations. In total the obligations amounted, depending form the quality of cultivated land up to 106 of groszes from a good land, 97 of groszes from a middle quality land, 83 from a bad quality land, and 66 of groszes from a very bad land. The corvée in the case of Ruthenian lands is referred to in the source material as služba tiahla (Ruth.) or
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the mid-16th century, according to Jurkiewicz, were 2–3 days' labour a week per włośka (a local measure of area = 21,36 ha; introduced in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania officially in 1557 in the course of “drag” reform), and by the second half of the 17th century they were 3 days a week by two persons from each “chimney” household. While giving his very emotional characteristics of peasant obligations in the mid-17th century Ukraine, to some extent Beauplan must reflected the state of matters in the Kuna estate of that time:

The local peasants are in a very miserable state, being obliged to work, themselves and their horses, three days a week in the service of their lord, and having to pay him, in proportion to the land they hold, many bushels of grain, and plenty of capons, hens, goslings and chickens, specifically at Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas. What is more, they must cart wood for their lord, and fulfil a thousand other manorial obligations to which they ought not to be subject; besides these, money is exacted from them, as well as a tithe on their sheep, pigs, honey, and fruit of all kinds, and every third year [they must give up every] third ox.

2. Tychon Semenowicz (before 1596 – 1615) and Municipal Rights for Kuna (1605).

We are fortunate in knowing the content of the royal charter, which endowed Kuna with municipal rights. It was granted by Sigismund III at the Warsaw Sejm (Diet) on 18 February 1605, on the petition from Tychon Semenowicz, “a gentleman of the Voivodeship of Bratslav”, no doubt supported by Ivan Meleszko, his legal guardian. Although the original deed is no longer extant, we have its entry in the Volhynian Metrica, where it is described as the “foundation of the town of Kima, hereditary property of Tychon Slupicz, in the Bratslav territory.” The original is reproduced in full in the Podolyanin’s paper and Gawroński gives a summary. Alongside permission to erect a
castle, the King granted Tychon the right to found a town, which would enjoy the freedoms of the general law. As we know, this was not the only attempt to establish a settlement here, this time a town. Unlike the earlier attempts, this one was successful. According to Zaiats’, who has recently studied the foundation of towns in Volhynia from the 16th to the mid-17th century, the factor ensuring the success of a private municipal foundation was the erection of a castle. This for sure had to play much bigger role in the “borderland” Bratslav area, being even the sine qua non condition for success.

Shipica was also granted the right to hold fairs twice a year and weekly markets, and also to keep inns. The charter specified the number of fairs at two per annum, each lasting a fortnight, but left blank the date when the fairs would be held. His subjects, both those already living there as well as prospective new colonists, drawn from “free men and craftsmen” were guaranteed municipal rights. They could keep inns selling mead, beer, and spirits. They were allowed to trade in the “usual merchants’ wares”, both home-produced and imported. All of His Majesty’s subjects as well as foreign traders had access to the fairs and markets, but the latter were expected to pay Tychon and his heirs customs or the ordinary toll for markets. It is hard to determine the legal nature of this foundation, as form the above description. With high probability it can be assumed, however, that it represented the most common in the Ruthenian lands form, prevailing especially in the country towns. The one being a mixture of the Ruthenian law, originating form the Kyiv Rus’ and based on the local customs, and the widely adopted since the second half of the 16th century Magdeburg law in its Polish version.

After 1605 the new settlement assumed a different name, Nowa Kuna [New Kuna] sometimes Kuna Wielka [Great Kuna], distinguishing it from the earlier village (Kuna Stara [Old Kuna]), which gradually came into the

---

Volhynia, Bratslav and Chernihiv under the letter „O” on the page 92. The extract from this entry was issued under Stanislas August dated 24 October 1789; Gawroński, 1915: 224-25.

21 On the castle see Chapter 3/2b: 179-83.
23 On the towns and their classification in regard to dimensions, ownership and legal status see BłaszczykLitwa, 2002: 175-79.
documents as well, showing that the town was a new foundation, not an outcome of the transformation of the earlier village. Nonetheless, the municipal rights extended to the village as well, since in his deed discharging Ivan Meleszko of wardship duties, Tychon commended his guardian for having established “two towns” in the uninhabited Kuna. According to Podolyanin, however, the Słupica success was only partial, as a rival settlement, founded in 1605 by Piotr Świąrski in the vicinity at Hajsyn, Świąrski’s tenancy, impeded a more rapid rate of growth. Świąrski’s aggressive policy with respect to his neighbours at Kuna made Hajsyn, just 5 km away from Kuna, develop faster, and by the 1720’s-30’s become the principal urban centre in the locality, acquiring in the 18th century the status of the chief town in the powiat (district). Other obstacles to the growth of Kuna Nowa were the family feuds and leasing out of parts of the estate as securities on loans, and finally the Khmel’nyts’kyi Uprising (1648-52).

3. The Contribution of Ivan Meleszko as Słupicas Guardian (1596-1612) to the Economic Development of the Kuna Estate.

Ivan Meleszko’s contribution to the economic growth both of Kuna itself and the whole estate can hardly be overlooked. The best testimonial of his input came from his former ward Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], in his letter of 13 August 1612, discharging Ivan of his wardship duties with respect to Tychon and his deceased brother Matiasz [VI/2]. When he assumed his duties of looking after the Słupicas estate, Meleszko found it completely devastated, both by Tartar raids as well as by the wilful damage caused by relatives and neighbours. Hence one of Ivan’s chief tasks, apart from its economic restoration, was the defence of the estate’s integrity.

---

24 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 8.
25 Podolyanin, 1886: 567. On Świrski’s hostile moves towards his immediate neighbours, especially the Słupicas’ see Chapter 6/A/3: 289-90. See also Beauplan’s map, Fig. no. 4 and SlownGeogr., 1882 III: 10-12 (Hajsyn).
26 Świrski’s activity as related in Chapter 6/A/3: 289-90.
27 The subject, which I have already discussed in Chapter 6/A/3: 288-90.
Meleszko and his wards took over "the uninhabited settlement of Kuna and Gusaków [Husakowce] on the Tartar Trail."\textsuperscript{28} When Tychon took control in 1612 he found a thoroughly transformed Kuna. He observed that his guardian had "repaired our estate the settlement of Kuna which had been uninhabited, with much effort on his part, establishing two towns there. He had set up ponds and built mills, and erected a castle...". Having come of age, and out of the wardship of Lord Ivan Meleszko, Tychon now assumed the governance of his patrimony Kuna, along with all of its assets, full of settlers and brought up to a good state of repair. Next Tychon gave a detailed list of Meleszko's achievements, discharging him and his family of all their duties, with respect to his "subjects, the ponds and lands that Lord Meleszko held and enjoyed, and also all the constructions in the castle and town; the payments and rents, and all the appointed and occasional revenues from Kuna." Finally, he pledged he would never bring any complaint to court against his former guardian, his wife, and offspring, against a deposit of 2,000 \textit{kopas} of Lithuanian \textit{groszs} (120 thousand Lithuanian groats).\textsuperscript{29} As we see from this account, it was thanks to Meleszko that Kuna and its entire estate could flourish again. It seems that Meleszko was responsible for the introduction of a new management scheme in Kuna, based on a system of fixed rents and liabilities for services and labour. Unfortunately this is all we know on this point, and may only assume that it worked in a similar way to the examples cited below for the Starosty of Vinnytsia. We shall also keep in mind the quoted above Beauplan's account, which however illustrates the state of affairs in the 1650's when most of the Bratslav territory came into the hands of magnate families engaged in a mass scale cultivation.

According to the inspection carried out in the Starosty in 1616, the liabilities due from the people of Tiutki (14 settlers and 8 peasant-tenants), belonging to Ivan Czerlenkowski, amounted to one day's labour per week, and a payment of two chickens at 1 \textit{grosz} each, a total of 24 \textit{groszs} per annum. The proprietor's annual income from a single-wheel watermill on the local pond and the inn was 30 Zlotys. Thus Czerlenkowski's annual income came to 30

\textsuperscript{28} CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 7v.
\textsuperscript{29} CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 8-8v.
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Likewise Andriej Chruślicki, tenant of the village of Skórzyńce, which had 40 permanent inhabitants prior to 1616, but only 4 after a Tartar raid (probably the one of 1615), expected one day’s labour per week from his subjects. He did not receive any rents or tithes. There was a single-wheel mill in his village as well, which gave him an annual income of 7 Zlotys.31


Ivan Meleszko had to represent his ward many times in court in cases involving runaway subjects. This was not an exceptional phenomenon. Desertion, especially by peasants, was a common occurrence in the newly colonised, or re-colonised parts of the Poberezhe in the years, when he was guardian of the Slupicas minors.32 There is an indisputable correlation between the frequency of abscondences and the progress made in colonisation.33 The editors of the collection Selians'kyi rukh na Ukraini 1569-1647 rr. [Peasant movement in the Ukraine 1569-1647] analysed a register of decrees issued by the Crown Tribunal at Lublin for the Voivodeships of Kyiv and Bratslav covering 22 years from 1591 to 1624 (in view of the unavailability of territorial and castle court registers for Bratslav in this period). Of the 4,613 decrees recorded, as many as 1,507 concerned fugitive subjects – 32% of the total number of cases heard. The escapees listed there came from 68 towns and 663 villages throughout the Ukraine (the Kyiv and Bratslav regions), and from 153 towns and 377 villages of the Voivodeship of Podolia and the three voivodeships of the Grand Duchy of...
of Lithuania. The authors stressed that often these were planned escapes, many of them inspired by a party interested in attracting new settlers to his own estate, towards which the fugitives would head. One shall take a closer look at the figures – both from the Kuna estate, as well as for runaways making off from other estates, not necessarily in the neighbourhood, and seeking sanctuary, or just better living conditions, in Kuna. The fundamental sources of information are the court records.

The information available from the judicial material for Kuna and Nosowce and their neighbourhood will suffice to draw some interesting conclusions. This kind of information is invaluable, because not only does it provide figures for the particular villages or individuals involved, but also it gives a socio-economic perspective on the phenomenon. It will come as no surprise that there were marked waves of desertion from places (both towns and villages) struck by a disaster, such as a bad harvest, fire, or Tartar raids, or offering poorer living and working conditions, in favour of newly established village settlements or new towns. This was true for the entire Bratslav territory from the late 16th century to the mid-1620’s, when significant changes ensued in property relations. At this time a large part of the Ruthenian “nested gentry” became extinct or impoverished. Their old ancestral lands, including the Słupicas’ estates, became incorporated in vast estates owned by magnate families such as the Zbaraski (masters of Berszadz and Ładyżyn), Kalinowski (owning Trościaniec and Derenkowce), Koniecpolski (holding Sawrań), Ostrogski (lords of Olbaczów and Trynożyn), and Sieniawski (owning the so-called Granowszczyzna, i.e. Granów with adjacencies).

This general rule is confirmed by data related to fugitive subjects to and from Kuna and other villages in the Kuna estate. There is a marked turning point around the 1590’s, especially after 1605, the year when Kuna received its municipal charter, with a rising influx of escapees coming into Kuna. Clearly subjects endorsed the Kuna’s prosperity under Meleszko and later Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3]. Information is available for individual examples

---

34 Selians’kyi ruch, 1993: 14. Editors referred also to the views on the subject by the above-mentioned Jabłonowski (ZDz., 1897 22: 127-37).
illustrating what must have been a more general phenomenon. Some of these cases throw light on more than just economic aspects – legal proceedings, methods of avoiding liability, and above all the obligation of returning deserters to their rightful masters. Remarkably, there are no exceptions from the rule to be observed: court proceedings in the first phase concern fugitives from Kuna and its environs, with the Słupiča family (and subsequently Meleszko) as plaintiff; while in the second phase the roles have been reversed and the only cases are against the Słupičas, for the return of subjects who have taken flight to Kuna or Nosowce.

Ivan Meleszko had to deal with such problems in his own property. In 1596 he and his mother Zofia née Mikulinska were sued by Vasil Hulewicz, the military curator (Pol. wojski, Lat. tribunus) of Volodymyr, for the return of a Hulewicz’s subject enticed out of the village of Sutyska and kept in Łuka. On 22 April 1602 the Tribunal heard a case brought by Meleszko, who in turn was suing Prince Joachim [Bohuszewicz] Korecki for the return of fugitives and their families who had fled to the Prince’s town, Kalnik. On 17 May 1606 the Lublin Tribunal issued a decree in a case brought by one Celużyński against Meleszko, for the return of escapees who had absconded to Żerdenówka from the Celużyński’s village of Karpowce. In 1607 Meleszko summoned Prince Roman Różyński before the Tribunal for the theft of goods belonging to Meleszko’s Ziatkowce subjects. The matter was settled out of court. Meleszko in turn appeared twice before the Tribunal in 1609 against the Prince Janusz Ostrogski in a case concerning the theft of cattle and sheep from Meleszko’s subjects in Łuka. First Ostrogski’s men had stolen the livestock from some people who were grazing their herd on their land in Hajsyn, in a desolate part named Hubnik; next they stole the animals of some other people on Semen Obodeński’s property at Worony Łučzańskie, and at Kalnik, the

______________
35 This phenomenon as well as usual forms of postponing legal proceedings, especially court sessions and abstaining from returning runaway subjects was underlined also in the introduction to the above quoted source edition. The authors evoked there all legal regulations applied to the cases of fugitive subjects, especially the II Lithuanian Statute of 1566 (Selians’kyi rukh, 1993: 14-15).
36 ZDz., 1896 21: 399: a decree issued on 9 July 1696 at Lublin.
37 ZDz., 1896 21: 421 (digest); PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 19.
38 ZDz., 1896 21: 526 (digest).
39 ZDz., 1896 21: 112 (digest).
property of Prince Korecki. On 22 April 1613 the Tribunal issued its verdict in the case brought by Meleszko against Halszka Słupiczanka. Ivan was demanding the return of his subjects who had fled from Omętyniec to her part of Nosowce. On 10 August 1616 Ivan Krasnosielski, Master of the Hunt (Pol. łowczy, Lat. venator) for Bratslav, sued Meleszko before the Lublin Tribunal for the return of his subjects, who had fled from the village of Krzykówce to Meleszko's town Ziatkowce. He also wanted damages for Meleszko's sending in his men onto Krasnosielski's property and stealing his cattle.

4.a. The Influx of Fugitives into Kuna and the Kuna Estate under Ivan Meleszko (1605-12).

On 29 April 1598 the Crown Tribunal issued a verdict in a case brought by Fedor Szandyrowski against Ivan Meleszko in his capacity as guardian of the heirs of Semen Słupica, for the return of Szandyrowski's men who had fled from his part of the village of Trościaniec to the town of Kuna. We do not know exactly how many fugitives were involved, since the decree has survived only in the digest, but the whole of Trościaniec once belonged to the Kuna estate, and was in the neighbourhood, albeit not in the immediate vicinity. A few days later (1 May) the judges delegated to the Tribunal issued another verdict in a case involving absconding subjects. This time Ivan Curkowski was suing Meleszko and his Słupica wards for the return of escapee subjects and their families from Demidowce (again, the digest does not give the number involved), who had settled in Kuna. Demidowce was a village on the River Rowiec, not far from Braiłów (near Żmerynka) in the western part of the

---

40 ZDż., 1896 21: 542 (two digests).
42 ZDż., 1896 21: 577 (two digests). Petrenko (PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 19) mentions undated decree of the Vinnitsia castle court that was to judge the case of an organised group of thieves, which used to rob villages around Vinnitsia stealing especially livestock and farm equipment. The chief of this band was an ataman from Łuka Meleszkowska one Biłasz and his closest collaborators were peasants from the same village Semen Omelianenko and Matiasz and Semen the Burczenko.
43 ZDż., 1896 21: 404 (digest).
44 ZDż., 1896 21: 405 (digest).
Bratslav territory (almost on its border with western Podolia) – at quite a distance from Kuna.45

On 29 April 1602 the tribunal issued a verdict in a case brought by Stanislaw Podczaski, who was suing the Słupica heir of Kuna for the return of fugitive subjects who had fled to Kuna with their wives from the village of Jabłońówka, which was situated in the Powiat of Kamenets’ in the part of Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland – a long way from Kuna. Again, there are no figures available for the number of fugitives involved.46 In 1606 the judges’ bench at Lublin heard a case against Eudotia [Eudoksja] née Krasnosielska, widow of Semen Słupica as legal guardian of her children, lodged by Wojciech Humiecki, Esquire Carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. daphifer) of Podolia.47 Humiecki, yet another plaintiff from the Kingdom of Poland, could not have been very knowledgeable about the Słupica family. The list of defendants enumerates Fedora Dmitriewna and “Anna” (probably for Halszka) alongside Tychon as the heirs of Semen Słupica, but does not cite Ivan Meleszko. Nevertheless, his grievance was the same: he was demanding the restitution of his subjects who had absconded to the town of Kuna, all the way from the village of Tamawa, a Crown property he held as tenant in the Voivodeship of Podolia. The Tribunal’s verdict followed an earlier decision by

45 The Curkowskis of Curków on the Rowiec are mentioned by Jabłońowski in the group of „lesser landowners” of the Powiat of Vinnytsia (ZDz., 1897 22: 647). They took over a part of the former family seat of the Demidowski family, the village of Demidowce also on the Rowiec, downstream near Brailów (the Powiat of Vinnytsia), as their successors, after they had executed the partitions of this property with the Obodenskis around 1595; the latter were in possession of Demidowce in 1594-1629 (ZDz., 1897 22: 628, 711). The revision account of 1552 counted in Demidowce 110 „chimneys” or cottages (ibidem: 98). Ivan Curkowski and Semen and Bohdan the Obodenskis acting as co-owners of Demidowce sued in 1598 the mother of the late Ivan Bokij Pieczychwostski, Sub-chamberlain of Volodymyr because of a foray and of seizure of a part of Demidów grounds, on which Bokij founded later the country town of Brailów (ibidem: 409). The Demidowskis themselves originated from the Kyiv territories where they owned Demidów on the downstream Iprzyn, the village castle of the Kyiv Starosty, mentioned in the Kyiv Castle revision register of 1579 (ZDz., 1897 22: 262, 523, 676). Jerzy Curkowski sued in 1602 Princes Frydryk and Zofia the Zaslawskis claiming the return of fugitive subjects that run away from Komoteńce (ZDz., 1896 21: 85).

46 ZDz., 1896 21: 434 (digest).

47 Wojciech Humiecki of Rychty of the Junosza arms (d. 1618) represented a Mazovian (in The Kingdom of Poland) gentry family that settled down in Podolia in the course of the 16th century. He was Esquire Carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. daphifer) of Podolia in 1602-11. Earlier he had acted as the castle court notary in Kamenets’ (1583). In 1589-1602 he was Master of the Hunt (Pol. lowczy, Lat. venator) of Kamenets’. Later on Humiecki became Castellan of Halych (Pol. Halicz), and finally he took over the Castellany of Kamenets’ (Boniecki, 1905 8: 2; U III/3, nos. 208, 242, 583 and p. 204). His brother Adam (d. 1641), a soldier in the borderlands defence structure was a lease owner of the village of Kutkowka alias Jastrzębińce in the Voivodeship of Bratslav. He got this tenancy in 1612 after Stanisław Jastrzębski, the Deputy Starost of Bratslav in 1602, in possession of this village until 1609 (Litwin, 2000: 115, 196).
the castle court in Vinnytsia of 14 February 1604, against which Humiecki was appealing. The local court at Vinnytsia had ruled that Eudoksja no longer had the right to legal guardianship of Semen’s heirs, which was true, since Ivan Meleszko was now their official guardian. Humiecki failed to appear before the Tribunal, which acquitted Eudoksja of the charge and annulled the lower court’s verdict. We do not know the reasons of Humiecki’s failure, but it is obvious the Słupicas used their local connections to win the case.

Alongside the Podolians, there was also a plaintiff from Volhynia who brought a case against the Słupica family for the return of absconded subjects. On 6 May 1606 the Tribunal ruled in the case lodged by Łukasz Choroszko Szelechowski, who claimed the restitution of fugitives from the village of Daszkowce in the Powiat of Kremenets. Again, no figures are available, and only an entry in the digest survives for the case. An immediate observation is that fugitives were coming to Kuna from further away as time passed and news spread of the good conditions in the new town. Initially the “recruitment” zone covered the neighbouring villages, but subsequently expanded into the entire Powiat of Vinnytsia, then that of Bratslav, and finally crept into the neighbouring voivodeships, Volhynia and Podolia in the Kingdom of Poland. The tables in appendix (No. 4) illustrate the influx and afflux of subjects both for the Kuna estate (Kuna and Nosowce) and for the Meleszko family estate. While looking at them it becomes more clear, that Kuna due to the 35 years

---

48 DIALO: F. 773, op. 1 [The Crown Tribunal, 1606], spr. 41, no. 343, f. 13-13v.
49 ZDz., 1896 21: 513 (digest).
50 On the very day (6 May 1606) the tribunal issued a verdict in another case in which Szelechowski was a plaintiff, concerning his subjects from Daszków. This time it went about the rifling of his subjects, who as it was their old custom had gone on the Sawranowski ground, namely on the wilderness (or meadow, Pol. uroczyszcze) called Podbuźne, which belonged to the Starosty of Bratslav. It was exactly there where his people were hunting on martens. While doing so they have been assaulted and robbed by the servants of the then Bratslav and Vinnytsia Starost Walenty Alexander Kalinowski (ZDz., 1896 21: 513). On 8 May 1606 in turn Szelechowski claimed from Kalinowski the return of his subjects that run away from Daszkowce to Bratslav. Information that Daszkowce were situated in the Powiat of Kremenets in Volhynia is found here (ZDz., 1896 21:515).
51 See Jablonowski (ZDz., 1896 21: 128-29). The author is of the opinion that it was a pretty rare occurrence in the case of Kyiv and Bratslav territories that the subjects’ afflux encompassed the area further than Volhynia, Podolia or Lithuanian Polesie area. In the case of Bratslavshchyna most often appeared here fugitives from the Crown Podolia (ibidem: 130). Jablonowski stresses also the fact of the lack of absconded subjects from the Bratslav territory among the fugitives, which used to appear from the beginning of the 17th century in the so-called Zadnieprze („Beyond Dnipro”), a usual territory towards which directed all fugitives.
exemptions offered much more attractive conditions than the neighbouring Meleszkos’ properties. That is why we can observe the more wide range of influx to Kuna from so distant areas as the Crown Podolia and Volhynia, while the Meleszkos estate attracted fugitives exclusively from the Powiat of Vinnystia. The tables show as well an apparent afflux of peasants from the Melszkos estate in 1620’s and 1630’s in favour of the then colonised by the Kalinowskis wild areas around Humań.

The litigation brought by Andriej Pilawski of the arms of Ostoja against the heirs of Semen Bohdnanowicz for the restitution of fugitive subjects should be examined separately, since it went on for a long time, from 1603 to 1615, and also because of the interesting points it involves. It started in 1603 when five of Pilawski’s subjects and their families fled to Kuna. They left his hereditary village of Nižne Piljawce (alias Pilawce) in the Powiat of Latyczów in Western Podolia. The Lithuanian Statutes of 1529 and 1566 imposed a limitation for abscondence cases of 10 years’ residence in the new place, after which time the right to claim the return of escapee subjects in the Voivodeships of Kyiv, Volhynia, and Bratslav expired. The first surviving document related to the Pilawski’s case, is the abstract of a decree issued by the Crown Tribunal on 23 April 1613. However, the bench ruled on the grounds of earlier documents, including a writ issued by the castle court of Vinnysia on 14 May 1612, in which Pilawski summoned Ivan Meleszko and Owdotia née Krasnosielska Słupiczyna as the legal guardians of the heirs of Semen Słupica, and the heirs themselves – Matiasz, Tychon, Helena, and Fedora – to appear...

52 Andriej (Andrzej) Pilawski was son of Pawel, and brother of Mikolaj and Pawel, with whom he was hereditary co-owner of Pilawce alias Piljawce (Uruski, 1917 14: 4).
53 The peasants were: Ostapko Kornil, Jan Ostapkowicz, Jan Waluzinczin, Waszko Pawelkowicz and Jan Zawalko (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/88, f. Iv.; Polish copy)
54 “Statut velikogo kniazstva Litovskago 1566 goda.” In Vremennik imperatorskogo Moskovskogo obschestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh. 1855. Vol. 23. Moscow = Statut1566 Edition 2003. See also VL, 4: 59; Selians’kyi rukh, 1993: 15. In 1578 the Voivodeships of Volhynia, Rus’, Belz and Podolia (in the Crown) acquired on the ground of the Sejm regulation the diminution of the so-called „oldness” of settlement to 3 years in the case of fugitives from the aforementioned voivodeships running away into Volhynia or opposite way around (VL, 1859 2: 189). The latter shows the scale of abscond from the Crown territories directed usually towards the eastern Ruthenian lands.
55 APKr.: ASang., t. XXIX/54 (original in Ruthenian).
before the Tribunal. The several years' delay between the incident itself and the initiation of proceedings seems to have been caused by the suspension of the administration of justice in the Voivodeship of Bratslav in connection with persistent Tartar threats. The earlier procedures in this matter against the Shipicas in the Vinnytsia court had ended with a sentence of banishment (viz. outlawing them).

According to the information in the decree issued by the Tribunal, the Pilawski's case was due to be judged in Lublin already in 1612, but it was not resolved. Thus the court adjourned it to the following year's agenda (see above the decree of 23 April 1613). Again the defendants failed to appear, despite the customary delivery of three summonses. As a result the Tribunal upheld the verdict of banishment, which before had issued the Vinnytsia castle court, supporting it with its own warrant for property confiscation (Pol. wzdanie). The latter verdict is known only from the entry in the castle court register of Vinnytsia, made on 17 February 1614 on Pilawski's behalf by his servant Sebastian Rapowicz. It mentions Ivan Meleszko guardian of the Shipica heirs (though officially he had ceased to hold this office in August 1612) and Andrzej Radlicki, Tychon's attorney, as representatives of the defendants. Despite their efforts, the court permitted the plaintiff to pursue proceedings against the defendants, except for Ivan Meleszko, who was acquitted of banishment and the publishing of such a verdict against him. Meleszko's

---

56 Once again the plaintiff turned out not to be informed on the family situation, as Matiasz was already deceased (d. after 1606 but before 1609), and Fedora was a daughter of Dimitr Hrehorowicz [V/5], thus the Semenowicz cousin.


58 In the case of non respecting of the court verdict of whatsoever instance regarding the absconded subjects and non handing them over back to their lawful owner the defendant could have expect to be deprived of his own property rights in respect to the very property in which the fugitives resided or settled down. The property in question passed on behalf of the plaintiff, means the owner of fugitives. Most often, however, the defendant did not allow an official introduction (Pol. intronisja or wwiązanie) of the plaintiff into his forfeited property, thus official transfer of the ownership titles to his property on behalf of sufferer. When a situation like that occurred the defendant had to expect a banishment penalty (Pol. banicja) what put him in the position of outlaws person. The announcement (Pol. publikacja) of outlawry meant he was outlawed in the whole territory of the Commonwealth. Thus usually such cases were solved finally on the basis of out-of-court agreements between both parties.

59 Wzdanie (Pol.), a legal term of different meaning: 1) an official transfer of property rights (both in case of landed property and movable assets) ordered by the court; 2) charging with a case; 3) an official sentence. Of which the first meaning is to be referred to in the text.

60 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/80 (Polish copy).

61 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/80 (Polish copy).
exemption probably came about only after he had proved to be no longer the
Shipicas guardian. He might have reached also an out-of-court settlement with
Pilawski, the conditions of which are unknown. After acquitting Meleszko, the
Tribunal did not allow “the defendant Shipica [Tychon] to conclude the
proceedings by the taking an oath”, whereupon Tychon’s attorney lodged a
protest. In addition, Tychon was sentenced to a fine of 6,000 Polish Zlotys to
be paid out to Pilawski in lieu of damages, against the Kuna properties”. By
sheer coincidence, one of the judges designated to the bench by the
Voivodeship of Bratslav and hearing the case was Ivan Meleszko, whose
signature is on the verdict, although it is not certain weather the Meleszko in
question was the same former guardian of the Shipicas or one of his relatives
from the Volhynian family branch.

The sentence of banishment on the Shipicas was publicly announced in
Lublin Town Hall, on 23 April 1613 by the court beadle Szymon Kumiński, the
same one who had earlier served a summons three times on the defendants.
Neither the publishing of the sentence of banishment nor the fine worried the
Shipicas. An account delivered by another court beadle sent to Kuna to collect
the fine on Pilawski’s behalf, reports that the masters of Kuna simply refused to
abide by the Tribunal’s judgement. Powerless Pilawski realised he did not have
much of a chance to satisfy his grievance in this manner, despite having
obtained endorsement by the law. Whereupon he turned to a measure
frequently applied in such cases. He conveyed his right to claim the fine ruled
by the court to Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, who held the offices of the
General [Starost] of Podolia (= Starost of Kamenets’ and Latyczów), as well as
Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Doubtless, the parties must have agreed upon
a financial compensation Pilawski was to receive from Kalinowski, if the latter
would succeed in executing the court verdict. Any way, this move promised a
chance of success, since Kalinowski represented the executive power in the

62 According to the laws Tychon was entitled to prove his innocence by taking an oath in the
presence of witnesses equal in status.
63 Usually, to what pays attention the source edition (Selians’kyi rukh, 1993: 15) the amounts of
fines have been lower that the official fine accepted in the Sejm regulation of 1588, which was
500 of Polish grzywna (Lat. Marca; 1 grzywna = 48 of groszs) per a fugitive peasant family
(VL, 1859 2: 269).
64 APKr.: ASang., t. XXIX/54 (original in Ruthenian and its Polish copy).
Voivodeship of Bratslav and had the forces and means required to compel reluctant individuals to conform to court sentences passed against them. Also, he was one of the most powerful magnates in the region, and as owner (since 1609) of the “wilderness of Humań”, an area adjacent to the Słupica estate, would have a vested interest in their property.65

On 16 April 1614 an entry was made in the castle court register of Vinnytsia for the conveyance to Kalinowski of Pilawski’s right to claim the fine.66 On the same day a copy of this deed was sent to Owdotia Słupiczyna and the children of Semen Słupica, with information that the right of claim had passed to Kalinowski. But Kalinowski’s engagement in a dispute concerning subjects mobilised Prince Zasławski, who never missed a chance to revive his own claim to Kuna. In this way the transfer, which was to help Pilawski redress his wrongs, made Prince Janusz Zasławski recognise Kalinowski as a rival in the bid to take over the Słupica estate. Paradoxically, it led to a situation in which, thanks to the rivalry between the two powerful men, the Słupica family, or more precisely Tychon managed to extricate themselves from the quandary and Pilawski’s claim, which was never satisfied in the latter’s lifetime.67

On 29 July 1615 the Crown Tribunal heard a case brought by Walenty A. Kalinowski against the Słupicas, namely against Halszka Semenówna and her husband Vasil Rohoziński, since both Matiasz and Tychon were dead (the latter had been killed on the night of 22/23 January 1615). It was for the collection of the fine imposed on the Słupica family, from the Kuna properties, which Pilawski had ceded to the Starost, whose plenipotentiary, Stanisław Ujejski, the notary of the castle court of Latychow, relinquished. Apparently he

65 Kalinowski did not become the proprietor of a part of the former Słupicas estates until 1615. See Chapter 5/A: 242-44 and note 41, p. 243.
66 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/88 (Polish copy).
67 The then owner of Pilawce Andriej Czermiński sued twice Marcin Kalinowski, Voivode of Chernihiv (the youngest son of Walenty Alexander). First, in 1640 because of five peasant subjects which ran away from Pilawce to the town of Strzyżawka in the Powiat of Vinnytsia (the former village belonging to the Starosty of Vinnytsia). Then, on 1 April 1645 on the basis of a writ issued by the castle court in Vinnytsia. This time the subject in question was a group of subjects from a town and the lower castle of Pilawce and the village of Uhryńówka in the Powiat of Latyczów (the Crown Podolia) that absconded together with their families. The fugitives in question enumerated in the summons by their names and surnames escaped in 1644 and again found shelter in the town of Strzyżawka, called then also Samuelów; most probably after Samuel Kalinowski (Selians'kyi rukh, 1993: 321-22 [no. 246], 471).
did so on account of Rohoziński’s “per incontumaciam” (contumacy = resistance). The latter must have refused to pay the fine imposed on his deceased relatives, and probably referred also to the “oldness” of settlement in Kuna (1603) of the subjects, who triggered the proceedings. Other events allow us to believe that Rohoziński was not one to stop short of drastic means to get what he wanted. On the other hand, it can hardly be imagined that even a fairly wealthy nobleman would offer passive resistance to, let alone prevail over, an armed force sent out by the starost himself, one of the most powerful men in the region, unless having legal grounds to back his resistance. But the real reason for Kalinowski’s withdrawal must have been the interference of Prince Janusz Zasławski in the matter. Earlier Andrzej Miączyński, princely attorney at Lublin, “fearing lest such a recesy wzdanie [confiscation] come about of His Lordship the Prince’s hereditary property called the town of Kuna and the villages pertaining to it, in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, declared [...] against both parties [Kalinowski and the Rohoziński], that such an act would be null and void.”68 The above mentioned referred to the Zasławski family claims to the Słupicas inheritance going back to 1552, the matter to be discussed in details further on. Thereupon not wishing to come into conflict with Prince Zasławski, Kalinowski withdrew his claim, leaving the field open for Miączyński’s attack to fall squarely on Rohoziński alone.

4.b. The Exodus of Subjects from Kuna and Nosowce under the Rohozińskis (1615-52) and the Kruszelnickis (1615-36).

Contrary to the cases discussed above, showing the constant influx of fugitives to the Kuna estate until 1610’s the wave of departures of subjects from Kuna Stara and Nowa Kuna and the villages in the estate may be observed under the Rohozińskis. There were several reasons of this. The main one was the perennial Tartar danger and the more frequent instances of Cossack mutinies. In 1615 and the 1620’s the Kuna estate yet again sustained damage from Tartar incursions.69 However, the main reason was the approach of the expiry date of the “franchise” or period of tax and duty exemption granted for Kuna in 1590

68 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/88 (original in Ruthenian and its Polish copy).
and 1605, which meant that inhabitants would face increased liabilities in regard to rents, tolls, as well as labour and services. This hypothesis becomes stronger by the fact that runaway subjects were still coming to nearby Ziatkowce, in the joint possession of Halszka Semenówna Rohozińska [VI/1] and Halszka of Rohoźno, widow of Ivan Meleszko, now married to Alexander Piaseczynski. In 1617 ten subjects of Jan Odrzywolski, then Starost of Hajsyn, fled to Ziatkowce. This was the same Odrzywolski who in 1615 had competed with Ivan Meleszko for the tenancy of Hajsyn. Finally, another reason impacting on the higher rate of running away from Kuna was the increasing rate of colonisation in the 1600’s-1620’s of the vast uninhabited areas surrounding the old Stłupica properties, now in the hands of the Princes Zbaraski and the Kalinowski family. The process continued until 1640’s, on 5 April 1644, under the Rohoziński brothers, two subjects fled from Kuna Nowa and Kuna Stara, which were held jointly by the brothers. They took refuge in the village of Mielnikowce, the proprietor of which was Jerzy Kleszczewski, in the Powiat of Vinnytsia. 

There is evidence that Nosowce of the Kuna estate was losing subjects, too. The phenomenon must definitely have been associated with the intensive colonisation campaign undertaken by the Princes Zbaraski in the first quarter of the 17th century on the area directly neighbouring on the old Stłupica domain. There is an extant decree issued by the Lublin Tribunal on 8 August 1622, for an appeal against a verdict pronounced by the castle court of Vinnytsia in March 1620, in outcome of litigation conducted by Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] and her husband Alexander Kruszelnicki against the Princes Zbaraski since 1618. In the spring of 1618 over 20 of the Kruszelnickis’ subjects absconded

---

70 Jabłonowski (ZDz., 1897 22: 127) on the basis of collected source material underlines the "attractiveness" of long-lasting "freedoms", as reaching up to 20 or 30-35 years, typical for the Ukrainian lands.

71 On 2 August 1622 the Crown Tribunal issued a decree in the case of runaway subjects, which fled to the part of Ziatkowce in possession Halszka of Rohoźno 1.v. Meleszko, 2.v. Piaseczynska. The plaintiff was this time Tychon Szaszkiewicz, who claimed the return of the fugitives from the village of Stare Wyszkowce in the Voivodeship of Bratslav (ZDz., 1896 21: 616 [digest]).


73 Selians’kyi rukh, 1993: 476.

74 On the Zbaraskis attempts to take over the considerable share from the Stłupicas’ doamins see Chapter 6/A/4, 4a, 4.b: 291-98 and B/1: 299-301.
from Nosowce with their families (the decree names them all), and settled in the town of Berszadź, “also known as Dąbrowa” on the River Dochna, on the edge of the Słupica former “wilderness.” If we consider the fact that in 1629 the Kruszelnickis’ part of Nosowce, with Michałkowce and the mills had a total of 119 households (“chimneys”), then this number of fugitives with their families must have meant a considerable depletion. Much of the evidence suggests it was an organised desertion, most probably encouraged by the Zbaraskis. The Kruszelnicki couple invoked a 1588 act of Sejm, and claimed damages of 500 grzywnas of Polish groszy (groats) for each fugitive, or their return. However, the Tribunal did not conclude the case due to the absence of one of the defendants, Prince Krzysztof Zbaraski, the Royal Equerry for the Kingdom of Poland (Pol. koniuszy koronny), who was away “on the Commonwealth’s service” in a legacy to the Ottoman Turkey. The case was adjourned to the supernumerary hearings for the Voivodeship of Bratslav. Unfortunately we do not know how it was concluded.

Not only powerful lords, but also close relatives benefited from desertions by runaways from Nosowce. On 2 August 1622 the Tribunal issued a verdict in a case brought by Fedora Dmitriewna against Lawrenty (Wawrzyniec) Kruszelnicki, demanding the return of fugitives from Nosowce and their families. These had settled in a part of Kublicz called Kożuchowce,

---

75 AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 403, 404 = ZDz., 1894 20: 108 (digest) = ZDz, 1896 21: 617 (digest). In the same year in the part of Nosowce sold to the Zbaraskis by Maruszka née Diakowska, widow of Jurij [Yurii] Hreholowicz [V/6] Prince Jurij, Castellan of Cracow, had 76 cottages (“chimneys”) (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 401). Possibly this escape was in connection with a rapid reconstruction work in Berszada (alias Berszadź), burned down by Prince Jerzy Zbaraski in order to fulfill Ottoman demands as agreed in the peace treaty of Busza alias Jaruga concluded on 23 September 1617 by hetman (commander-in-chief) Stanisław Żółkiewski and Skinder Basza (Iskender Pasha). As claimed the Turkis Berszada was a main basis for Cossack incursions on the Ottoman Black Sea coast (Dobrowolska, Wanda. 1930. Księgęa Zbarascy w walce z hetmanem Żółkiewskim. Cracow: n.p. 16 and notes 2, 3). In the peace treaty itself there is no mention of Berszada and the Ottoman precondition regarding its annihilation KołodziejczykOttoman-Polish, 2000: 345-48 [doc. 31], 349-53 [doc. 32]). As it can bee seen from the tax-register of 1629 Berszada functioned then as a considerably big town, thus it must have been rebuilt. See also SłownikGeogr, 1880 I: 154 (Berszadź).

76 See above, note 63, p. 215.

77 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 21-23. The subjects escaped from Nosowce were: Łukian Stary, Sawka son of Łukian, Semen son of Łukian, Petruszko Stary, Fedor son of Petruszko, Ivan son of Petruszko, Jarema son of Petruszko, Mikita Dubenos, Ivan son of Mikita, Fedor son of Mikita, Sawko Czerenko, Belasz Miško, Fedor Starzenieko, Hryniec Jurienko, Danilo Ilk, Stach, Makar, Dasko, Kuzma, Seňko, Łazar, Hawrysz and Teresnyna, all with their wives and children.
where Ławryn was master. This was a different Ławryn Kruszelnicki from Fedora and Alexander’s son, who was still a minor at the time.

The proof of the planned nature of the departure of large numbers of the Kruszelnickis’ subjects, enticed away with offers of new franchise conditions by the Zbaraskis and Kalinowskis, is obvious in a case brought before the castle court of Kremenets by Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko against Adam Kalinowski, the Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. On the grounds of an act of Sejm of 1609 the Kalinowskis became the owners of the wilderness of Humań (often as Uman in English literature), a large expanse of land to the east of the Kuna estate, where they founded the town of Humań as their main centre. The writ issued on 12 April 1635 on Meleszko’s behalf offers an excellent illustration of the rate at which colonisation was progressing in the uninhabited country of Bratslav. It is also a proof that abscondency was an organised procedure and that landowners were meticulous about their records of subjects. Like the Kruszelnickis, in his summons Meleszko named all the subjects he had lost, which shows that he must have kept accurate records, unfortunately no longer extant.

On 15 April 1629 over 30 of his men fled with their families, movables, and livestock from the village of Łuka, the settlement Ometyńce, and the town Ziatkowce to Humań. They were led by their ataman (Pol. and Ruth. = a chief of the village or country town), Bitasz, with his sons Vasil and Demko. On 6 May 1630 another 10 or so from the same properties followed, fleeing to Kubicz. On 4 March 1631 Meleszko lost a further 24 subjects, who settled in Romanówka. On 9 May of the same year 6 more deserted Ziatkowce for Muszurów. On 13 October 1632 10 more of his subjects disappeared from Ziatkowce, and emerged in Baban. Earlier, on 21 March, 11 subjects had left Ometyńce for Metynowa. Before the end of 1634 there were two more escapes from Ziatkowce: first 14 who left, on 2 June and settled in Stara Horodecka and Nowa Horodecka; and a further 5, on 3 August, for Markówka. In each case these were departures by entire families with their movable assets. Like the

---

78 ZDz., 1896 21: 615 (digest).
79 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4-7v.
Kruszelnickis, Meleszko demanded damages of 500 *grzywnas* of Polish *groszs* (groat(s) per head and obtained the chance to appeal to the Tribunal.\(^8^0\) If we consider the number of households ("chimneys") listed in the 1629 tax-register for Ziatkowce (196), and Ometyńce and Łuka (213), it is obvious that the losers in a rapid colonisation campaign being conducted by the landowning magnates of the borderlands were the "ancient" Ruthenian families.\(^8^1\)

Absconding subjects were a common occurrence by no means restricted to the mid-17\(^{th}\) century, especially as from the beginning of the 18\(^{th}\) century Bratslavshchyna witnessed huge ownership changes and yet another colonisation process. On 15\(^{th}\) March 1775 a verdict was registered in the court register at Vinnysia, for a case brought by Leonard M. Świejkowski, the Territorial Judge of Bratslav, against Bohdan Ostrowski, the Sub-Chamberlain of Bratslav. Świejkowski was suing for the return of runaway subjects from his property Rohożna (formerly the hereditary estate of the Rohozińskis), who had fled to Nosowce, where Ostrowski was the tenant.\(^8^2\)

5. Some Remarks on the Economic Policy Followed in the Kuna Estate (Kuna and Nosowce), 1615 - ca. 1652.

According to Jabłonowski, the *folwark* (Ger. *Vollwerk*) farming system, comprising an agglomerate estate of several villages cultivating exportable agricultural produce, started to appear in the Ukraine in the 1620's-40's, although some pioneering estates of this kind were already mentioned at the turn of the century. This system of agricultural management was adopted in the private estates much earlier than in the crown Ukrainian tenancies. In the Kyiv territory the first large estates were being established in the late 16\(^{th}\) century, while records for their counterparts in Bratslav are dating much later.\(^8^3\) Its implementation was in connection with the "drag" reform (Pol. *pomiara włóczna*; officially started in 1557), which has been introduced in different parts of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from 1540's to 1560's. It did not

---

\(^8^0\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4v.-5v.
\(^8^1\) AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 408, 411, no. XXIV (Ometyńce and Łuka).
\(^8^2\) Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Oddział w Kórniku <BKórnik>: ms. 1219, doc. 20.
\(^8^3\) ZDz., 1897 22: 266-68, 271.
introduced the *folwark* system itself as it has already been operating since the end of the 15th century, depending from the area, but enabled its development and more efficient functioning.\(^8^4\)

The only direct mention of the large farm system we have for the Kuna properties comes for 1629, though we do not know how many such large units were employed. A case was judged in 1639 (the date is uncertain, as the document is damaged) in the territorial court of Vinnytsia, the parties to which were Vasil Rohoziński and his seven sons, all of them still in their minority, inheritors of their mother Halszka’s estate, and Dimitr, Anna, and Barbara, heirs of the deceased Prince Janusz Korybut Wiśniowiecki, the Equerry of the Kingdom of Poland (Pol. *koniuszy koronny*) and the Starost of Kremenets, and their mother the Princess Katarzyna Eugenia née Tyszkiewicz Wiśniowiecka. The decree described the latter as successors to their father’s estate and to the estate of Prince Hieronim Zbaraski of Zbaraż, the Castellan of Cracow. There was also a co-defendant, a Mikołaj Gruja. Halszka Semenówna had originally brought a case against Prince Janusz Wiśniowiecki and Mikołaj Gruja in 1632, and the court session was held at Epiphany (6 January); continued in the St. Michaels session (29 September) 1638. She claimed damages for the losses her subjects from Krma, one Fedor Punda alias Punza, and Radziewicz, had suffered by Oleksa Reznik Bubnow. Apparently in 1629 Oleksa and his men had come in the night, up to the town and the *folwark* of Kuna and stolen 15 sheep from Punza. Halszka estimated the then afflicted losses at 100 *kopas* of Lithuanian *groszs* (6,000 Lithuanian groats).\(^8^5\)

On 8 May 1607, when she sold her part of Nosowce to Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Marusza Mikołajewna Słupiczanka [VI/4], then already married to Paweł Prysowicz Zablocki, described in the contract not only the type and nature of the freehold land conveyed, but also the liabilities associated with this

\(^8^4\) On this reform see Introduction, Part 3, note 45, p. 41. For an average *folwark* the „drag” regulation of 1557 accepted as a norm 7 of villein *włoścas* (drags; 1 *włośca* = 21,36 ha in the Grand Duchy) for 1 *folwark* drag. This meant 7 of peasant house holdings of 1 drag or 14 of half drag had to work for 1 drag in the *folwark*. In the period of the reform implementation an average size of a *folwark* became much bigger than before, thus it could reach from 8-30 drags = 160 to 640 ha (Błaszczyk Litwa, 2002: 133).

\(^8^5\) CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1 [Bratislav territorial court registers book], no. 11, f. 13-14.
land. One may assume that the conveyance to the Voivode of Bratslav of her share in Nosowce, along with “the proprietor’s house (manor house, Pol. dwór) [at Nosowce] and the subjects dwelling along the Korytno [Korytna] and Hruszko [Hruszka] Rivers”, as well as all the woodland, uninhabited areas (wildernesses, Pol. uroczyszcza), and defence structures (Pol. horodyszcz), was for land that had already reached a good state of development and was managed on the folwark system. The formula used in this document diverges from the standard wording of deeds of conveyance and leads us to believe that it reflects the actual economic condition of the Nosowce property. This property consisted of income mainly from forestry, hunting, collecting (forest fruits), and fisheries, supplemented by cultivation. The latter’s share especially in terms of crop cultivation was growing relatively slowly. It is a picture typical of the farms held by the landowning nobility and gentry of the Ukraine, especially Eastern Podolia, in the period, in which cultivation was of secondary importance. The market value of this part of Nosowce estimated of 10,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (600 thousand Lithuanian groats), only confirms its economic condition.

Up to the 1630’s the volume of crop cultivation in the Bratslav territory was limited to supplying for the domestic needs and/or the local market. There is little evidence of export of cereal crops to other parts of the country or abroad. The obstacle to the growth of export was the lack of navigable rivers, except for the Dnipro, although instances of export of potash to Gdańsk down the inland waterways are recorded. For the Kuna estate we are in possession of a record confirming cereals (wheat and rye) production in the 1640’s. This is the only extant document showing that by the mid-17th century Kuna was engaged in crop cultivation, and probably also its export.

86 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 2: “with people, settled subjects and their works and liabilities, all possible grounds, arables and unploughed fields, woods, forests, groves, orchards, apiaries, beavers and martens abodes, brushwood’s, cuttings, rivers, brooks, fishery ponds and their pours, ponds and their marshy meadows, mills as well as with all these estates’ profits, belongings and adjacencies”.

87 See Chapter 1: 60 and below 228 and note 91, p. 228.
In 1644 the Rohoziński brothers took Princes Wiśniowiecki, descendants of the Zbaraskis to court for damaging to their property. The defendants were Jerzy Dymitr (1631-82) and Konstanty Krzysztof (1633-85), sons and heirs of the deceased in 1636 Prince Janusz, their legal guardian Prince Jeremij Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, and Ludwik Lisiecki, leaseholder for the town of Sobolówka, which bordered Hubnik, the village formerly in possession of the Słupcias. Noteworthy is the person of the Wiśniowiecki guardian, the future ruthless tamer of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Cossack Rebellion (1648-51). The decree registered on 7 June 1644 in the territorial court of Vinnytsia accused the Wiśniowieckis as trespassing on the Rohoziński property in August 1643 (?) and “spoiling it.” Lisiecki and his men are alleged to have brought “several hundred carts” into the Rohoziński lands and carried off “two and a half thousand bushels [Pol. kopy = 36, 6 liters]” of cereals (wheat and rye) that had not yet been harvested, of which wheat accounted for “a thousand bushels” and rye for “one and a half thousand bushels.” The decree made it plain that the market price of these commodities was one Zloty per bushel of rye, and two Zlotys per bushel of wheat, which would give a total value of 3,500 Zlotys for 2,500 bushels of both cereals. A complaint lodged on 31 January 1664 against Maciej Rohoziński by Ewa Postolowska, who had held some land in Kuna Stara on a lease against a pledge, provides confirmation that cereal farming was being conducted in Kuna. The land under the lease, granted in 1648 by Alexander and Adrian the Rohoziński, had been farmed by 10 men, who had sowed it before the

---

88 The Wiśniowiecki princely family descended from the Zbaraskis, taking its origine after Prince Michał Zbaraski (d. ca. 1516), hair of Wiśniowiec. He left two sons from his first marriage who started two separate family lines. The first, older one, the so-called princely line took after Ivan, while the younger one, the so-called royal line took after Alexander. From this line descended the mentioned-below Wiśniowiecki’s guardian Prince Jarema, and his son Michał Korybut the future King of Poland (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 552-76 [as Wiszniewicki], especially 552; Widacki, Jan. 1984. Kniąż Jarema <Widacki>. Katowice: n.p. 8). Prince Jeremij Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki (1612 – 22 August 1651). To his guardianship over the Prince Janusz children refers Widacki while describing the quarrel regarding the rights to the said guardianship which had broken up between Jarema and Prince Constantine, the father of the late Janusz. Formally Jarema took over the guardian duties after the death of Constantine in 1641. Soon after he came into conflict over the same guardianship with the second husband of Janusz’s widow, Prince Alexander Radziwiłł, the Marshal of Lithuania (Widacki: 47-50). On Jarema see also: Orgelbrand, Seweryn (ed.). 1860-67. Encyklopedia Powszechna, Vol. 28: 238-45 (en entry by Bartoszewicz); Stecki, Tadeusz Jerzy. 1864-71. Wołyn pod względem statystycznym, historycznym i archeologicznym przez Tadeusza Jerzego Steckiego. L’viv: n.p. Vol. 2 (1871): 224-47; WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 562-63.

89 B. PAU/PAN Kr.: sig. 4524, no. XVIII/8/40.
outbreak of the Cossack war at Lady Postołowska’s expense. Unfortunately, we are not told what kind of cultivation it was.\textsuperscript{81} The same complaint informs us that in the part of the town of Kuna Nowa leased out in 1648 by Adrian Rohoziński to Postołowska’s sister, Marianna Gromadzka, there had been a mill “near the town” with “land under cultivation.”\textsuperscript{82}

The mentioned above document from 1639 referring to the theft of 15 sheep from Punza, a Kuna subject, by Prince Wiśniowiecki’s men, provides invaluable information on the price of livestock in 1629. Halszka Semenówna estimated her losses at 100 kopus of Lithuanian groszy (6,000 Lithuanian groszy), which gives a sum of 6.7 kopus (about 40 groszy) for each animal.\textsuperscript{83} Animal breeding required a plentiful supply of fodder, especially hay, and again we have a record available. According to the registers for the territorial court of Lutsk, in 1665 Zuzanna and Prudencjanna, daughters of the deceased Adrian Rohoziński, and their paternal uncle Matwiej Rohoziński, initiated a litigation against Jan Żórawnicki, son of Adam Żórawnicki and his wife Katarzyna, for the theft of hay. The offence had been committed in 1641, when the value of the Rohozińskis losses, according to their estimate, was 300 Polish Zlotys.\textsuperscript{84}

Until the 1620’s-1630’s potash, animal breeding, and the extraction of metal and other minerals seemed in the Eastern Podolia territories to be more profitable than crop farming. We have no documentary evidence of any metal ore deposits at Kuna, or of their extraction. There is however an indirect indication that this kind of activity may have been pursued. In 1602 the Crown Tribunal heard a case, in which the plaintiffs were Adam Hański and the Podhorodeńki, and the defendant Prince Joachim Korecki. The charge was unlawful occupation of the plaintiffs’ hereditary lands, the villages of Kalnik and Cybulów on the upper course of the Sob, between Daszów and Ilińce, upstream from the Kuna estate. The greatest loss they had sustained, according

\textsuperscript{81} CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1 [Bratslav territorial register book], no. 27, f. 55.
\textsuperscript{82} CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1 [Bratslav territorial register book], no. 27, f. 54-55. For details see Chapter 6/D/2b: note 275, pp. 350-51.
\textsuperscript{83} CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1 [Bratslav territorial register book], no. 11, f. 13v.
\textsuperscript{84} CDIAUK: F. 26, op. 1, spr. 51 [Lutsk territorial register book], no. 69: 139-140v., no. 70: 140v.-141v.
to the plaintiffs, were the "barrows of Soroka", where there were saltpetre deposits. They estimated the total value of their losses at 6,000 of Polish Zlotys.85 According to Jablonowski, there were plenty of veins of saltpetre on either bank of the Dnipro.88 The mineral was obtained chiefly from the ancient kurgans and sites with mostly early medieval fortified settlements (Pol. *horodyszcza*).86

It should be noted that all villages in Podolia and Ukraine are for the most part surrounded by wooded areas, where there are hiding-places to which the peasants withdraw in summer, when an alarm is sounded announcing [the approach of] the Tartars. These woods may very well be a half-league wide.89

Potash or burnt ash (wood ash) was one of the basic sources of income in the eastern part of the Bratslav territories, especially since the region was afforested.87 It was exported via Gdańsk.88 Yet, from the Beauplan's map one may notice that in the 1650's the area around Kuna and Nosowce, as well as the majority of their surroundings, were still densely afforested. This referred especially to the square on the left bank of Sob, below Nosowce enveloped by the rivers of Kunka, Sob and Boh, as well as to the area on the right bank of Sob between Boh, Sob and Kublicz stretching so far as Ziatkowce. In the vicinity of Kuna Beauplan mentions by name two greater woods. First of them called *Driewny Las* [Ancient? Wood] was on the left bank of Sob alongside the Kunka, between Kuna and Nosowce. The second one was on the right bank of Sob, below Ziatkowce and is named by him as *Durowo Las* [Oak Wood].90 Modern maps of Vinnytsia *oblast* (district) still show considerable stretches of the former Voivodeship afforested. A belt of forest land survives on the right bank of the Sob, in the fork made up by that river and the Kublicz, to the south-

---

86 This view is supported among others by the Beauplan’s account: They [Cossacks] are very skillful at preparing saltpeter, which is found in abundance in these regions, and make from it excellent gunpowder (Beauplan, 1999: 11). For Kalnik and Cybul6w see also his map Fig. no. 4 and no. 5.
88 Beauplan, 1999: 72.
89 *ZDz.*, 1897 22: 343, 347.
90 For example in 1623 the Szaszkiewicz family concluded a sale contract with Gdańsk tradesmen regarding the sale of the Iliniecki forest and Peczeniecki Maly forest as well as others „wildernesses” belonging to Tymonówka property together with the right to burn there wood ash and make planks „as long as it will suffice suitable wood" (*ZDz.*, 1897 22: 347).
91 See Beauplan’s map Fig. no. 7.
east of modern Kuna and around the village of Marjanówka, stretching up to Ziatkowce in the east and Ładyżyńskie Chutory in the south. We have no direct evidence for the burning of wood to obtain potash in the immediate vicinity of Kuna. On the other hand, there is proof of the substantial role that forestry played in the economy of Nosowce in the times of Alexander Kruszelnicki and his wife. The following documents show the intensive level of “exploitation” of this densely afforested area.

The Kruszelnickis fought a long legal battle against the Princes Zbaraski for the occupation of woodland belonging to the Nosowce estate and potash-burning conducted there on an “industrial” scale. The woods and uninhabited areas were included in the sale of the part of the Nosowce properties held by Marusza Mikołajewna Słupiczanka [VI/4], wife of Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki, to Prince Janusz Zbaraski, on 8 May 1607. These were the “forests and wastelands of Kozłów (alias Kozłowski), the forests and wastelands of Borczów (alias Borczowski), the uninhabited area and wasteland called Trościaniec, and the forest and wasteland of Rozwalski on the River Trościaniec.”⁸⁹ Of which Beauplan was still able to name in the 1650’s the Rozwalsky Las.⁹¹ The Crown Tribunal was preoccupied with this case twice in 1630, and in 1632 after Prince Zbaraski’s death. The defendants were his successors, the Princes Wiśniowiecki and the Warszyckis. Proceedings in the suit had started in the territorial court of Vinnytsia with a verdict against which both parties appealed to the Tribunal. On 28 May 1630 the Tribunal issued its verdict in the case brought by the Kruszelnickis against Prince Janusz Zbaraski, the Castellan of Cracow.⁹⁰

Yet again the Kruszelnickis accused Prince Zbaraski of unlawfully seizing part of Nosowce, “where in some areas the woodlands and the oak groves are of the best quality to be found in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, having been allowed to stand unused for hundreds of yeares”, and of having cut down “umpteen, hundreds of thousands” of ash-trees and oaks, in all the

102 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 1v.
103 See Beaupaln’s map, Fig. no. 7.
forests, not just in his own portion. This had been done in the times when Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] was “in the care of many hands in her orphanhood.” The plaintiffs claimed that Zbaraski had set up workshops in which for well over a decade his men had been burning wood to obtain potash, devastating the forests and groves. The Lord Castellan sent the wood-ash to Gdańsk, and had received 30,000 [kopas] of [Lithuanian] groszs (1,800,000 Lithuanian groats) from sales. Thus the Kruszelnicki couple estimated their losses at 30,000 of Polish Zlotys, not counting the loss from the forests.\(^{91}\) Zbaraski’s attorney, Andrzej Bedoński, notary of the court at Volodymyr, argued that since the Nosowce property was not subject to partition, the Prince had as much right as the Kruszelnickis to fell trees anywhere he liked within it. Moreover, the defendant had only had potash burning conducted “on his own land.” Resorting to a whole range of legal ploys, he retorted that what the Kruszelnickis really sought was not to protect the forests, so much as to snatch away Zbaraski’s holding in Nosowce, whereby he won an adjournment of proceedings.

On 28 April 1632 the deputies of the Tribunal were hearing yet another complaint brought by the Kruszelnickis, this time against Prince Janusz Wiśniowiecki and Helena née Wiśniowiecka, wife of Stanisław Warszycki, successors to Prince Jerzy Zbaraski. The plaintiffs had renewed proceedings following the death of Zbaraski (d. 4 July 1631). The new summonses issued by the territorial court of Vinnytsia recapitulated the old charges word by word. In Lublin Kruszelnicki again met the attorney Andrzej Bedoński, this time defending Prince Wiśniowiecki, and Paweł Rosciecki, representing Lady Warszycka, in the Tribunal. The Tribunal ordered the Kruszelnicki couple to take an oath to confirm the truth of the charges brought in their writs, especially as regards to their claim to the Nosowce property.\(^{92}\)

On 9 June 1636 the Tribunal returned to the case yet again, this time due to the death of Alexander Kruszelnicki. His widow and children were again summoning Prince Janusz Wiśniowiecki, Lord Equerry of the Kingdom of Poland and Starost of Kremenets, and Helena Warszycka, wife of the Voivode

---

\(^{91}\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 25v.
\(^{92}\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 41-43v.
of Mazovia, on the grounds of the decree issued by the territorial court of Vinnytsia at its Trinity session in 1634. This decree reiterated all the earlier summonses and hearings, with the same complaint. The same attorneys yet again represented the defendants; while Andrzej Kruszelnicki and his wife Zofia appeared for the Kruszelnicki family. The Tribunal acquitted Lady Warszycka from the charges, since she had relinquished her share in the Voivodeship of Bratslav to her brother. She was ordered to take an oath to this effect before the territorial court in Vinnytsia. The final outcome of this hearing was yet another adjournment to the next session of the Tribunal.\textsuperscript{93} It was extremely hard for the Kruszelnickis to obtain any sort of compensation in this battle against the most powerful lord in the region, while the losses they had sustained meant a major setback for the economy of their estate. The harm done is still patent on today's maps, with a belt of woodland stretching to the north and north-western side of the village of Nosowce – a mere remnant of the oak forest that once stood there.
CHAPTER 5

The Słupicas Estates from the Late 14th to the Late 16th Century. Territorial Range, Development, and Family Portions.

1. What is the name of the town or village, and of what construction it consists? - The town’s name is Kuna, it consists of mixed construction, partly brick, and partly wooden.

2. On which river it lays, and where this water flows; in which country, and how far from the Powiat and gubernial centre is it [situated]? - It lays on the water that comes from three rivers of Kunka, Sob and Kublicz all of which converge here, and this water flaws into the Boh on its the south-western side; it is far from the Powiat town of Haysyn a quarter of mile, and from the gubernial capital Kamanets’ 25 miles.

3. How vast and how populated is it, and of its people how many belong to which creed? - It spreads in 1 versts [Pol. wiorsta] in length and a half of versts in breadth, and of its population 180 “souls”’ are of Roman Catholic religion, 300 Greek Russian [Orthodox], and 200 Jews.

4. How long ago, and by whose initiative was it founded? - That the town of Kuna was founded long ago it shows from the ancient maps; but by whom there is no information.

A. The Earliest Słupicas Endowments: Charters by Svidrygiello (?) (1400/02?) and Vitold (ca. 1411-30):

Kuna and Nosowce (the Kuna Estate) and the Trościaniec Estate.

There is general agreement in the whole of the literature of the subject on the early association of the Słupica family with Podolia. However, the family’s origins are not clear. As the extant sources date no further back than the 15th century, the

---

1. DAVO: F. 737, op. 1, spr. 3, f. 547-552v., here f. 547: „Answers on the Puncta [Points] served before the visit of His Excellency the Bishop in the Kuna [Capuchine] convent, written down on 10 October 1817."

question arises whether the Šljupicas belonged to the local landed gentry, or whether they migrated to Podolia (perhaps already along with the princely Koriatovich family) from the neighbouring territories. At the beginning of the 16th century, they already enjoyed the status of wealthy local landlords (Pol. *panowie* = lords), with undoubtedly Ruthenian roots, associated through their hereditary properties with the local Powiat (district) of Bratslav, which had previously been the respective castle volost'. The first records of their holdings relate to Ivan Šljupica [II/1], the addressee of the Vitold's charter of ca. 1411/30, and possibly of the Svidrygiello's charter of ca. 1400/02, in which case Vitold's deed would have been the confirmation and perhaps extension of the previous act. This document covered a wide expanse of land along the lower course of the River Boh (Ukr. *Boğ*) and its tributaries, mainly the left-bank ones. Originally the Šljupicas endowment was for uninhabited land, which only started to be gradually settled in the late 15th century.

The sparse extant documents and tax registers concerning the most ancient local families in the eastern part of Podolia present a picture of a planned policy of endowment and colonisation conducted by Vitold, during his period as governor of Podolia in 1411-30. Subsequently the starosta of Bratslav and Vinnytsia,

---

3 Iakovenko pays attention to the fact that the families legitimising themselves with the longest settlement in the Kyiv and Bratslav territories, such as the Šljupicas (from Podolia), the Koszkas (from Volhynia) or the Aksaks (of Turkic background) showed no interest in producing the armorial legends regarding their origin, which was a common phenomenon for the less ancient families. The scholar notices as well that the oldest known endowments in Kyiv and Bratslav areas date back to Prince Volodymyr Olgiyordovich (1363-94) and Vitold (1392-1430) (IakovenkoSliaxta, 1993: 153).

4 In the 14th-15th centuries Ruthenian lands of the Grand Duchy there were two types of landed properties: 1) the so-called “fatherlands” (Ruth. *otchizna*, pl. *otchizny*; here also *materizny* [motherlands], *didizny* [grandfather lands]) enjoying hereditary rights; partly counted among them were also the lands acquired through sales contracts (Ruth. *kupli zemli*), which however followed a bit different, more restricted regulations when it came to inheritance issue, 2) the so-called *wysługi* (Pol.), the estates restricted to temporal ownership, usually endowed by the Grand Duke as a reward for services and with the condition of performing service, mainly a military one. Until 1566 (the II Lithuanian Statute) one could sell not more than up to 1/3 of the hereditary property (*otchizna*). In the case of Bratslav territory in the mid-16th century the majority of endowments were hereditary ones, thus they have been counted among *otchizna* type (IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 32, 175, 176).


6 See KurtykaRepertorium, 2004: here numerous examples of Vitold’s endowments both in the western and the eastern part of Podolia. Earlier, Rolle counted the following families among the
representing the Grand Duke of Lithuania, continued to pursue Vitold’s policy, rewarding their clients and servants with endowments of property in the former volost’s of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. Apart from the Shipicas, other landowning families claiming ancient status in settlement in the Bratslav territories, like the Mikuliński, Koszka, Kozar, Korotko, and Krasnosielski, later on neighbours and relatives of the Shipicas, owned their fortune to Vitold.7

The earliest documentary records of the Shipica family antedate Podolia’s incorporation in the Kingdom of Poland <the Crown> (1394) and the period of rivalry between Svidrygiello and Vitold (from the close of the 14th century). The late 14th century was also the time when Tartar incursions into the territory of Podolia and Volhynia became a permanent fixture of life in the region. The Tartar scourge would afflict the Shipica family during their operations in the Poberezhe (Pol. Pobereże = Eastern Podolia) area. Testimony is supplied in the early 16th century documents related to the family seat, Kuna, “in the middle of the Kuchman (Pol. Kuczmań) inroad.” 8

The earliest Shipicas properties may be reconstructed on the basis of three documents from 1566 and 1581. On 15 April 1566 King Sigismund Augustus issued a deed endorsing Vitold’s endowment of one Shipica with the estates of Kuna and Nosowce (of ca. 1411-30). This deed was destroyed in the great fire of Vinnytsia Castle on 8 October 1580. There is only an extant account in a digest transcribed in 1757 from an unknown source for the “collection of Shipica transactions” (Seyasz zebranych tranzakcyj Slupiczańskich). The text in this digest suggests that there must have been at least two separate deeds issued by Vitold, one for Kuna and one for Nosowce, and a third document in which he presumably

local landed gentry in possession of endowments from Vitold and Svidrygiello: Korotko(i), Kozar, Mormil, Koszka, Jakuszyński, Bajbuza, Krasnosielski, Żytyński, Kleszczowski, Łastowiecki and Siemaszowicz. The Shipicas were related to the majority of them through kinship, neighbourhood, or clientage connections (RolleZdziejów, 1890: 9-10 and passim).

7 For these families see Chapter 2/A/2 [the Mikuliński], 2/B/1 [the Koszka], 5/B/6a [the Korotkos and the Krasnosielski], 5/B/6b [the Kozars] and below note 99, pp. 258-59.

8 See Chapter 2/B/1: 91-103.
confirmed his earlier endowments (or the Svidrygiello’s ones?).\(^9\) On 3 February 1581, during the Sejm (Diet) of Warsaw, Hrehory Bohuszewicz Słupica [IV/3] entered a declaration in the register of the Ruthenian (Volhynian) Metrica. He stated that his deeds for the properties of Derenkowcy [Derenkowce], Rolincz [Roliniče], Kalikinczy [Kalicznice], Jasłowićz [Jasłowiec], Hubnik, and Nosowce, along with the earlier charter investing Ivan Słupica [II/1] with Nosowce and its adjoining properties, subsequently endorsed by Vitold (ca. 1411/30) had all perished in the great fire of Vinnytsia Castle.\(^10\) On the same day, 3 February 1581, Hrehory’s former ward Semen Bohdanowicz Shipica [V/1] made a similar entry into the Volhynian Metrica for his properties Gusakowcy [Husakowce], Nosowce, Minderewku [Skinderówka], Czeremosznoie [Czeremoszne, after the Koszka family?], Derenkowcy [Derenkowce], Tymoszkow, Karpow, Baszow [Batoł] alias Botóg], half of Kalikiczzi [Kalicznice], and Jazlowiec [Jasłowiec]. However, this document does mention neither Svidrygiello nor Vitold.\(^11\) We may assume as well, that the earliest endowments were for Kuna and Nosowce, while the remaining

\(^9\) ZDz., 1894 20: 106 („1566 die 15 April obłata [an entry] at Vilnius. The privilege of Prince Vitold issued to Słupica for perpetual ownership. The privilege of the King Sigismund Augustus to Born [Lord] Semen Bohdanowicz Słupica for the estate of Kuna cum attinentis, Nosowce ac alia cum approbatione of the Prince Vitolds’ privileges issued for perpetuity.”)

\(^10\) ZDz., 1894: 20: 106; RGADA: MW, F. 389 op. 1, spr. 195, part 5, f. 339v.-340 = MW Edition 2002: 343, no. 159 [book 6, f. 339v.-340]: a document dated 3 February 1581, and issued in Warsaw to Hrehory Słupica to confirm the loss in a fire in Vinnytsia on 8 October 1580, of his deeds of privilege, incl. Vitold’s confirmation of endowment of Ivan with Nosowce and adjacencies. Of all likelihood Podolany quoted this very document (Podolany, 1886: 566). As he mentions an undated complain of Hrehory Słupica, in which the latter offered the proofs of his rights to the Słupicas properties on the basis of an extract from the Crown Metrica. This extract, accordingly to Podolany, encompassed a confirmation charter of Svidrygiello and Vitold endowments for Ivan with Derenkowo, Rolincz, Kaliczynce, Jaslawie [sic = Jasłowićz] and Hubnik on either bank of the River Boh, thus with the Trościaniec estate, however without mentioning Nosowce, thus contradicting the abovementioned entry in the Volhynian Metrica registers. Gawroński repeated Podolany’s information uncritically (Gawroński, 1915: 215). However, in the Volhynian Metrica, besides the document in question, there is yet another obłata (entry) concerning the Słupica family, namely the one of Semen Bohdanowicz (RGADA: Mw, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 195, part 5, f. 343-343v. = MW Edition 2002: 344, no. 162 [book 6, f. 343-343v.]). See also KutrykaRepertorium, 2000: 170, no. 44 (the alleged privilege by Svidrygiello), 197-98, no. 100 (the Vitold’s privilege for Ivan), 198-99, no. 101 (the Vitold’s privilege on Kuna and Nosowce). The author modified here his previous statements associating the first Słupicas endowments with Paweł [I/1] bringing sceptical about the possibility of existence of the Svidrygiello charter. See Chapter 2/A/1: 68-69 and note 2, pp. 68-69 and 2/A/2: 84 and notes 58, 59, p. 84. Both extracts of 1581 will be discussed in details below B/4: 258-60.

settlements enumerated in the 1581 documents were founded on adjoining lands in the 15th and 16th centuries.

In the light of these entries, Hrehory Bohuszewicz had lost his charter for Derenkowcy, Rolincy, Kalinecz [Kalicyńce], Jaslowcy [Jasłowiec], and Hubnik on both banks of the Boh, and for Nosowce on the River Korytna. Whereas, Semen Bohdanowicz reported the loss of his deeds for the properties of Husakowcy, Nosowcy, Minderewku [Skinderówka], Czeremosznoie [Czeremoszna after the Koszka family?], Derenkowcy, Miłoszów [Tymoszków], Karpow, Batow [Batoh alias Batóg], half of the village of Kalikiczy [Kaliczyńce], and Jasłowiec [Jasłowiec], in addition to the deed for the legacy for Zalesie left him by his mother, Zofia née Mikulińska. Remarkably, neither of these declarations mentions Kuna, which most probably must have been completely devastated in the Tartar raids of the 1570’s. Of the villages listed, Nosowce and Husakowce belonged to the Kuna estate, Karpów and Batoh to the Trościaniec estate, and Hubnik was on the small portion of the old Oblin estate, which had passed down to the Slupicas from the Kozar family via the Krasnosielskis.

According to authors writing about the Slupica family, these endowments were for land along the lower stretch of the Boh. They lay on either bank of the river, with a concentration on the right bank, on the area enclosed in the fork at the confluence of Boh’s tributary, the Sob River (in vicinity of Ladyżyn). The type and nature of these endowments to the Slupica family is another matter. Taking into consideration the location of Kuna and Nosowce within the jurisdiction of the

---

12 ZDz., 1897 22: 604 = Podolyanin, 1886: 566 = Gawroński, 1915: 215 = SlownGeogr., 1883 IV: 873–75 (Kuna). Rolle states that Vitold’s charter for the Slupica family was on properties which in the 16th century encompassed the territory spreading over an area from Lobaczów to Berszada and Batoh, 30 settlements in total, among with the so-called Oblin grounds (Pol. grunta oblinskie), and the others being extended in 12 miles (RolleZdziejdw, 1890: 10 passim). According to Iwanowski Vitold endowed the unknown by name Slupica with “28 properties (Pol. klucze) spread over an area from Lobaczów to the Boh River: Trościaniec, Kuna, Kunden known earlier as Wójtowce, Barszada, Iwangeldb, Olszowcy alias Lobaczów etc.” (HeleniuszKozmowy, 1873 1: 535). The author referred however to places names from the end of the 16th century, and to the 1775 revision register of the Bratslav Starosty quoted in the entry on Kuna (SlownGeogr., 1883 IV: 873–75).

13 See Fig. no. 4 (the Beauplan’s map of the Bratslav Voivodeship from 1650’s), Fig. no. 5 (the Jabłonowski’s “reconstructive” map of the Bratslav Voivodeship).
former volost’ of the Bratslav Castle and the close cooperation between the family and the Starosts of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, one can assume that these were feudal hereditary endowments entailing the responsibility to military service (Ruth. otchizny). Most probably the endowment of Ivan of Nosowce and its adjacent area had a perpetual character and, was similar in nature to the other mentioned in earlier 14th-century charters, including the right of inheritance and alienation.

In his outline of the history of the Słupica family, Rawita Gawroński refers to a text by Podolyanin, who had relied on documents published earlier by Rulikowski in a collection of documents. He quotes that the original charter, issued to Ivan Słupica, enumerated the villages of Derenkowo, Rolince, Kaliczyncy, Zaslawie [sic], and Hubnik, which were located on either bank of the Boh. However, he omits to mention Nosowce, which is also listed in the documents.

---

14 The phrase ziemianin bracławski (Bratslav landlord) used for Ivan proves, that his endowment was within the volost’ of Bratslav Castle. The same was to be true for the grounds of the Trościaniec estate, lying in further distance from Bratslav, as the castle volost’ must have also encompassed this territory. All settlements located in the Trościaniec area have been consistently and persistently enumerated in all Słupicas deeds referring to the earliest family endowments. In turn the digest of the charter of 1566 (ZDz., 1894 20: 106) and an extract of the document dated 9 October 1566 (APKr.; ASang., t. X/45: original in Ruthenian) confirm the hereditary nature of Ivan’s and other early endowments.

15 Military service was an immanent obligation to the otchizna hereditary endowment. Each boyar or lord enjoying this type of ownership in case of war or military expedition have been obliged to perform military service in person. It was not until the end of the 15th century this personal obligation could have been exchanged for a fixed payment or be transferred on another person. E.g. in Kyiv territories the owners of wysługi (non hereditary estates) have been obliged to serve in person while summoned by the local Voivode, when the hereditary owners of otchizny could have delegate their servants instead of performing military obligations themselves. The lords (upper gentry) enjoyed the privilege to man their own colours (on condition they could afford it), the custom which in the opinion of Iakovenko came to Ukraine from the Polish-Czech tradition. The allodial character of ownership brought as well the necessity of performing the so-called landed obligations such as castle and bridge (Pol. mostowe) service (providing work for maintenance and repairation of castles and bridges), podwody (providing of transportation and maintenance to ducal or starostial officials) and struża (keeping guards in castles and on inroads). In the case of the Grand Duchy these obligations were required from all landlords until the 1560’s giving the cause for numerous disputes and conflicts between the landed gentry and local starosts (IakovenkoShliakh'ta, 1993: 177). See also Chapter 2/A/1: 68-78 on Pawel Słupica and 2/B/4: 131-38 on Bohusz Słupica.

16 Gawroński, 1915: 215 = Podolyanin, 1886: 566 = Trusiewicz, 1870: 305-06. In the light of a topographic material one can hardly interpret the above-mentioned settlements as a close neighbourhood or adjacencies of Nosowce. Situated on the right bank of the Boh, slightly underneath Ładyżyn, Hubnik and Rolince belonged accordingly to the 16th century sources to Trościaniec (Rolince) and Oblin (Hubnik) estates. Moreover mentions on these villages in the source material do not exceed the first half of the 16th century.
This inaccuracy seems to be emerging from the use of two rather late documents. Rulikowski and Gawroński used a digest of the charter issued in 1566 by Sigismund Augustus, published by Jablonowski, while Rulikowski and Podolyanin utilised the 1581 entry in the Volhynian Metrica of Hrehory Bohuszewicz’s [IV/3] declaration. However, the description they give of the Slupieas estates on the basis of these late documents (some of them no longer available) can hardly be recognised as reflecting the situation at the turn of the 14th and 15th centuries, although they must have given a fairly accurate account of the settlement structure in the Kuna and Trościaniec estates in the latter half of the 16th century. Territorially the core of the 16th-century Slupicas holdings would have corresponded to the 14th-century endowments.

The charter endowed by Sigismund Augustus to Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] and entered in the register in Vilnius on 15 April 1566 confirmed Vitold’s earlier perpetual endowment. It was an endorsement of two (or perhaps three) earlier charters for an unnamed Slupica ancestor with Kuna and its adjacencies, and with Nosowce “cum alia.” Rulikowski, who refers to this charter and may have seen its post-1581 transcript, adds that the Slupica family owned extensive

---

17 See above note 10, p. 233.
18 It is well known, that Rulikowski enjoying the friendly relations with the Jaroszyński was in capacity to make use of the collection of documents from the extinct family archives in Tywrow and Kuna. Jablonowski in his preface to Žrôta Dziejowe (ZDz., 1894 20) states, that „Seryasz zebranych tranzakcy Shipiczskich” completed in 1757 which was the basis for his 1894 digests was at that time in the hands of Rulikowski. As to the settlement structure, for example the author (hidden under penname dr M.) of an entry on Kuna in Słownik Geograficzny (SlownikGeogr., 1883 IV: 873-75) states that the Kuna estate has been composed of 28 properties spread over an area from Łobaczów to the Boh River. Nevertheless, he does not precise the period in which the Shipica family estates were to envelop such an area; his description in respect to 28 properties bases on the 1775 revision register of the Bratslav Starosty. There is, however, a visible dependence of his writing on Iwanowski, whose text he must have used (see above note 12, p. 234). Yet, this information, seems to picture the state of affairs in the end of the 16th century, when the Slupicas laid claims to parts of legacies after the Korotki and Kozar families and were in force to control some of the “emptiness” on the steppe, bordering their Kuna and Trościaniec estates.
19 ZDz., 1896 20: 106 = Vitoldiana, 1986: 134, no. 164 = KurykaRepertorium, 2004: 197-98, no. 100. Urbâński (UrbâńskiPodzwonne, 1928: 42) was of the opinion that the original of Vitold’s charter was being housed in the Kuna family archives for 5 centuries. The author while writing this must have thought of the deed of 1566, or rather of an extract from it commissioned after 1581. The latter, accordingly to Mienicki, an archivist charged by the Jaroszyński with the task to rearrange and catalogue the Kuna family archives was there until 1919 (Mienicki, 1927: 1: 215-19). See also chapter 3 on Ivan and Tychon the Slupicas.
estates endowed by Vitold “for heroic military exploits,” though there are no
mentions of any such achievements by them in the Metraca itself.20 On the other
hand, Gawroński claims that this was a deed issued to Ivan Słupica by Vitold or
Svidrygiello. He then summarises Rulikowski’s account of the 1566
confirmation.21 According to the author of the entry “Kuna” in the encyclopaedic
Słownik Geograficzny [Geographical Dictionary], Ivan was endowed by
Svidrygiello with a charter for the land on the Boh, while Vitold issued a deed
confirming this endowment, which was kept in Bratslav Castle, where it eventually
perished.22 The transcripts from the Metraca of Volhynia, entered in the register at
the Sejm of Warsaw on 3 February 1581 related to Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3]
and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], are in turn available in their full versions.23

Thus, the endowments made for the Słupica family, hypothetically by
Svidrygiello and surely by Vitold, and known only from the 16th century records,
concerned Ivan [II/1], and perhaps Tychon [II/2], close relatives of Paweł [I/1].24
Paweł is the earliest known representative of the Słupica family recorded in the
documents.25 He is to be regarded as the family’s founding ancestor and the
pioneer of their later social and political advancement in eastern Podolia in the 15th
and 16th century. One may assume that his political career went hand-in-hand with
material benefits such as endowments of property, but there is no outright proof for
this surmise. In my opinion there are not enough grounds to identify the
beneficiary of Vitold’s charter (published from the 18th century digest by
Jablonowski and recently reedited in Vitoldiana), in which Kuna and Nosowce
were endowed to an unnamed Słupica, as Paweł what claimed Tegowski and

20 Trusiewicz, 1870: 305.
22 An extract of this document, which „defined the borders of the Słupicas grounds”, was also to be
found in the Minor Chancellery of the Crown Metraca office. See Iwanowski (HeleniuszRozmowy,
1873 1: 577). Most probably the author referred here to the destruction of the act in question in the
fire of Vinnytsia Castle in 1580.
23 See above notes 9, p. 233 (Semen Bohdanowicz) and 10, p. 233 (Hrehory Bohuszewicz).
24 Ivan and Tychon could have been Paweł’s sons (possible is also other affiliation like of brother
and son). Any way, they (or only Ivan) were the first addressees in the family of landed privileges
in Podolia confirmed in source material, making use of Paweł’s position and prestige independently
of their personal merits.
25 On Pawel’s career and activities see Chapter 2/A/1: 68-78.
Kurtyka (recently the latter modified his opinion). After the downfall of the princely Koriatovych family in 1394 there are no more mentions of the castle voivode for Podolia, i.e. of Pawel in the sources. In view of the general political context, Vitold is more likely to have issued the charter in ca. 1411-30 that is after the death of the Shupica founding ancestor. However, without the possibility of verification in the original document, it is hard to say what was the nature of the Grand Duke’s charter or charters. Whether it was a confirmation of the earliest investiture granted to Pawel by the Princes Koriatovych, or whether it was a separate endowment of Ivan [I/II] for Nosowce and its adjacencies granted perhaps by Svidrygiello, and confirmed by Vitold, and (probably) another endowment granted by Vitold to Tychon [II/2], for Kuna. This hypothesis cannot be ruled out completely, especially in view of Pawel’s status as castle voivode of Kamenets’ Castle and the ambiguous position of Ivan as first a servant of Svidrygiello and later of Vitold.

The 1566 transcript from the original of the confirmation for Vitold’s privileges, and also their later mentions, are not all unanimous and precise. From an 18th century digest of the 1566 confirmation and from the two above-mentioned entries in the Volhynian Metrica (1581), we learn that Vitold’s endowment for Ivan of ca. 1411-30 concerned Nosowce and its adjacencies, and the settlements on what later became the Trościaniec estate, and that it might have been an


27 If taking for granted, that the original of Shupicas’ endowments was written down in more than one charter (for example from one [Fyodor?] Koraitovych and Svidrygiello), what might have been understood from the digest of the privilege of 1566, than this original endowment charter could be referred to three or two of the Shupicas – already Pawel, but most probably to Ivan and Tychon, who (at least Ivan) might have got donations from Svidrygiello (ca. 1400/2). In such a case Vitold’s endowment charter could have encompass a confirmation or enlargement of earlier endowment(s?), which had been made on behalf of one or two of the above mentioned. One may not exclude as well, that both Ivan and Tychon (possibly also some other family member/s) have been granted separate Vitold’s privileges, and that perhaps the Grand Duke secured one of them yet with another charter summarising the endowments of all his predecessor(s?).

endorsement of Svidrygiello's endowment, which could only be made ca. 1400/02.\(^{29}\) We may also assume that Kuna, the earliest endowment alongside Nosowce, became the property of Tychon [II/2], mentioned in documents for the period 1443-46, and seemingly representing the second line of the Slupica family. The fact that Tychon’s name passed down in the family line and was given special prominence lends us to presume that Vitold’s endowment concerned Tychon as well as Ivan.\(^{30}\) Kuna’s importance is corroborated by the fact that it was consistently developed and reconstructed (after Tartar raids) throughout the 16\(^{th}\) century by successive generations of the Slupicas, who made it their family seat and in 1605 founded a town and brickwork castle here.

There are no records enumerating the Slupicas properties from the 1430’s to the mid-16\(^{th}\) century. Not until the confiscation of the estates of Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1] does one encounter the names of all the settlements belonging to the estates of Kuna, Trościaniec, and partly to Oblin. One of the obvious conclusions is that the land held by the Slupica family was not colonised (anew?) until the mid-16\(^{th}\) century. The intermission was caused by the Tartar raids that harassed the borderlands of Lithuania with Moldavia and Wallachia, especially in the latter half of the 15\(^{th}\), and at the turn of the 15\(^{th}\) and 16\(^{th}\) centuries.\(^{31}\) Perhaps the frequent recurrence of devastation reduced the chances for successful colonisation funded by 15\(^{th}\)-century representatives of the family, about whom we know so little. At any rate, Kuna and Nosowce were the earliest Slupicas tenancies mentioned in the records, along with the lands later colonised. Kuna was situated on the River Sob at the confluence of two of its tributaries, the left-bank Kunka and the right-bank Kublicz, what offered good defence possibilities and promised additional income from fishing, mills, and … martens.\(^{32}\) Later on Kuna’s location

\(^{29}\) See note 27, p. 238.
\(^{30}\) Specifically in the case of Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], the last of male family line, murdered at Kuna in 1615.
\(^{31}\) For the Tartar issue see Chapter 2/B/1: 91-103.
\(^{32}\) There is no information on the origin of the name Kuna, but taking into account its location in the confluence of three rivers, not mentioning the ponds of the area one may assume it was named after a marten (Pol. *kuna*). These animals must have been living in large quantity in the whole of the Bratslav territory. An indication for this is to be found in the investiture charter of the Bratslav
was moved from the right to the left bank of the Sob. This event was connected with the growth of firstly the village, and then the country town, of Kuna (different form the village location), as well as with the emergence of a rival and rapidly developing settlement at Hajsyn, a royal estate/tenancy (Pol. królewszczyzna) in the early 17th century. The right-bank property nearest Kuna was Ziatkowice, a Meleszko holding. Nosowce in turn was northwest of Kuna, on the left bank of Sob, on the Kunka, having Rajgród on the left and Kiślak on the right hand. The village bordered on some old settlements, like Kropiwna on the west, and Sutkowice alias Sitkowce (near Rajgród) on the north. It was separated off from Kuna by the village of Kunka, which appears to have been founded at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries. The core of the Słupicas properties was thus located in the northwestern area of the square whose corners were marked by Bratslav, Sutkowce, Hajsyn, and Ładyżyn. The original area held by the Słupica family also included settlements and “wildernesses” which through colonisation became part of the Trościaniec estate. After some time the Trościaniec properties were depleted owing to partitions within the family, and especially due to the expansive policy pursued by the princely and magnate families (the Prince Zbaraski, the Kalinowskis), establishing themselves in the area. By the close of the 16th, and early 17th century, the Słupica family had become involved in unsuccessful proceedings lodging claims to the extensive lands once held by the Korotki (allegedly princely), and Kozar family, a matter I will discuss in detail later.

Thus, a review of the 16th- and 17th-century documents discussed in this chapter and the fairly detailed genealogical connections allows us to put forward the hypothesis that from the very beginning Kuna was the ancestral property of the “senior” line of the Słupica family. This line also had a share in Nosowce, which

---

33 For the exact Kuna location and the changes occurring in its placement during the centuries see Chapter 3, note 22, pp. 175-76. See also Fig. no. 4 (the Beauplan’s map) and Fig. no. 5 (the Jablonowski’s map).

was the family seat of the "junior" line. This division seems to have come into operation in the times of Bohusz [III/3] and Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1], viz. the early 16th century, while the "younger" line held the Troschianiec estate, which had remained uncolonised until the mid-16th century. The "elder" line had its seat in the Kuna estate, while the "younger" line at Nosowce (except for the small portion belonging to the elder line). This division became permanent in the times of Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1] and Hrehory Bohuszewicz known as Żdan [IV/3]. It was ultimately confirmed in the 1592 partition of property between Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3] and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. Nosowce was also used for the provision of dowries for the daughters of the Słupica family. Thus, it is hardly surprising that Nosowce "was broken up" at a faster rate, with disputes and litigation by the heiresses going on for years, in the early 17th century over the conveyance of the individual parts. In time the separation of Kuna and Nosowce become more extensive.\(^{35}\)

It has to be stressed that the disaster of 1551, which resulted in the confiscation and temporary forfeiture of the Kuna and Troschianiec estates affected these two properties. The Słupica family did not lose the inscribed to her remaining properties held by virtue of tenancy or through family connections, until the late 16th century (cf. the discussion of the Korotki and Kozar inheritances). Of the villages, which had been part of the original endowment (according to the earlier authors), one that was severed from the Słupicas domain in the 1570's and 80's was Ometynce. The village passed to the Meleszko family by way of marriage.\(^{36}\) It was only some time later that the Meleszkos obtained an official deed confirming their right of tenure. The charter issued to Jermolaj Meleszko in 1570 by Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav, was endorsed by an act of Sejm

\(^{35}\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108: „On the sale of the village of Nosowce in the Vojvodship of Bratslav together with adjacent forests and wildernesses known as Kozłowski, Borsczowski, Troschianiec and Rozwalski as well as Zabolocki to Janusz Zbaraski. On the controversy regarding the title of ownership to these properties between the Zbaraski’s successors – Jan Wiśniowiecki and Słupica, Zasławski, [Mrs.] Rohozińska and the Kruszelnickis (1609-1760)”, pp. 1-98v. (in Polish, mostly the 18th century extracts from territorial and castle court registers).

\(^{36}\) Gawroński, 1915: 216; Trusiewicz, 1870: 305 note 79; SłownikGeogr., 1883 IV: 873.
Earlier Jermolaj Meleszko, Deputy Starost of Bratslav (d. 1570), had obtained this property through marriage to Zofia, daughter of Olechno Mikulinski and widow of Bohdan Iwanowicz Słupica [IV/1]. That is why this particular starostial deed issued to Meleszko, along with the later documents confirming it, was associated with rights of inheritance, not a new endowment—unlike the Zalesie endowment.

The Trościaniec estate, which at the time the gift was made, consisted of a large stretch of "vacant spaces," was as old a property as Kima itself. But there is no possibility of establishing beyond all doubt the identity of the beneficiary (probably Ivan?) and benefactor (Vitold?). The estate was situated on the left bank of the Boh beyond the Ladyżyn and Klebąń estates, in the valley of the Trościeniec River. The Trościaniec settlement itself was located on the lower course of the Niedotieka, which joined the Boh at Trościańczyk. It bordered Hubnik, in the Oblin estate, which lay on the opposite bank. South the neighbourhood of Trościaniec was Obodówka. In the early 17th century the Trościaniec property, along with Klebąń, which the earlier authors ascribed to the Słupica family, came into the hands of the Kalinowskis of the arms of Kalinowa, a family aspiring to magnate status, and from the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries until 1652 supplying successive incumbents for the offices of starost in Bratslav (as of 1599) and Vinnytsia (from 1604). According to Litwin, in 1615-23 Trościaniec became the property of Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, who purchased its component parts from the Słupiczas, the Kruszelnicki family (heirs to the Słupiczas), and Princes Zbaraski. The last-named had earlier bought up the portion of Marusza

---


39 See Fig. no. 4 (the Beauplan’s map) and Fig. no. 5 (the Jabłonowski’s map).

40 Litwin, 2000: 182.
née Diakowska, widow of Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica [V/6]. The subsequent masters of this property were Adam (1623-38) and Marcin (1638-48) the Kalinowskis. Following the conveyance, around 1630 the Kalinowski family transformed its main centre, Trościaniec, into a town they called Adamgród in honour of the purchaser (though the new name had already been in use in 1622). Other names encountered in the sources are Smilhorod and Ujście Trościańca.

Litwin gives the following list of places in the Trościaniec estate in the early 1630's: Batoh, Chodolowka, Derenkowiec, Hackowce, Hryhorowka, Junaki, Kaliczynce, and Stratowka.

The Klebań estate occupied an area about half the size of the Kuna properties. It was situated on the left bank of the Boh and on the north neighboured on the Kuna and Ladyźyn lands. On the southeast it touched the Trościaniec estate. According to Rulikowski, Gawroński, and the author of the entry “Kuna” in the Słownik Geograficzny, it was a component part of Vitold’s endowment for the Słupica family. However, none of these writers provide further detail. Under the Kalinowskis the Klebań properties became an integral part of the Nesterwar estate. In the 16th century the focal point of the Klebań estate was a place of the same name straddling the banks of the middle course of the River Sielnica, one of the Boh’s left-bank tributaries with its point of confluence at Ladyźyn, a place, which had also become a Kalinowski property. According to Litwin the Kalinowskis acquired Klebań from the Słupica and Kozar families in 1600-06, while Jablonowski gives a date of ca. 1611. Under their proprietorship Klebań

41 Rulikowski was of the opinion that parts of Trościaniec and Derenkowce grounds were given up to Adam Walenty Kalinowski (in reality to Walenty Alexander) in 1615 by Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5], wife of Alexander Kruszelnicki (Trusiewicz, 1870: 312-13); ZDz., 1894 20: 106, 109, 1897 22: 633, 728. See also Chapter 6/D/3b: 365-66.
42 Litwin, 2000: 182.
43 ZDz., 1896 21: 616 (Adamhorodek, a town called Trosteniec), 623 (Trosteniec renamed to Smilhorod). Yet it seems, that the second name might have referred rather to Trościańczyk then Trościaniec.
44 Litwin mentions this particular name separately as Trościaniec alias Adamgród, and Ujście with Trojanica, what can be regarded as misinterpretation of the source material. Since Ujście and Trojanica have been mentioned together as one settlement, namely Ujście Trościaniec.
45 Litwin, 2000: 182.
46 See Fig. no. 4 (the Beauplan’s map) and Fig. no. 5 (the Jablonowski’s map).
developed into a town and was given the name Sławhorod or Sławgród. The most ancient settlements in the estate, alongside Klebań, were the villages of Michałówka and Wasylówka, formerly part of the Kozar ancestral lands. In his account of the Tulczyn estate in the 17th century, Litwin enumerates the following places: Nesterwar (later, under the Potockis proprietorship known as Tulczyn), Klebań (Sławhorod), and the settlements Jankowce, Icki, Kiamasówka, Wojtówka, Żurawlówka, Kryszczynce, Zachariaszówka, Fedorówka, and Bohdanówka. Like the places in the Trościaniec estate, all of these villages came into being as a result of the colonisation campaign conducted by the Kalinowskis – Walenty Alexander (d. 1623), Adam (d. 1638), and Marcin (until 1648).

B. The Słupicas Estates in the Course of the 16th Century:


There is only one surviving record for the Słupicas properties in the early 16th century, the 1533 delimitation of boundaries, in which a Żdan Słupica [III/2] appears. Rulikowski has left an account of this document. The lack of source material compels one to assume that until 1551, when the forces of Devlet Girey took Bratslav, the property held by the Słupica family comprised the entirety of the lands endowed in Svidrygiello’s (?) and Vitold’s charters. In view of the lack of information on Żdan (and it cannot be ruled out that he was identical with the young Hrehory Żdan [IV/3]) and the land he held, as well as the paucity of particulars concerning the delimitation itself, it is reasonable to at least attempt a general reconstruction based on the facts presented by the remaining parties to the delimitation - Bohdan Markowicz Mormil and Ivan (Jan) Żabokrzycki. The 1545 popis (revision) register for Bratslav and Vinnytsia provide us with comprehensive

48 See ZDz., 1897 22: 611 (1611), 727 (here as Klebań or Sławgród [Sławhorodek] “sometimes referred to as Krasna góra [Red Mountain].")
49 Litwin, 2000: 182. See below B/6b: 274-77.
50 Litwin, 2000: 182.
51 Trusiewicz, 1870: 301. I assume that Rulikowski quoted this information based on nonexistent today source to which he had access in Kuna or Tywrów.
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information related to properties of the three parties present in the 1533 delimitation. Isaij Żabokrzycki held a place called Bobrów (Bobryk?) on the River Kodyma. Hence the Żabokrzycki family also belonged to the group of gentry invested with land from the Bratslav voïvodship. This hypothesis is further confirmed by the fact that Isaij Żabokrzycki was joint proprietor, along with Bohdan Słupica [IV/1] and Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, of the first horodnia edifice in Bratslav Castle. In 1602 the Żabokrzycki sold part of the villages of Torków and Jurkowce, near the sources of the Sielnica in the valley of the Boh and neighbouring Żabokrzycz their ancestral seat in the Bratslav territory, to Prince Constantine Ostrogski, the Voivode of Kyiv.

The properties held by the Mormil family in 1545 were Ziatkowce on the Kublitz, Żerdenowce (Żerdenówka) near the Sob, and Kuźmińce on the Sob. They also had their own horodnia in Bratslav Castle. In 1609 Bohdan, Roman, and Tychon the Mormils, grandsons of Eudoksia née Koźuchowska, delimited the boundaries between their properties in all three villages and the land held by Ivan [Jermolajewicz] Meleszko, guardian of the sons of Semen Słupica [VI/2, 3], who were minors at the time. Meleszko was also one of Koźuchowska’s grandsons, and had already acquired a share in his grandmother’s estate (1606).

---

52 ZDz., 1877 6: 118 (horodnia), 123 (Bobrow), 1897 22: 540, 631, 722, 726. A horodnia (pl. horodnie) was a house-like edifice built of wood (less often of bricks) within the castle’s walls. Usually its was fortified and most often attached directly to the walls. The owners of horodnias were local noblemen, villagers and burgers. The villagers in the starosty were obliged to build one horodnia for each village. The main aim of these constructions was to store food and mobile property of local population, seeking refuge within the castle’s walls in case of emergency.

53 In April 1602 (entry of 30 April 1602 at Vinnytsia) Prince Constantine Ostrogski, the Voivode of Kyiv sued the Żabokrzyckis because although they had sold half of the village of Żabokrzycz, the village of Kuźmińce, the settlement of Jurkowce, the old settlement of Torkow and the settlement Bialotynka, and received 3000 Polish Zlotys making the sales contract valid the transaction had not been completed. This might have suggested that the Żabokrzyckis did not want to hand over to the Prince the formally sold property (ZDz., 1896 21: 437 [digest]). A confirmation of this is to be found in an entry dated 10 August 1604 at Vinnytsia of an precondition agreement (Pol. rozpis) written down by Seweryn Bolanowski as a plaintiff, and Prince Constantine Ostrogski. The latter had deprived Bolanowski of the possession of the village Kuźmińce, which earlier was a part of the Żabokrzyckis property (ZDz., 1896 21: 510 [digest]).


55 ZDz., 1896 21: 526 (digest dated 17 May 1606; here I. Meleszko as the owner of Żerdenewka), 512 (digest dated 5 May 1606; here I. Melszko as the owner of Ziatkowce), 541 (digest, an entry dated 18 May 1609 at Vinnytsia). In May 1613 (entry of 14 May at Vinnytsia) Ivan Meleszko resigned half of Ziatkowce with adjacent grounds to the Rohoziński​s – Vasil and Halszka.
identifies Momiilec, a place located on one of the tributaries of the River Roś, with the village of Mormilówka. The above enumeration of properties shows that the Mormil family also belonged to the group of gentry endowed with land from the volost' of Bratslav Castle. The only information given in the 1545 popis records relating to the properties owned by the Ślipica family is that Bohdan [IV/1] was joint owner (along with Żabokrzycki and Koszka) of the horodnia in Bratslav Castle, as mentioned above. One may suppose that the Ślipicas’ lands subject to the delimitation were probably part of Kuna or Kunka, the latter referred to from the first quarter of the 17th century, as Wójtowce. A less likely guess would be that it belonged to Nosowce itself, though this cannot be ruled out.

2. The Confiscation of the Kuna Estate, 1552, and Endeavors to Retrieve It, to 1556.

As a result of the surrender of Bratslav to Devlet Girey, Khan of the Crimean Horde, in September 1551, Bohdan Iwanowicz Ślipica [IV/1], then the Plenipotentiary Starost and commanding officer in charge of the defence of Bratslav Castle and town during the absence of Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia received the blame. For this “act of


Trusiewicz, 1870: 301 note 73. Momiilec (Mormilówka, Mormulewka) the village in the river basin of Roś listed by Jabłonowski in the group of settlements with the Turkic origin names as Mormulewka (ZDz., 1897 22: 169).

ZDz., 1877 6: 118 (horodnia; as Bohdan Ślibica).

In 1617 Katarzyna Żabokrzycka and her sons lodged proceedings against the Kopijewski family for encroachment of property (grounds and meadows) owned by the Żabokrzycki. The summons contains the full particulars of the boundaries to this land, which bordered the former Ślipicas’ Trósianiec estate (ZDz., 1896 21: 596 [digest, dated 23/25 April 1617 at Vinnytsia]). In accordance with the digest these borders went as follows: „taking from the Malica part of the River Sielnica, where the “heels” of borders with the grounds nesterwarski [of Nesterwar], wyszkowski [of Wyszków] and żabokrzycki [of Żabokrzyz] start, and next on the other bank of the Sielnica River through the kopyłiński ground [of Hoptylińce], where the Baksza River falls into Sielnica, next upstream of this river where the żabokrzycki ground stretches along the right bank of Siłnica as far as the Opelzła Valley, and from here until the mouths (Pol. uchód) of Olunkowa, and from Olunkowa zachod through the Peczenitz Forest up to Krzywoszczechyna apiary and further as far as Sobowicka spring on the Jurkowiec River, called Rublena”.

On the siege of Bratslav in 1551 and Bohdan’s treason see Chapter 2/B/5: 138-53.
treason” he was punished by the confiscation/forfeiture (Pol. kaduń) of his ancestral lands. Originally the entirety of his estates was liable, which was a serious threat to the livelihood of the remaining members of the Słupica family. The property confiscated from Bohdan Iwanowicz went to Prince Kuzma Iwanowicz Zasławski (before 1510 – 1566), as remuneration for the latter’s contribution to the initial phase of the Castle’s and town’s restoration. Prince Zasławski took advantage of the minority of Bohdan’s only son and heir, Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] to benefit from the confiscation. Thus, the task of retrieving the ancestral lands fell to Bohdan’s younger brother, Hrehory Bohuszewicz known as Ždan [IV/3].

Some light is shed on the circumstances related to the transfer of the Kuna properties to Prince Kuzma Zasławski in the documents in the Archives of the Princes Sanguszko of Sławuta (APKr., Cracow). There is a letter from Sigismund Augustus dated at Vilnius, 25 September 1552, to Prince Bohusz F. Korecki, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, concerning the confiscated land of the traitor Bohusz Słupica in the Powiat of Bratslav, and allocated by the monarch to Zasławski. Mikolaj Radziwiłł, the Voivode of Vilnius, Territorial Marshal and Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, supported Zasławski’s petition for

---

60 According to the Lithuanian laws until 1566 the inherited estates were regarded as the family property, thus one could have sold out of the family hands with its consent not more than one third of the inheritable properties. Inheritances (Ruth. otchizny) were inherited both in male and female lines as well as in the secondary family lines when there was no direct heir or heiress in the main line. Contrary to the landed properties restricted to a temporal ownership (Ruth. vosluhi), endowed usually by the Grand Duke, they did not come back to ducal disposal after the death of their owner (JakovenkoShliakhhta, 1993: 175).

61 Prince Kuzma Iwanowicz was the younger son of Prince Ivan Juriewicz Zasławski (d. ca. 1516), who represented the family’s Volhynian branch and of Princess (Ruth. kniahtni) Olena Fedordowna. His older brother Michał died ca. 1530. Prince Kuzma while being in his minority in the guardianship of Prince Constantine Ostrogski lost on behalf of the Ostrogskis almost half of his hereditary estates. After he came of age Kuzma initiated legal proceedings against the Ostrogskis (1534-39), concluded by half success. In next years (1540-46) new conflicts of economic nature aroused between both princely families. Married prior to 1529 to Nastazja (d. 1561), daughter of Prince Jurij Iwanowicz Dubrowicki of the Holszanskis, Kuzma left on only son Janusz Kuimicz and a daughter Anna, who later married (1547) Prince Ivan Fedorowicz Czartoryski. From 3 September 1540 to February 1543 Prince Kuzma was the Starost of Święlocz. He resigned from this starosty to be replaced by Prince Vasil Michalowicz Sanguszko. In 1546 he became Tenant (starost) of the Kamenets’ Castle, resigning in 1552 (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 597-98 [Iwan Juriewicz], 598-600 [Kuzma Iwanowicz]).

62 See also below B/4: 257-61.
the confiscated Shipicas properties. Characteristically, this letter refers to all the lands held by Shipica, but does not list them by name. Apart from this letter addressed to Starost Korecki, the royal chancellery must have issued a separate charter to Prince Kuźma, in which no doubt the particulars were enumerated more precisely. It is not very likely that Zasławski could have taken advantage of the lack of precision in this particular document to disregard the rights of Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3] and drive him out of his holding.

In the available digest of the Shipicas contra Zaslawski proceedings there is no mention of any kind of deed issued to Zaslawski between 1551 and 1555, when the next extant document relating to the case and belonging to the Sanguszko collection, was issued. Thus we are obliged to assume that Zasławski and Korecki were acting on the grounds of the royal letter of 25 September 1552 and a no longer extant charter issued to the claimant. Perhaps the main part of the missing charter is preserved in the opening part of the digest recorded on the initiative of the Zaslawskis for their proceedings against the Shipicas. The digest says that:

His Majesty ordered the conveyance in compensation to Prince Kuźma Januszewicz [sic] Zaslawski of the bona confiscata [confiscated lands] of the traitor Bohdan Shipicz, that is the town [sic] of Kuna, and Lorynće, Wiasłowiec, Karpow, Nosowice, Hukawcy, and other places in possesione haereditariam [as perpetual property], which had already came ad fiscum Regium [become the property of the royal treasury], for hereditary tenure.

However, it cannot be ruled out that this record was made solely on the basis of a compilation of the documents to be discussed below, as it refers to the situation from the beginning of the 17th century, and shows complete dependence from the

63 APKr.: ASang., t. VII/80 (original in Ruthenian and the 19th century copy in Polish), t. 205/23 (the 16th century copy in Polish); Ostafi Wołowicz, notary of the Crown Metrica chancery, has countersigned royal letter = ASang., t. 205/23 (Sumariusz): here digest of the document. For details see below note 64.

64 APKr.: ASang., t. 143/1 (Sumariusz). This summary (the second one) together with an account of the Shipicas family history in the 16th and 17th century was of all likelihood written down by Bronisław Gorczak on the basis of source material from the Princes Sanguszko archives; ASang., t. 205/23: „Specifcatio in hoc fasciculo of the collected here Documents pertaining to the process started by His Lordship Prince Janusz Kuźmowicz Zaslawski. Against Lords Shipicas for the Kuna estate Cum attinantys ex Negorio tali” (a digest of documents = Sumariusz).

65 APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23.
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documents in question. Also, it is hard to establish beyond all doubt who is to blame for the extension of the confiscation covering the whole of the Slupicas property. As a result, by taking over the whole of the Kuna estate and also of the Trościaniec estate (as the documents show), Zaslawski infringed the rights of Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3], his sister Żdanna [IV/4], and the minor Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. One learns precisely which of the Slupicas’ properties were subject to confiscation from a letter of 25 October 1552 from Prince Bohusz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav, who in fulfilment of the royal orders administered “the introduction of Prince Zaslawski to the Slupicas settlements.” Korecki’s servant, Lewek Boratyński, appointed for the task, carried out the introduction. According to Korecki’s letter Zaslawski received Kuna, Wjaslowicz [Jaslowiec], Karpow, Kaletin, Derenkowiec, Lorincy, Nosowcy, and Husakowcy. In the mid-16th century these 8 villages were the economic backbone of the lords of Kuna.

The Slupica family, in the person of Hrehory Bohuszewicz, lost no time in undertaking steps to recuperate at least part of their forfeited property. The first sign of their activities is a royal document issued in 1555. On 5 September of that year the monarch again wrote to Starost Bohusz Korecki, this time from Rudniki. His letter was the effect of Hrehory Bohuszewicz Stupica’s intervention at court. Hrehory managed to appear before the King and, with a czolem bicie (courteous bow; a gesture typical of Ruthenian court customs), made the required representations. Perhaps the Princes Sanguszko, or more particularly Prince Alexander Andriejewicz Sanguszko of the Koszyr line (before 1533-65), who had recently been appointed ducal Marshal (Pol. marszalek hospodarski) of Lithuania (1553) offered him support. At any rate, in this letter Sigismund Augustus informed the Starost that apart from the land held by the traitor Bohdan, the portion held by his brother Hrehory, which he had held “together” with his brother,

---

66 APKr.: ASang., t. VII/82 (original in Ruthenian script) = ASang., t. 143/1 (Sumariusz): here digest of the document = ASang., t. 205/23 (Sumariusz): here digest of the same act, but dated 29 October 1552.

67 APKr.: ASang., t. VIII/45 (the 16th century Polish copy) = ASang., t. 141/1: here digests of the document dated 8 September 1555.

68 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 442-44 (Aleksander Andriejewicz), especially 443.
had also been made subject to forfeiture. This is confirmation that at the time of the confiscation no partition of the property had been alienated. The King made it quite plain that Korecki was to restore to Hrehory "that part of the property, which we have not given to any other person." This in turn confirms the assumption that Zaslawski had presumably no legal grounds to take over the whole of the Kuna and Trościaniec estates. Since there was still part of the original Slupicas property at the King’s disposal, the royal chancellery must have been well aware of the fact that no partition had been carried out. Also, for some reason Sigismund Augustus was reluctant about entrusting the whole of the Slupicas property to Zasławski. Moreover, the King informed Korecki that he had given instructions for a letter to be sent to Prince Zasławski to let him know of this decision regarding the said portion of the Kuna estate and its adjacencies, and that he (Zasławski) was neither to hold it nor intervene once Korecki handed it over to Hrehory. Thereby, the King’s letter also gave the official order for Hrehory Bohuszewicz’s intromission into the previously confiscated property. On the same day the King sent another letter to Zasławski, with an account of Hrehory’s audience at court and its outcome. He also informed Zasławski that he had ordered Korecki to restore Hrehory Slupica to his rightful portion of the property, and warned him (Zasławski) not to interfere with the execution of this order.

The next known document is Starost Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki’s letter of 30 May 1556 issued from Vinnytsia, in response to the intervention at the royal court of [Hrehory] Żdan, the “son of Bohusz Ślupica, landowner of the Powiat of Bratslav.” Żdan delivered the King’s letter to the Starost, with the order that the latter restore to Żdan half of the lands confiscated after Bohdan’s treason and subsequently conferred to Zasławski. In Korecki’s reply, we find a full description of the particulars related to the division of the Slupicas property between Żdan and

---

69 APKr.: ASang., t.VIII/45 (the 16th century Polish copy).
70 APKr.: ASang., t.VIII/45
71 One may assume, that Zasławski has taken some steps against Hrehory, the aim of which was to delay the return of property, as no documents confirming its execution prior to 1556 are to be found.
72 APKr.: ASang., t. 141/1 (the 16th century copy in Polish) = ASang., t. 143/1 and 205/23: here digests of this document.
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the Zaslawski family, with an account of the boundaries and their economic condition. The issue of this letter exactly at the time of the death of Prince Kuźma (1556), who left a son, Prince Janusz, a minor, was hardly a coincidence. Korecki noticed that he had transferred to Ždan half of the Słupicas estates, viz. the villages of:

Jasłowiczy and Rolinczy, Hubnik and Derenkowiec, Czeremoszny, Kalicycz, Tymoszkow, Karaczin [?], that is those properties lying on either bank of the River Boh and another, small river, along with the beaver habitat, Bobrowe Gony. That is Trostianiec, Berszad, Tma, along with all the profits and revenues from those villages and settlements.

These places lay along the south-eastern edge of the Kuna estate; by this time most of the villages and uninhabited areas named in the letter made up the area referred to as the Trościaniec property. At the same time the Starost made it clear that the other half of the Słupicas’ properties, “that is Kuna and Husakowce along with their adjacencies, that is the settlements lying along the River Sob and the woodlands and oak groves, fields, streams and beaver habitats” were to remain in the possession of Zasławski. Thus Prince Zasławski kept the Kuna part of the estate, while Hrehory Bohuszewicz was restituted to the Trościaniec estate.

This division makes no mention of Nosowce, which had also been subject to forfeiture. The point is explained later in the letter. The Starost wrote that he returned to Hrehory Ždan the village of Nosowce on the River Korytna, which the deceased Bohusz Słupica [III/3] had given to his daughter Żdanna [IV/4] and son-in-law Roman Krasnosielski against a security of 30 kopaś of Lithuanian groszs (180 Lithuanian groszs). Finally he concluded that Hrehory:

was to return the 30 kopaś of dowry to his brother-in-law the Lord Roman Krasnosielski and his sister the Lady Krasnosielska née Słupiczanka, and Lord

---

73 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 600. Prince Janusz Kuźmicz (d.1562) was married to one Kierdejówna (of the Kierdej family), with whom he had three children. On the Kierdej family see also Chapter 6/A/4b: 296-97 and notes 65, p. 296, 66, pp. 296-97.

74 APKr.: ASang., t. 141/1.
Roman Krasnosielski, having been repaid the 30 grosz by Ždan Słupica, was to hand back the property Nosowce to the latter.⁷⁶

Thereby Nosowce, a property associated with the “junior” Słupicz line, along with Trościaniec, returned to Hrehory, who was bound to provide military service for all of his lands („służbę Hsprska [hospodarską] ziemią słuzyc”), confirming the feudal nature of the Słupicas tenure. We do not know when exactly Słupica repaid Krasnosielski and recovered Nosowce. 1551, alongside Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1]. Afterwards he pursued official career as the castle judge in Bratslav (1569).⁷⁷ Perhaps it was around that year that he married Ždanna; at any rate it was not the only union that linked There is no further mention in the family documents of Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosielski and his wife Ždanna. A descendant of a nested family of gentry as “ancient” as the Słupica in the Bratslav territory, Roman had participated in the defence of Bratslav in the Krasnosielski of the arms of Prus I with the Słupica family.⁷⁸ Ivan, the only son of Ždanna and Roman Iwanowicz, later married Marusza alias Marianna Czerlenkowska, daughter of Sylwester, the Bratslav territorial notary, and Anna née Szaszkiewicz.⁷⁹ The only daughter of the

---

⁷⁶ APKr.: ASang., t. 141/1.
⁷⁷ See Chapter 2/B/5: 146, 148 and note 203, p. 148. See also NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.
⁷⁸ On the Krasnosielskis see below B/6; 265-66 and B/6a.
⁷⁹ Accordingly to Pulaski the mother of Marusza was Anna Szaszkiewiczówna, the daughter of Mikołaj Szaszkiewicz (d. 1624) who in 1596-1622 was the standard-bearer (Pol. chorąży, Lat. vexillifer) of Bratslav. Pulaski notes Marusza as wife of Sylwester Czerlenkowski from 1626 (see below). Anna Mikołajewna of the Szaszkiewicz had also a sister Marianna and a brother Fedor. Of them Marianna married to Bohdan Krasnosielski (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 212). However, in the opinion of the same author, expressed in a different place, Marianna was the first wife of Krzysztof Aleksandrowicz Szaszkiewicz, with whom she had a son Nikodem (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 231). Some light offers the Krasnosielskis genealogy (APKr.: ASang., t. 119/29: Genealogical trees of the Krasnosielski family from Roman Iwanowicz) which states that from the union of Ivan Romanowicz Krasnosielski and Marusza/Marianna Czerlenkowska was to descend 4 sons and 3 daughters. Of them only the oldest son Bohdan married to Marianna Szaszkiewiczówna had an offspring, namely a son named Fedor. His three brothers Vasil, Ivan and Jurij (Jerzy) died without heirs. Of his sisters all were married and left progeny. Alexandra married to Seweryn Bolanowski, Anastazja (Nastazja) became wife of Łukasz (Eliaz) Kleszczowski, and Anna married Jakub Ławrynowicz Piaseczyński, after whose death she remarried in 1639 to Vasil Rohoziński (see Chapter 6/D/2: 331 and note 212, p. 301, 334-35 and notes). Meanwhile Pulaski claims in other place that Jakub Piaseczyński married to Anna of Krzykowce Krasnosielska, who was to be not Vasil’s sister but his daughter (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 150). According to Iakovenko’s investigation the Czerlenkowskis were members of the Knita family. They formed a separate branch of the Knitas and took their surname after Czerlenkow in the Bratslav area, in 1529 being recorded already as a town, in contrast to the village of the same name. In 1629 the Czerlenkowskis
Krasnosielskis, Bohdana was married to Dimitr Olechnowicz Koźniński (d. 1579) of the Kierdeja arms, the son of Olechno Hryńkówicz, the Starost of Vinnytsia in 1506 (plenipotentiary of Michał W. Zbaraski Wiśniewiecki?) and the royal courtier in 1536. Dimitr himself was the Deputy Starost of Vinnytsia in 1563, most probably on behalf of Prince Roman F. Sanguszko Koszyński or Prince Bohusz F. Korecki.80


These actions by Hrehory Żdan [IV/3] were by no means the end of the efforts to recuperate the Słupicas properties. Hrehory continued in the following years, with the support of Bohdan’s son, Semen [V/1]. Although there is no direct evidence that Semen was officially Hrehory’s ward, we may assume from the context of the extant source material that Hrehory acted very successfully as his guardian. An indication of the strong influence Hrehory had over his ward is provided by Semen’s later marriage to Owdotia, daughter of Juchno Iwanowicz Krasnosielski. Owdotia was the niece of Hrehory’s brother-in-law, Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosielski.81 It cannot be ruled out that the marriage was planned when Semen was still Hrehory’s ward. Semen was Bohdan’s son by his wife Zofia Mikulińska, daughter of Olechno. After Bohdan’s “disappearance” Zofia re-married. Her second husband was Jermolaj Meleszko, who performed the duties of deputy starost (Pol. podstarości) of Bratslav for Prince Bohusz Korecki.82 There is no mention whatsoever of her first husband in all the documents from the period of

80 The Koźnińskis were one of the branches of the Kierdeja family using their individual arms (the variant of Kierdeja called sometimes Zagloba) and originating from Kozin in Volhynia, in the Powiat of Kremenets. The couple of our interest had four children: Ivan, Olechno, Pawel and a daughter Eudoksja (Boniecki, 1908 12: 93; Uruski, 1910 7: 376). See also NykierBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix A and B.
81 See Chapter 2/B/5: 146, 148 and note 203, p. 148; NykierBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.
82 See Chapter 6/A/1: 280 and note 6, pp. 279-80.
her second marriage. Evidently Bohdan’s name was relegated to oblivion. If Semen was a minor in 1552 and reached the age of majority ca. 1566, the year he was granted the charter of restitution to “the Kuna estate cum attinentis [along with its adjacencies], Nosowce, and other properties, as invested in the charter given in perpetuity with the approval of the Grand Duke,” then he must have been born around 1546.83

The deed whereby Semen Bohdanowicz’s right to the whole of the Kuna estate, including the part given to Prince Kuźma Zasławski in 1552, was restored, would have been one of the most valuable documents in the archival collections of the Jaroszyński family, and as such preserved with special care, but it was finally destroyed along with the rest of the archives in 1919.84 However, in the light of Semen Bohdanowicz’s declaration of 3 February 1581 entered in the register of the Volhynian Metrica, the original deed perished in a fire at Vinnytsia on 8 October 1581. The document kept at Kuna was therefore only a copy, issued by the royal chancellery of all likelihood in 1581.85 It was nonetheless of profound significance for the Słupica family, since it provided them with the legal grounds not only for the long-lasting dispute with the descendants of Prince Kuźma, but also in litigation over property matters the Słupicas themselves and their successors brought before the courts in the 17th century. Since the document’s sole addressee was Semen Bohdanowicz, this suggests that by 1566 he had reached the age of maturity. No doubt Hrehory Bohuszewicz must have supported him in his endeavour to obtain this document. The Słupica family probably launched their campaign at court (perhaps through the mediation of Prince Alexander Andriejewicz Sanguszko) already in 1562, the year in which Prince Kuźma Iwanowicz Zasławski’s only son, Prince Janusz Kuźmicz, died (in the summer).86 Just as in 1556, the heirs of Bohdan decided to take advantage of this “period of transition” in the affairs of the Zasławskis. Prince Janusz had left two sons, the

---

84 Mienicki, 1927: 217.
86 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 601.
Princes Janusz and Michał, who were still in their infancy, and a daughter Zofia. Two digests from the collection of the Słupicas’ deeds prove the connection between the efforts undertaken by them and Zasławski’s death. They also show that not only the Słupica family took advantage of the ailing Zasławski’s weakness and the minority of his heirs. The two digests relate royal letters containing warnings addressed to Prince Korecki, the then Starost of Lutsk, Bratslav, and Vinnytsia.

The first was sent on 15 June 1562 from Vilnius on request of the critically ill Prince Janusz Kuźmicz. The King exhorted Korecki not to use the latter’s lands around Bratslav Castle, which had passed to him from Bohdan Słupica, for his own gain, but to allow them to be enjoyed as the property of Prince Kuźma Januszewicz Zasławski. The second letter, also preserved in a digest as well as in the original, was dated 29 October 1562 from Warsaw. The King repeated his order, that Prince Korecki “refrain from unlawfully encroaching upon the property of Prince Kuźma Januszewicz [sic] Zasławski.” Undoubtedly Korecki’s endeavour was strictly connected with the battle for the right to exercise the powers of guardianship over Prince Janusz Kuźmicz’s three children, heirs to one of the more substantial estates at the time. Soon after their father’s death a dispute broke out between the guardian appointed in Zasławski’s will (devised before 19 June 1562), Hrehory Aleksandrowicz Chodkiewicz, Castellan of Troki, and Prince Constantine Konstantynowicz Ostrogski, who claimed the guardianship on the grounds of being closely related to the deceased. In 1530’s Ostrogski’s father had appropriated

---

87 Princes Zofia married first Alexander Zahorowski, and then (after 1577) Fryderyk Tyszkiewicz Łohojski (of Łohojsk). Prince Michał Januszewicz died unmarried in an shooting accident. Besides conflicts with relatives and neighbours because of family estates he had distinguished himself by nothing special, although accordingly to Niesiecki he was to take part in campaigns against Ottoman Turks and Tartars (Niesiecki, 1845 10: 93). Prince Janusz Januszewicz married in 1577 to Princes Alexandra Sanguszkowna (d. 1602), daughter of Roman Fedorowicza, and next (after 1605) to Marianna Leszczyńska, widow of Andrzej Firlej, Castellan (Pol. kasztelan, Lat. castellanus) of Radom (in the Crown). He had three sons: Alexander, Constantine and Julian, and died on 4 August 1629 (Wolff-Kniaziowie, 1895: 601 [Zofia], 601 [Michał], 601-02 [Janusz]).

88 APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23.

a large part of Prince Kuźma’s property.90 It was at the instigation of Hrehory Chodkiewicz, Grand Hetman of Lithuania and Starost of Grodno, that the King rebuked the Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia (October 1562). Defending his wards, Chodkiewicz claimed that Korecki had unlawfully taken possession of the estate of the deceased Prince Kuźma in the Powiat of Bratslav, and demanded its restitution. The properties concerned were those Zaslavski had inherited from Prince Vasil Fedorowicz Czetwertyński, and those forfeited by Shüpica.91 The latter included “the settlement Kuna on the River Sob, another one of Gusakowcy [Husakowce], and a third one of Rolincy on the River Bog [Boh],” from which the Starost was drawing revenue on the apiaries and the marten and beaver skins.92

Hrehory Bohuszewicz utilised the confusion caused by the successive deaths of the Zaslawskis for his own purposes. It was at those times, 1556 and 1562, that he obtained important documents concerning the restitution of the Shüpicas properties. Moreover, he skilfully adapted his operations to the external circumstances, Tartar threats (in 1566 and 1575).93 The charter he obtained in 1566 for the restitution of Kuna and its adjacencies to Semen Bohdanowicz was at the same time a confirmation of Vitold’s endowment. It brought to an end the Shüpicas efforts to regain the rights to all the property they had held prior to 1551. In the light of later events we are led to assume that Zaslavski’s young heirs, protected by their guardian the Grand Hetman of Lithuania, retrieved the property Korecki had appropriated. And they did not allow Kuna, Husakowce, and Rolincy to be restored to Semen, notwithstanding the royal charter.

---

90 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 600-01.
91 Ivan Juriewicz Zaslavski, the father of Prince Kuźma, has also been performing some conversions of properties in Volhynia. He has done it with Prince Vasil Fedorowicz Czetwertyński. The latter represented the Czetwertyński branch of Czetwertnia and Jarowica, and died before 1545, being among others, the hereditary proprietor of one third of property after the deceased in 1538 Prince Jurij Michajłowicz Sokolski. His sons inherited also this part (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 37, 597, 598). The above quoted document does not mention which villages after the late Prince Vasil Fedorowicz Czetwertyński might have been at stake.
92 APKr.: ASang., t. X/45.
93 Trusiewicz, 1870: 284-85. Here the data on the Tartar raids into Bratslavshchyna in 1566/67 and 1575.
4. Semen Bohdanowicz and the Battle against the Zaslawskis for the Kuna Estate, 1575-90.

In view of their partial success in reclaiming Semen’s portion of the Kuna property – they won the legal battle (1566) but their achievement remained on paper – Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/3] and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] decided to take matters into their own hands (there are no extant papers for the interval 1566-81). The next surviving document, a royal summons to Semen Bohdanowicz dated 30 January 1581 from Grodno, gives conclusive evidence that the Šupicas had executed the royal decision by forcibly driving Janusz and Michal (sons of Janusz) the Zaslawskis, who had at the time reached their majority out of Kuna and its adjacencies. According to this document the young Zaslawskis were calling for the restoration of the property which Semen had seized: Kuna, Wiaslowicz [Jaslowicze], Karpów, Kaletyn, Derenkowce, Loryńce [Rolince], Nosowce, and Husakowce – the entire Kuna estate plus part of the Trościaniec estate. Apart from the restitution of this property, they were also claiming damages of 2200 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (132,000 Lithuanian groats).

Referring to Bohdan Šupica’s treason and the forfeiture of his lands to Prince Kuźma, the young Zaslawski heirs declared that Semen had no right to the said property, and “for reasons unknown set out to impound it when they had been left orphaned by their father in their young years and were in care in the villages.” The “impounding” had started in 1575 with a move by Hrehory Ždan [IV/3] on his own, who later (1585) assisted Semen in similar actions, as we learn from subsequent summonses. Hrehory Ždan’s implementation of force in 1575

---

94 APKr.: ASang., t. XV/5 (original in Ruthenian), t. XV/1 (its Polish copy) = ASang., t. 205/23 (digest).

95 See Chapter 6/B/2: 301-02, D/2a: 336-46. For example, the summonses of 25 January 1615 against Halszka Semendwna and Vasil the Rohozihskis calling them to the Court Tribunal and issued on behalf of Prince Janusz Zaslawski relates the events as follows: “And when the said Voivode of Volhynia together with his younger brother the late Prince Michał Zaslawski were in their minority after their father Prince Janusz Kuźmicz Zaslawski being in different hands, than the younger brother of the abovementioned traitor Bohdan Šupica, Hrehory called Ždan Šupica, the late castle judge of Bratslav took violently and illegally these aforementioned estates, “squeezed” and deprived the legal owners of peaceful tenancy and use, and started to use and take advantage of
came at a particularly hard time for the Bratslav territory owing to a serious Tartar incursion, as related in Marcin Bielski’s *Chronicle*. Pursuant to the summons, Semen was to appear before the King’s jury “wherever We shall be at the time” to present the charter of restitution allegedly granted to him in 1566.

The young Zasławskis’ renewed legal action coincided with a campaign conducted by the Bratslav landowners at the General Sejm (Diet) of Warsaw. A large party representing the territory arrived to petition in the royal chancellery asking the issuing of a new set of charters for their properties. The reason behind their endeavour was the fire, which “by misfortune and misadventure” had consumed virtually the whole of Vinnytsia Castle and town on 8 October 1580. In anticipation of Tartar attacks, most of the landowners resident in the Vinnytsia area had deposited their deeds and valuables in the Castle or with relatives who had houses in town or *horodnia* structures in the Castle. Now deprived of the material proof of their property rights mostly hereditary estates, they lodged on 3 February 1581 the required declarations for the reassurance of their lost property deeds. Hrehory Ždan and Semen Bohdanowicz were among those making the

---

90 Trusiewicz, 1870: 284 and note 29. Rulikowski quotes an account of Marcin Bielski and a poem by Jan Kochanowski. This raid was to envelop the whole of Bratslav territories, as far as Sieniawa. Its outcome, besides the robbed property and domestic animals resulted 55 thousands of captives, which however seems to be an overestimated data.

declarations. Hrehory had kept his deeds in Vinnytsia Castle “in the chamber of his brother [in reality cousin] Semen Obodeński.”

These deeds had included the charter endowed by the Grand Duke Vitold to Ivan Słupica, for the following settlements in the Voivodeship of Bratslav: Derenkowcy [Derenkowce], Rolincy [Rolińce], Kalikinczy [Kalicyńce], Jaslowicz [Jasłowicze], Gubnik [Hubnik], situated on either bank of the River Boh (in other words the Trościaniec estate); along with Niesowcy [Nosowce] on the Koiytna River. Semen had also deposited his own deeds and those of his mother Zofia née Mikulinska, wife of Jermolaj Meleszko, in Vinnytsia Castle. These had included Sigismund Augustus’ charter to Jermolaj Meleszko for the Zalesie property (see the Meleszko family), which Zofia had held in her widowhood. Semen declared the loss of Sigismund Augustus’ charter issued to him from Vilnius in 1566 for “his perpetual reinstatement to his ancestral lands in the territory of Bratslav,” that is to Gusakowcy [Husakowce], Nosowcy [Nosowce], Minderewku [Skinderówka], Czeremosznoie [Czeremoszne], Derenkowcy [Derenkowiec], Tymoszkow [Tymoszków], Karpow [Karpów], Batow [Batoń], half...
of Kalikiczi [Kalicyńce], and Jastowiec. It was no doubt the loss of these documents that caused the delay in the proceedings renewed by the Zasławskis, since Semen was not able to present the original deed of 1566, which had been destroyed in the fire of 1580.

The new proceedings started in 1584, on the initiative of Prince Janusz Januszewicz Zasławski. On 25 September the territorial court (Pol. sąd ziemski) of Bratslav served another “notice” on Hrehory and Semen. One of the signatories to this warning letter was Ivan Koszka, who held the office of justice (Pol. sędzia ziemski, Lat. terrestrial judex) at the time and was a kinsman of the Słupica through the Krasnosiecki and Diakowski families through his wife, Nastazja Krasnosiecka, daughter of Vasil and Nastazja née Diakowska. The content in this summons was basically a repetition of the previous one, of 1581. Zaslawski said that the disputed property was “his own, inherited, and patrimonial.” The sum he now claimed in damages had shot up to 2640 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (158,400 Lithuanian groats). From the statement made by Fedor Bratkowski, court beadle, on the following day (26 September) before the court of Bratslav Castle, he had served the summons on Hrehory Ždan “in his house which he has in the town of Bratslav.” The fact that Hrehory now lived in town was no doubt connected with his office (as of 1583), of district deputy sub-chamberlain (Pol. komornik ziemski) of Bratslav, which meant that he had to perform many of the duties of the deputy chamberlain (Pol. podkomorzy, Lat. subcamerarius), Ławryn Piasczyński, who was often out of town. Bratkowski did not deliver the summons addressed to Semen Bohdanowicz until 5 December 1584, as related in his report entered in the registers of the castle court of Bratslav on 4 April 1585. We do not know


102 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI/49 (original in Ruthenian script and its Polish copy) = ASang., t. 205/23 (digest).

103 On the Diakowski family see Chapter 6/C/3: 320-23.

104 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI/49 (Polish copy), t. XVI/50 (original in Ruthenian script) = ASang., t. 205/23 (digest): here 28 September 1584.

105 See chapter 2/B/6: 156 and notes.

106 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI A/10 (the 16-th century Polish copy) = ASang., t. 205/23 (digest).
what caused the delay, especially as the court beadle left the summons "in the house of the said Lord Semen Słupica which he has in the town of Bratslav."

The most likely reason why both Semen and Hrehory the Słupicas were living in town at the time, apart from Hrehory's office, would have been the Tartar incursion of 1584, during which the Kuna estate may have suffered serious damage. This hypothesis is substantiated by an analogous move of the Koszka family into town (Bratslav and Vinnytsia) at around the same time.

This time again the Słupica family does not seem to have been very worried by Prince Janusz Zasławski's complaint. He and his brother Michał served another summons on them issued by the territorial court of Bratslav on 1 July 1585. This document repeated the content of the earlier writs. It determined that the sum of damages the Zasławskis claimed, 2640 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (158,400 Lithuanian groats), was the amount due as computed from the time of their father's death in 1562. This time the obstacle to a conclusive close to the proceedings were "the numerous instances of territorial court sessions not being held in Bratslav for reasons of other judicial circumstances occurring in the Kingdom of Poland." Semen Bohdanowicz made use of the delay to repair the damage done to the Kuna estate due to Tartar forays.

5. The Partitioning of the Słupicas Properties, their Allocation to Hrehory Ždan and Semen Bohdanowicz (1592), and the Renewal of Litigation against the Zasławskis (1592-96).

On 4 November 1592 Hrehory Ždan [IV/3], by then already judge of the castle court of Bratslav (Pol. sędzia grodzki, Lat. iudex castrensis), and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] the Słupicas, appeared before the court of Bratslav Castle to make a perpetual partition of their hereditary lands. The allocation of the estate left

---

107 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI A/10.
109 APKr.: ASang., t. XVI A/40.
110 See Chapter 4/1: 199-203 on sloboda ("free settlement") in Kuna in 1590.
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by Bohdan Słupicz in 1552, which turned out not to have been partitioned off from
the rest of the family’s real property, followed by the efforts to recuperate it, had
taken up many years – up to 1566, and de facto up to 1575 (and 1585 in the case of
Semen). There are no data available to make an estimate of the financial costs, but
the expenses they had incurred to retrieve their patrimony must certainly have been
very high. No doubt the financial aspect also had some bearing on Hrehory’s and
Semen’s decision to split up their holdings officially. Unfortunately, neither the
original document relating to the partition, nor its entry into the registers has
survived. It is known only from the digests in the collection of documents relating
to the Słupicas’ properties. Semen, the representative of the “senior” line,
received the town of Kuna and Kunka, Nosowce, and Hubnik, places described in
the deed as “on the left hand of the Boh, downstream,” along with their
adjacencies. Hrehory’s portion consisted of:

Rosolínce [Rolińce] and Zachody, with all of their component parts, that is Połoska
up to half the width of the River Boh, Trościaniec up to half the width of the River
Batoh, Batoh cum attinentiis, Derenkowiec wood, and Kalinczynec
[Kaliczyniec].

The parties decided on an indemnity deposit of 5 thousands kopas of Lithuanian
groszs (300,000 Lithuanian groats) in the event of a breach of contract. Thus
Semen, younger by age but representing the “senior” branch of the family and its
prospective head, received the major share of the Kuna estate (its left-bank part),
along with the top margin of the Trościaniec estate. Hrehory’s holding comprised
the relatively small section of the Kuna estate on the right bank of the Boh, and the
major part of the Trościaniec estate.

The registration of the partition brought about an immediate reaction from
the Zasławskis. Henceforth virtually every court transaction involving either of the
Słupicas or one of their relatives instigated a Zasławski counteraction, usually in
the form of yet another writ rehearsing the Zasławski claim to Kuna. Until the
death of Prince Michał in 1587, the two sons of Janusz, Princes Janusz and Michał

111 ZDz., 1894 20: 106 (digest) = APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23.
112 ZDz., 1894 20: 106.
the Zasiawskis, acted jointly. Thereafter Prince Janusz, later Voivode of Podlachia (as of 1591), continued on his own, until the final conclusion of proceedings in 1622. On 13 December 1592, on the petition of Prince Janusz Zaslawski, the office of Bratslav territorial court served the first of a new series of summonses, addressed to both Semen and Hrehory the Słupicas. In this document they were called the “unlawful and violent tenants” of the Kuna properties. The new ingredient was a higher sum of damages demanded – 6200 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (372,000 Lithuanian groats) instead of fixe 2640 claimed before. Prince Janusz also had a more detailed account of the particulars drawn up for the Słupicas restoration procedures after 1566.

The summons, which was issued in two copies, read as follows:

Whereas the present Lord Voivode of Podlachia [Prince Janusz Zaslawski] and his younger brother Prince Michail [Michał] the Zaslawskis were lately orphaned by their father in their minority . . . and were in the care of sundry guardians, Heorhei known as Ždan Słupica unlawfully but forcibly entered the said properties and usurped all of the revenues to be had therefrom. First on his own until the year 1575, and thereafter together with Semen Słupica, who accompanied his paternal uncle the said Heorhi known as Ždan Słupica, they did unlawfully and forcibly enter the said properties and did jointly usurp all of their revenues unto themselves until last year, that is 1585 after the birth of Our Lord Jesus Christ Son of God...

Hrehory’s summons was handed over to him “in his own house” in Bratslav. Semen Bohdanowicz collected his summons personally, but the court beadle gave no particulars in his report as to where the service was made. This was the last set of writs served on Hrehory and Semen jointly. The next one, dated December 1596, was addressed to the sons of Semen Słupica, wards of Ivan Meleszko. Since

---

113 Prince Janusz Januszewicz became the Voivode of Podlachia (Pol. Podlasie; north-eastern part of the Crown) on 18 March 1591; on 10 April 1604 he got promotion to the Volhynia Voivodeship, on which magistracy he remained until his death in 1629.
114 APKr.: ASang., t. XIX/61: here the date 6 December 1592 = ASang., t. 205/23 (digest): here the date 13 December 1592.
115 Three days later (15/16 December) the court beadle Jacko Szikilowski entered to the Bratslav castle registers an account of the delivery of a copy of summonses, an official action which he had performed witnessed by two nobleman Walenty Werbski and Wojciech Beniaszewski (APKr.: ASang., t. XIX/61: here the date 15 December 1592 = ASang., t. 205/23 [digest]: here the date 16 December 1592).
neither Hrehory Ždan nor Semen Bohdanowicz appear in any of the subsequent source materials, one may infer that they must have died during one of the anti-Tartar campaigns, prior to 8 December 1596 (the date of this summons).

In 1592 Hrehory and Semen the Słupicas appeared jointly in just one other case not connected with the Zasławskis. On 7 July Owdotia Komarowa Wereyska, daughter of Bohusz [Komar] Sutyski, registered a deed of alienation for the benefit of her husband Jan Wereyski, concluded on 2 July, in the court register of Bratslav Castle. The property she transferred comprised the Sutyska estate, situated south-east of Vinnytsia, along with its appended villages and settlements, that is the villages of Sutyska alias Sutyski, Witawa, Jankow, Tywrow (later seat of one of the branches of the Jaroszyński family), Szersznie, Borsuki, Majanów, Woroszyłowce, and the country residence (Pol. döwór) at Sutyska. The name of Hrehory Ždan Słupica, Bratslav castle court judge, occurs among the officials receiving the entry into the register. The fairly long list of witnesses includes Michajlo Januszewicz Dołżki [Dołżski] Hulewicz, Awram Soszkowski, Andriej Hrybunowicz Czeczel, Juchno [Iwanowicz] Krasnosielski, Bohdan Kozar [Oblinski], who is described as the former Bratslav castle judge, and Semen Slupica. The presence of Semen in this list alongside Kozar and Krasnosielski is an indication of the family and property associations between them and the Żytynski alias Žityński, who are not mentioned on the list, but were Słupica clients from the late 16th century onwards.

117 CDIAUK: F. 49 op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 120, f. 112-121 (Genealogy and digest of the Komar Sutyski family privileges from the 16th century onwards), here f. 112-113v.

118 On the Żytynski see Chapter 6/C/2: 313-15. In the document of 1592 appeared among others, the paternal uncle of Owdotia Bohuszówna Komarowa Sutyska - Nikifor Komar, and her aunt „Pani [Lady] Nikiforowa Tyszczyna Maria Komarówna”. It was the said aunt, who on 26 June 1600 entered to the Crown Tribunal registers in Lublin, in the series of Kyiv Voivodeship cases, an act regarding estates in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, which she had inherited from her mother Anna Siemaszkówna (of the Siemaszczyz). These were the following villages: Sutyski, Tywrów, Witawa, Hublin, Czunkowo [Dziunków], Wontakow, Jankow, Majanow, Szersznie and Woroszyłow. On that day she resigned them on behalf of her son Jan (Ivan) Żytyński in 3 thousands kopas of Lithuanian groszs (ZDz., 1896 21: 61: here as „Nikonowa Tyszczyna Marya Komarowska”). On the following day (27 June) also at Lublin Ivan Żytyński got a verdict in the case he had put in action against Janowa Wereyska (wife of Jan Wereyski) Owdotia of the Komars regarding the division of the mentioned above villages from the Sutyski estate. He based his title to these properties on the legacies from his mother and aunt (ZDz., 1896 21: 63). For the continuation of the family divisions
In 1545 the Komar family had been mentioned, along with the Kozar, among the “lesser” gentry of Bratslav Castle, tenants of the village of Strzeleczyńce on the Boh, situated somewhat upstream from the Koszka tenancy, Rohozna. In time the Komar acquired Sutyska alias Sutyski (1569), Janków (1590), and other properties. By the early 17th century the Komar family owned the larger part of the Sutyska estate, encompassing all the villages enumerated in the document under discussion. They also held Dziunków at the confluence of the Kojanka with the River Roś, and Hubin at the source of the Deśnica, a tributary of the Boh. By that time the family had already split up into three branches: the Komar of Strzeleczyńce (the Strzelczynski), Komar of Sutyska (Sutyski), and the Komar of Janków (Jankowski). However, before they managed to acquire the greater part of the Sutyska estate, from ca. 1569 they had been engaged in litigation against the “parties” to these properties, the Hulewicz, Żityński, Obodeński, Łozka, Koszka, and Krasnosielski families.

6. Semen Bohdanowicz’s Marriage and his Effort to Enlarge his Hereditary Estate by Acquiring the Properties Ładyżyn (Inherited from the Korotki Family) and Oblin (a Kozar Legacy).

Regarded as a traitor’s son, Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] did not have an easy life at first. He took no part in public life, concentrating instead on the restoration of his ruined estate. Since his only sibling was an older sister, Marusza, Semen had to bear the full burden of restoration. Marusza does not appear in the documents until 1615, when she is mentioned with her sons from her marriage to Ivan Łysohorski. As I have already written, the choice of a wife for Semen was
undoubtedly determined by Hrehory Bohuszewicz, whose sister Źdanna was married (before 1551) to Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosielski. The bride was Owdotia (Eudoksja) Krasnosielska, daughter of Juchno [Iwanowicz] Krasnosielski and his wife of the Korotki family. We do not know the exact date of Semen and Owdotia’s marriage, but it must have been before 1592, since Hubnik, part of the Oblin estate and a legacy from the Kozar family, is mentioned in Semen’s portion of the Słupicas properties.

Juchno Iwanowicz Krasnosielski of the arms of Prus I was the brother of Roman Iwanowicz, which meant that the Słupica and Krasnosielski families were now linked by two marriages. Apart from Owdotia, Juchno and his wife had five surviving sons, Danilo, Dimitr, Michał, Ivan, and Hrehory. There is also a possibility of a third marriage between the Krasnosielski and Słupica families – between Michał’s daughter Marusza (Marianna) and Tychon [VI/3], the younger of Semen Bohdanowicz’s sons, whom the earlier researchers had regarded as unmarried. Any way she took no part in the future legal proceedings following Tychon’s death in 1615. Owdotia survived both her sons, Matiasz [VI/2] and Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], and died around 1617. While passing away she was survived by the Słupica family’s sole contender for the maintenance of the ancestral estates, her daughter Halszka [VI/1], who was married to Vasil Rohozinski.

6. a. The Ładyżyn Property, the Korotki Family Legacy.

In my account of the Korotki and Kozar families, and the disputes between the heirs to their estates, I would have to rely chiefly on the later digests and before the case of restitution emerged. On her marriage to Ivan Łysohorski and her sons see Chapter 6/D/1: 323-28.

124 The deceased ca. 1603 Michal Krasnosielski left a son, Alexander (who died without offspring), and five daughters: Olena, Lubka, Raina, Marusza alias Marianna and Anna. Of these, Olena and Anna with were married two times. The first one to Semen Juszkowski and Piotr Słonicewski, the second to Jan Wargocki and Jan Leonowicz.
125 On the Rohozinski see Chapter 6/D/2: 329-34.
transcripts, and their interpretations by earlier researchers, especially Rulikowski, who had access to no longer extant archives. Bohusz Daniłowicz, the last male descendant of the Korotki family by his marriage to the Princess Zbaraska had two daughters, Duchna and Marusza. Authors' opinions differ as to the marriages of these two heiresses. According to Boniecki, Marusza married Juchno Iwanowicz Krasnosiecki, who received the villages of Wasylówka and Michałówka by way of dowry. Their children were Owdotia, future wife of Semen Bohdanowicz, and five sons (as listed above). In the opinion of Uruski, Juchno married Marusza's sister Duchna, while Marusza married Roman Żytyński. Rolle concurs with this view, and also argues that Owdotia was Żytyński's daughter. Rulikowski and Wolff also follow the argument that Duchna was the wife of Juchno Krasnosiecki, while Marusza was Roman Żytyński's wife. Thus, they accept that Duchna, not Marusza, was the mother of Owdotia and her four (not five) brothers. The relatively abundant material concerning the Krasnosiecki family and their part in the family property, which I shall discuss below, show that Marusza was indeed the wife of Roman Żytyński.

The Korotki or Korotko family, whose origins are not known, but whom Wolff describes as "pseudo-princes," owned an extensive stretch of land along both banks of the Boh near the confluences of the Sielnica and Sob, centred (in the mid-16th century) in the small town of Ładyżyn. According to Jablonowski the

---

126 While writing his essay Rulikowski used "the summary digest of court cases" related to the estates of the Korotki, Kozar and Słupica families, which was in the collection of Konstanty Świdziński in Sulgostów, and a set of documents regarding the Korotkos' properties from the domestic archives of Wacław Borejko in Samostrzaly (Trusiewicz, 1870: 302 note 77, 321 note 91). See also Palaski, F. 1909. Spory o bibliotekę i zapis Konstantego Świdzińskiego. Warsaw n.p.
127 Boniecki, 1908 12: 226.
129 Rollezdziejdw, 1890: 9-10; HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1.
130 Trusiewicz, 1870: 303; WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 661. See also on the Żytyńskis Chapter 6/C/2: 313-15.
131 In the opinion of these authors Marusza Romanowa Żytyńska left a son and two daughters, Katarzyna married Polocznia, and the unknown by name wife of Kondrat Kozar (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 661). See below B/6b: 275 and note 167, p. 275.
133 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 660-61; ZDz., 1897: 22: 277, 603, 607, 728. Wolff was of the opinion that Rulikowski made a mistake by regarding the Korotkos as a princely family. According to him this scholar misinterpreted genealogical information offered by Wieladko, and concerning the wife
Korotki family acquired Ładyżyn by purchase from the Ladyzyński family. Indirect confirmation of this comes from the entry of the perpetual conveyance (sale) into the register at Bratslav by Roman Ladyzyński and his wife Lubka née Jesmanówna (of the Jesmans, the Krasnosielski's ancestors) on 4 April 1509 (?). Thereby Ladyzyński and his wife sold the patrimonial village of Plisków in the Powiat of Bratslav to Semen Juchnowicz Koszka. The witnesses to the conveyance were [Prince] Semen Fedorowicz Czetwertyński, Hrehory Głuski (Hluski, the current plenipotentiary for the starosty of Bratslav), Stecko Shupica [III/1], and “Pan (Lord) Korotki,” who may only be identified with Bohusz. A “Pan Korotki” (no doubt again Bohusz) testified once more at Bratslav in 1510. Afterwards Fedor Korotkowicz and his brother attended the popis registration of 1545 in the Bratslav Castle.

By the close of the 16th century the 30 settlements in the Ładyżyn estate were being referred to, as the “the Korotkos’ fortune” (Pol. “fotruna Korotkowska”). According to Rulikowski it was made up of a complex of properties stretching for miles and miles along the Boh, Sob, and Silnia [Sielnica]. The master of this vast territory was Danilo Korotki, father of Bohusz and Olechno. This Bohusz was the grandfather of Owdotia, wife of Semen Bohdanowicz Shupica [V/1]. In 1565, apart from the Ładyżyn estate, the Korotko family also held the tenancy of the crown estate (Pol. królewszczyzna) of...
Hrobowce in the part of Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland. In 1569 in Bratslav, Olechno [Daniłowicz] Korotkij of Tryizby, husband of Bohdana née Szandyrowska, took the oath of allegiance to the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania. By the time of Semen and Owdotia’s marriage the Korotko family’s heyday was just a distant memory. Their economic decline was caused chiefly by the Tartar incursions of the 1580’s, just as happened with the Słupicas and Krasnosielskis. Still in 1579 Roman and Juchno (sons of Ivan) the Krasnosielskis had partitioned between themselves the vast fortune they had inherited from their father Ivan. Roman’s portion included Krasneńskie, Krynkowce, Wasyłówka, and Koziniec. Juchno received Olbaczów (alias Łobaczów) and Trynożyn (later known as Piatyhory). But already in 1595, owing to the devastation their property had sustained from Tartar raids, the brothers of Owdotia, wife of Semen Słupica [V/1], were obliged to sell their patrimonial lands of Olbaczów and Trynożyn for a modest sum of just 18 kopas of Lithuanian grosze (1,080 Lithuanian groats) to Prince Janusz Ostrogski, Castellan of Cracow.

The long-lasting disputes over the estate left by Owdotia’s grandfather, Bohusz Daniłowicz Korotki, started soon after his death. The Słupica family were to have a part in them. On his marriage to Owdotia, Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] assumed her legal claim and titles, which went further than what he was able to secure. What he most wanted was the “quarter” portion of the Korotki estate neighbouring on the Kuna, Trościaniec, and Klebań properties. It was a large and, most importantly, settled stretch of the Ladyżyń estate. Bohusz may well have

---

140 Founded in the 16th century the village of Hrobowce in the Powiat of Latyczów in the Crown Podolia was mentioned as royal tenancy (Pol. królewszczyzna) in the inspection registers (Pol. Inustracja) of 1615 and 1629 (KrykunKil’kist’, 2002: 495).
142 They did not spare even the well-fortified Olbaczów, the Krasnosielski property, which was situated in the midst of forests.
143 See also below note 149, p. 271.
144 In the Rolle’s opinion Bohusz Daniłowicz Korotki made a last will, according to which large part of his property was to be given to his granddaughter Owdotia. This was done, because of lack of issue from his brothers. However, because the author has taken Owdotia for Roman Żytyński’s daughter, he was mistaken also in regard to her brothers. Of the five sons of Juchno [Iwanowicz] Krasnosielski, only Danilo died without issue (RolleZdziejow, 1890: 9 and passim).
left a clause in his will in Owdotia’s favour over her brothers (as Rolle suggests), which would explain their reluctance to delimit the customary “quarter” (Pol. czwarczna) due to their sister. However, the transaction Hrehory Olechnowicz Korotki made in 1595 with his relative Prince Zbaraski casts doubt on the “attractiveness” of the Korotki inheritance. At any rate, Semen’s endeavours came almost to nothing. By involving himself and his wife in protracted litigation he only aggravated the demanding condition of his hereditary lands, which had been severely devastated by Tartar raids. Irrefutable evidence for this is provided in a 1612 record of the condition of the Kuna estate had been in when his heirs inherited it in their minority (1596). However, we cannot clear all the ambiguities, as there are no original documents extant.

The already described conveyance made by the heirs of Juchno Krasnosielski to Prince Ostrogski, in 1595, provided the overture to the many years of litigation to follow. A second cause of the court disputes was Hrehory Olechnowicz Korotki’s sale in the same year of the major part of the Ladyżyn estate to Prince Janusz Zbaraski. Owdotia’s brothers made a vast stretch of

---

145 In accordance with the Crown regulations in the case of death of a father his sons were obliged to respect the dowry, which had been fixed by him on behalf of his daughter or daughters. If the father had managed to give in marriage one of the daughters before he died, her brothers were to provide for other daughters dowries, the latter being equal with the one of already married sister. At any rate the brothers (if it was their decision to fix the amount of dowry) had to decide on dowry(ies) during a year from their father’s death. In the case when a father had not fixed the dowry before he died (for example died intestate) the First Lithuanian Statute (1529) stated that his sons were to offer their sister(s) the so-called “quarter” (Pol. czwarczna), means the quarter part from the paternal estates. This rule was to work irrespectively to the fact if there was one daughter or more. Thus, the sons had to offer their sisters dowries in the amount decided by their father or, if there was no father’s will in the amount equal to the quarter part of paternal property. In the Second and Third Lithuanian Statute (1566, 1588) the sons were permitted not to pay dowries accordingly to their father’s will. If they concluded that the dowry designated by the father was too large they could have change it in favour of the “quarter”, which might have been less than the original dowry. The same rule worked in the case when the “quarter” trespassed the total amount of money reserved by the father for all dowries to be paid to his daughters. The Statute stressed however, that brothers or paternal uncles were to pay back all what they had lost while being ladies guardians (Dąbkowski, Przemysław. 1910. Prawo prywatne Polskie. (Vol. 1) L’viv: Nakładem Towarzystwa dla Popierania Nauki Polskiej. Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego) pod zarządem J. Filipowskiego. Here 387-412: Chapter VI [The Martial Law], sub-chapter 3 [The term of rules of dowry], and especially 394-95 on czwarczna).

146 See Chapter 6/A/2: 287.

147 Accordingly to Rulikowski it took place already in ca. 1615 (Trusiewicz, 1870: 313).

148 Boniecki, 1907 11:165.
steppe along the Svarna along with the Oblin property they had inherited from the Kozar family, part of the conveyance to Prince Ostrogski, alongside the lands inherited from their father. The transaction was concluded with no “quarter” partition set aside for Owdotia from the patrimonial lands. Thereupon, supported by her husband, Owdotia instituted proceedings for the “quarter” due to her, which her successors (namely her daughter Halszka Rohozinska [VI]) continued.\(^{149}\)

On 11 January 1596 a conveyance dated 30 June 1595, was recorded in the castle court registers of Vinnytsia, whereby Hrehory Olechnowicz Korotki sold Prince Janusz Zbaraski for 200 *kopas* of Lithuanian *groszy* (12,000 Lithuanian grosz) some villages he had inherited in the Voivodeship of Bratslav: *Bohusza* [Bohusze], *Michałowce* [Michalkowce], *Strumiatynce* [Strelatyńce], *Katurzyn*, *Kołaszyński* and *Nakiszynce* [Skaszyniec], along with half of his lands in *Stawy*, and *Hnyła Ruda* and *Besedki*, which he had earlier purchased from Roman Ladyzyhski.\(^{150}\) The remaining parties to the Korotko’s properties almost immediately contested this conveyance, because at the time of sale, the estate had not yet been partitioned. Therefore, Hrehory Olechnowicz was bound by Zbaraski to appear in court within 10 years of the transaction “which had been conducted

\(^{149}\) In the Princess Sanguszko archives (APKr.: ASang., t. 207/22) is preserved among other documents the 17\(^{th}\) century (the exact date of its drawing up is unknown) register of the family estates of Prince Dominik of Ostrog Zaslawski which were situated in the Bratslav Voivodeship and which caused some controversies with Zaslawski’s immediate neighbours. There is to be found the following note: “Town of Lobaczow [Olbaczow], Town of Pethory [Piatyhory]: This ground on which the said town was founded, got the Late Highness Lord of Cracow [= Castellan of Cracow, Janusz Ostrogski] from the Lords Krasnosielski. Although, they declared this resignation officially in the court […], yet Lady [Halszka] Wasilowa Rohozinska née Shipiczanka, the one born of [Owdotia] Krasnosielska, and the sister of these Krasnosielski, who had sold their estates to the Prince, she summons them now on pretext of an unpaid dowry after her mother.” The claims to these estates were transferred after Halszka Rohozinska [VI/1] to one of her sons Adrian, who left two daughters, one of which was Zuzanna married to Jan Glinka Wolski with whom she had a daughter Halszka. The latter became the wife of Jan Borejko, the sub-bearer (Pol. *podczaszy*, Lat. *pocillator*) of Smolensk. As from this union came 6 daughters ana a son, Pawel Felicjan, the inheritance passed next to the Borejkos. In the 18\(^{th}\) century, they were succeeded by the Świdziński, Narbut and Puszkowski families, which supported the same claims. From the part of the Ostrogskis in the line of succession were: Zaslawski, Sanguszko, Denhoff, Ledóchowski and Ostrowski families. In 1797 Wincenty Rohoziński, a successor to Vasil, but different than Halszka Semenówna’s husband also Vasil [VI/1], bought from Tomasz Ostrowski the Trynożyn estate, which long ago has been known under the name of Piatyhory. It was Ostrowski who represented the direct line of succession of Halszka and Vasil the Rohoziński. In turn, Wincenty’s grandson Władysław sold Piatyhory in 1858 (SłownGeogr., 1884 V: 669, 1887 VIII: 62-63).

\(^{150}\) See Chapter 2/B/2: 103-04, 105 and note 85, p. 105.
solely on the grounds of his declaration of tenure, and regulate his liabilities”. On
the very same day, 11 January 1596, another conveyance by Hrehory Olechnowicz
to Prince Zbaraski was registered in Vinnytsia. This deed concerned the
settlements of Tryizby, Michalewka, Szurutow [Strutow?], Supiatow, and Ladyżyn
on the Sob and Boh, along with the wildernesses (meadows) Woronowa Łuka and
Kijowiec, which were conveyed for the sum of 400 kopas of Lithuanian groszs
(24,000 Lithuanian groats).[^151] The reason for the sale seems to have been the
devastation of most of these properties by Tartar raids. As Ivan Samczyński wrote
in a letter to Prince Zbaraski, Korotki had been “very much impoverished on
account of the Tartar incursions.”[^152]

In the opinion of Rulikowski, who does not cite a date for this transaction,
the deed of perpetual partition of the Korotko inheritance left just a portion –
Michalkowce, half of Wasilówka, and half of the town of Ladyżyn – to the
successors of Bohusz Daniłowicz Korotki: the sons of Duchna from her marriage
with Juchno Krasnosieński, and the daughter of Zytynski, who married Kondrat
Kozar. Prince Janusz Zbaraski had, already bought up all the rest, 25 villages and
half of Ladyżyn.[^153] Thus, it appears that the perpetual partition must have been
accomplished soon after 1596, and that Prince Zbaraski enforced it on the
remaining parties. What may be said to the credit of the Lord Voivode of Bratslav
(Zbaraski) is the fact that, the deed for the transaction contained a clear and
accurate description of the extent of the properties. It involved also a record that
Hrehory Olechnowicz had no issue, and that the other claimants to the inheritance

[^151] ZDz., 1894 20: 120-21; Trusiewicz, 1870: 303-04. The price of 200 kopas of Lithuanian groszs
was calculated “counting each grosz of 10 White Money, and in one three-scores of 60 groszs.”
[^152] Trusiewicz, 1870: 304; ZDz., 1894 20: 120: here Bohusza, Michalkowce, Strelatyńce,
Kołaszynki, Skaszyniec, Hnila Ruda and Biesiadki.
[^153] Trusiewicz, 1870: 308-10 and note 81. In Rulikowski’s opinion they were to be: Tryizby,
Bohusze, Strymiatyńce, Katarzyn, Nakiszyńce, Kijowiec, Besedki, Hnyła Ruda with grounds and
meadows and Zanowo, Dwomy, Drohuszów, Miśkow, Supiąłów, Stawy, Serednik, Biłaszków,
Siemiankowce, Karadzyn, Mały Dolżek, Woronia Łuka with grounds, settlements, and old
settlements (Pol. horodzyszcz), “in which as his own [Prince Zbaraski] would be free to erect
castles and build manors, settled down towns, villages and settlements and populate their
meadows.” While writing this he author must have been of use of annihilated documents from the
domestic archives in Kuna.
had all become impoverished. But again Owdotia was passed over in this partition as well. Any realistic chance Semen Słupica and his wife had, to secure their portion of the inheritance, dwindled down to a potential, meagre share in the villages of Michalkowce and Wasyłówka, and half of Ładyżyn. But by the late 1620’s part of Wasyłówka and Michalkowce were in the hands of Mikołaj and Dimitr the Krasnośielskis and other parties, which meant that the Słupica family had gained nothing on the partitioning of the Korotki inheritance.

After her husband’s death (1596), Owdotia renewed the proceedings lodged by the Korotki heirs against Prince Zbaraski for the restitution of unlawfully acquired property belonging to her (1610). She claimed the property, which had been her mother’s estate inherited from the Korotki family. On 7 August 1612 the castle court of Bratslav issued its verdict in the case brought by Owdotia née Krasnośielka, widow of Semen Słupica, the Krasnośielskis, Żytynskis, and other plaintiffs. Owdotia had yet again claimed a “quarter” to be apportioned to her from the Korotki estate. The verdict gave a clear definition of that “quarter,” showing the progress that had been made in the settlement of the Ladyżyn estate. The lands in question covered

154 Trusiewicz, 1870: 308-10 and note 81. A description of the borders of grounds sold by Hrechory Olechnowicz encompassed also the following: „passing across the Wasiłówka River, through the said river of Wasiłówka, continue straight ahead through the field to the Bachmatówka Valley. Next, going down behind this valley as far as the mouth of the said Wasiłówka River, where it flows into the Silnica. Afterwards, so far as to the mouth of the Olszanka River, where on the other bank the said Olszanka River flows into the Silnica. From the mouth of the Olszanka continue upstream along this river. Here on both banks of the said river free possibility for inundation of ponds has been granted [to all parties], so far as the village of Jarmolince and the Słupiczanka border. To the right from Michałówka and Wasiłówka, and to the left from Ładyżyn, the settlement of Bilousówka and the village of Michalkowce, all the ground is to be encompassed within these borders.” Accordingly to SlownGeogr. the transaction concluded by Hrechory Olechnowicz and Jerzy Zbaraski was to take place already in 1610 (SlownGeogr., 1883 IV: 875).

155 ZDz., 1896 21: 555 (digest).
the settlement in Tryizby, the village of Michalewka, Bohusza, Michałowce, the settlement Stremiatyniec, Nataszyn, Huszkiszynice, the town of Ładyżyn, the settlements Gnila Ruda, Bezedki, Zbinów, Dworne, Drahusów, Minków, Supiatów, Jamna, Bełaszków, Semenkowce, Karadyń, Besiadki, Dolżek Wałaski, Worona Łuka, and Kijewiec.\textsuperscript{158}

However, we do not know how the case came to an end. The subsequent transactions concluded between the heiresses of the Słupica family (Marusza Mikołajewna née Diakowska, the widow of Jurij Hryhorowicz [V/6] or Fedora Dmityewna [VI/5], the wife of Alexander Kruszelnicki) with the Princes Zbaraski, as well as the delimitation decree of 1629 suggest that the closure of proceedings was a failure for the petitioners.\textsuperscript{159}

6.b. The Oblin Estate, a Kozar Legacy.

Like the Korotki, the Kozar family have been classified by Wolff as “pseudo-princes.”\textsuperscript{160} Contrary to Rulikowski’s opinion, there is nothing in the documents to confirm their princely origins. Their name is mentioned among the “lesser gentry” of Bratslav for 1545.\textsuperscript{161} Wolff reconstructed a framework family tree for them on the grounds of the Lutsk deeds for 1645. According to this testimonial Hrehory Kozar laid the foundations of the family through his marriage to the sister and sole successor of Constantine alias Kostia Koszylowicz, who had been killed by the Tartars.\textsuperscript{162} The declaration presented by the Kozar family said that Kostia Koszylowicz had held his endowments through the Grand Duke Vitold and King Jan (John) Olbracht.\textsuperscript{163} There is a Kostia Kozar, perhaps the son of Hrehory,

\textsuperscript{158} ZDz., 1896 21: 555.
\textsuperscript{159} For both ladies and their transactions with the Zbaraskis see Chapter 6/A/4a: 291-95 (Marusza Zablocka) and 6/A/4b: 295-98 (Marusza Dziuszy). On the decree of 1629 see Chapter 6/D/3b: 366-67 and note 330, p. 367.
\textsuperscript{160} See above B/6a: 267 and note 133, pp. 267-68. ZDz. 1877 6: 118.
\textsuperscript{161} WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 662.
\textsuperscript{163} WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 662. According to Rulikowski who based his statement on the Volhynian Metrica record (see above notes 99, p. 258 and 162, p. 274) Kostia Koszylowicz was a direct ancestor of Kondrat and Bohdan the Kozars and took his name after the “Koszylów settlements” („sieliszcze Koszylowskie”), which were situated not far from Kulnik. It was on their
registered in the *popis* record of 1545 drawn up at Bratslav Castle register. The next member of the family portrayed in the documents is Kondrat Kozar. His succession to the office of castle judge of Bratslav in 1572, following Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosielski, is no coincidence. His son Bohdan Kondratowicz (ca. 1589) whose successor was in turn Hrehory Żdan Słupica [IV/3] (1592) replaced him in the magistracy. On 3 February 1581 Kondrat (or more precisely his son Bohdan acting as his proxy), presented a declaration to the General *Sejm* at Warsaw, alongside a crowded group of landed gentry of Bratslav, stating that they had lost the deeds to their hereditary property during a fire in Vinnytsia Castle. Earlier (13 October 1580) Kondrat had made a similar declaration in the court registers of Bratslav Castle. The documents which perished included deeds for *Oblin, Paszkowce, Sawran, Besidki, Koraczowce, Derenkowce, Koszyłowce* etc.

This declaration implied that Kondrat had been the master of the major part of the Oblin estate.

Kondrat’s wife was the daughter of Roman Żytyński and Marusza née Korotkówna (of the Korotko family). Their son Bohdan Kondratowicz was killed in 1598. In the same and following year, the Juchnowicz Krasnosielskis, Owdotia’s brothers and guardians of Bohdan’s widow and children, were considering instituting court proceedings against the other contender for the Kozar

grounds wherein the famous connected with Tartar raids moulds (= tombs) called *Soroka, Napromacha and Prakseda* were placed (Trusiewicz, 1870: 307).

Trusiewicz, 1870: 307-08. The author quotes a claimant entered to the Crown Metrica registers in Warsaw. It is impossible that Kostia Koszyłowicz was endowed both by Vitold (d. 1430) and Jan (John) Olbracht, who ruled in 1492-1501, as comes out from the Rulikowski’s text. Of all likelihood Jan Olbracht only confirmed him the earlier endowment from Vitold to his ancestors. See notes 99, p. 258, p. 162, p. 258 and 162, p. 274.

See Chapter 2/B/6: 158 and note 236, p. 158, above the note 99, p. 258 and NykierBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B. See also Fig. No. 6.
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the Zbaraski princely family. Meanwhile yet another rival petitioner emerged to challenge the Zbaraski claim to the Kozar inheritance – Prince Joachim [Bohuszewicz] Korecki. On 29 July 1599 the complaint by the heirs of Kondrat Kozar against Prince Joachim Korecki for the expulsion for the Kozar family from Oblin and Charpak, was heard before the Lublin Crown Tribunal. The court ordered the plaintiffs to present their charters of tenancy for Oblin, but judged in Korecki’s favour over the village of Charpak and its appended uninhabited lands. Prince Korecki had managed to present the required deed for this property: the charter issued by Sigismund Augustus to Kondrat Kozar, claiming that the latter had ceded this property to him (Korecki). In response the Kozar family accused Korecki of having killed their brother-in-law at Belilowka. They claimed also, that Korecki’s servant had then removed the deed from the dead man’s body. Thus, Kondrat’s heirs said there were no grounds for Korecki’s argument that Kondrat had left him (Korecki) a legacy.

We do not know whether Kondrat’s daughters managed to disprove Korecki’s claims to Oblin. However, they retained their portions in their father’s estate, since in 1605 Maria Goliszewska, wife of Stanisław, ceded her share of Koszylów and Oleszkowce, “and half the Rivers Soroka and Doszka,” to her sister Owdotia and brother-in-law Kulczycki. A year later (1606) Kulczycki and his wife lodged a complaint against another magnate, Kalinowski, for expelling them from Owdotia’s hereditary property, the villages of Michałówka and

---

168 WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 661, 662. Apart from the aforementioned son Bohdan, also daughter Maria married to Stanisław Goliszewski and Eudoksja, wife of one Kulczycki (Boniecki, 1908 12: 46) was their descendant. As Rulikowski states Lady Kondratowa Kozarowa (wife of Kondrat) had also a brother and a sister Katarzyna Połoczyna (wife of one Poczeczyn?) (Trusiewicz, 1870: 305). Wolff referred to a digest of 1602, in which Jurij Kozar was mentioned as already deceased, and his daughters were fighting against Prince Zbarski for the legacy of Bohdan Kondratowicz (WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 662). See also Chapter 2/B/2 note 96, p. 110.

169 This suggests Wolff, who used a later digest. In 1598 (on 29 April at Lublin) Wincenty Labenta got a favourable verdict in the case regarding robbery of his subjects in Szpików. The defendants were the widow and offspring of Bohdan Kondratowicz Kozar assisted by their guardians Danilo “and others” of the Krasnosielskis. In the very document also Jurij Kozar is mentioned (ZDz., 1896 21: 404).

170 Relying on the account in the Volhynian Metrica of 1581, this must have rather been a copy from an original charter, which was burned at Vinnytsia on 8 October 1580.

171 ZDz., 1896 21: 412-13 (two digests).
Bohdan Kondratowicz Kozar, Maria’s and Owdotia’s brother, left daughters only. One of them Fedoria married Wawrzyniec Juszkowski. On 6 September 1607 Fedoria and Wawrzyniec sold their share in Koszylów and Oleszkowce to Adam Hieronim Sieniawski, Crown Cup-bearer (Pol. podczaszy koronny, Lat. pocillator Regni). The deed of conveyance mentioned that Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav, had unlawfully established the towns of Kniaźa Kryńca and Deszczka on the Koszylów property. In the same period Ivan Przywołowski also sold his share in these villages to Sieniawski. Thus, her brothers excluded Owdotia, wife of Semen Słupica, when they partitioned up the Ładyżyn estate, as well as in the partitioning of the Oblin estate between Prince Zbaraski and the remaining Korotki and Kozar heirs. She lost the battle for the share that was due to her at least formally. The only sign that she had gained anything in the legal proceedings was the fact that the Słupica family became the owners of Hubnik (formerly Sokolec in the Oblin estate), part of the Kozar inheritance.

\[172\] ZDz., 1894 20: 124 (digest, (an entry in the castle court of Vinnytsia dated 20 June 1605) = WolffKniaziowie, 1895: 662). One year earlier, on 5 August 1604 at Lublin, The Crown Tribunal issued a verdict in the case brought by Stanisław Gulczewski and other participants in the village of Koszylów against Prince Janusz Zbaraski. The subject of it was deprevation of the Koszylów grounds. The Tribunal’s verdict regarding the case transferred its final conclusion to be issued in the Bratslav sub-chamberlain’s court (Pol. sąd podkomorski) (ZDz., 1894 20: 124).


\[174\] ZDz., 1894 20: 125 (digest).
CHAPTER 6

The Slupicas’ Estates from the Late 16th Century to the First Quarter of the 17th Century.

A. The Heirs of Semen Slupica as Wards of Ivan Meleszko, 1596-1612:

1. Ivan Jermolajewicz Meleszko (Mid-1560’s - 1617) and his Family. Meleszkos’ Family Ties with the Slupicas and the Rohozińskis.

Ivan Meleszko came from a family of middle gentry of the arms of Korczak with Lithuanian roots. According to Niesiecki, the Mieleszko (Meleszko or Meleszkowicz) family had originally lived in the Smolensk (Pol. Smoleński) area of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Following the Muscovite occupation of this region in 1514, they moved and settled in the Powiat of Słonim in the Grand Duchy. They arrived in the Bratslav area probably no earlier than the middle of the 16th century, as they are not mentioned in the inspection reports (Pol. rewizje) of 1545 and 1552. Their first tenancies here the Melszkos owed partly to Jermolaj’s endowments and partly to family links with the Mikulińskis and the Mormuls or Mormils of the arms of Piatyrog, who were considered to belong to the “lesser gentry” and came to the Bratslav territory from Volhynia. For 1569 Jablonowski mentions a Meleszko line from Zalesie in the Powiat of Vinnytsia, called the

---

3 On the Mikulińskis see Chapter 2/A/2: 89-90 and note 77, pp. 89-90. The Mormuls alias Mormils descended from Volhynia. In 1542 Marek and Miśko obtained from Sigismund I a confirmation of the earlier privilege for the „Dyzenkowice” and Fedronowce properties (Uruski, 1914 11: 267). In 1545 the Mormils were in possession in the Bratslav territories of the following property: Ziatkowce on the River Kublicz, Żerdenowce, closer to the Sob and Kuźmińce “on the Sob River.” Yet, in 1629 they were proprietors of Żenderowce, while the other two villages were already in the hands of the Meleszko and Czeczel families (ZDz., 1877 6: 118, 1897 22: 108, 540, 632, 646, 732). See also Chapter 2/B/1: 112 and note 100, p. 112.
Maleszkowicz Zaleski family, and classifies them as “lesser gentry”.^ Later – from the 1580’s onwards – the place was known as Łuka, and by the 17th century as Łuka Meleszkowska. One of the members of this branch was Stefan Meleszko of Woronowica (d. ca. 1615/17), deputy judge of the territorial courts (Pol. podsesdek ziemski, Lat. judex terrestris) of Bratslav and Vinnytsia (1611-17). A close relative of Ivan Meleszko, Stefan participated in the foray on Kuna in 1615, and will receive further attention in the description of the foray below.\(^5\)

Following the Act of Union of Lublin in 1569, Jermola Meleszkowicz Zaleski, gentleman landowner of the Powiat of Vinnytsia, took the oath of allegiance to Poland-Lithuania before the royal commissioner.\(^6\) His kinsfolk Piotr

---

^ ZDz., 1897 22: 647. The surname Zaleski (pl. Zalescy) stems out of the village Zalesie “behind the Vinnytsia woods” on the meadow (in Ruthenian and Ukrainian meadow means luka) on the Czapla River. This is also the origin of later villages’ name Łuka. See below, note 6.

^ ZDz., 1896 21: 597 (digest): The last will of Stefan Zaleski entered to the Crown Tribunal registers on 26 April 1617 (BCzart: ms. 2468, k. 197: The second oblata [entry] of the Zaleski’s will).

® Deputy starost of Bratslav in 1566 (8 July), Jermolaj Meleszko had his superior, Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, Starost of Bratslav, Vinnytsia and Zvinogrod (1548-76), to thank for his estates and the advancement of his public career (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 120, f. 15-16v.: July 1566, as Deputy Starost of Bratslav, F. 242, op. 1 [Choloniewscy], spr. 16, doc. 3, f. 13, spr. 21, f. 81; F. 49, op. 2, spr. 120, f. 15-16: 8 July 1566, and died before 1570. Meleszko became Bratslav deputy Starost most probably taking over this magistracy after Bohusz Słupica (d. 1541) [III/3], although because of scarcity of source material one may not exclude the possibility that Melszko was not a direct Słupica’s successor. In 1567 as deputy Starost in Vinnytsia, also by the appointment on behalf of Prince Bohusz Korecki acted Andriej Jelec of the Leliwa arms, who himself descended form Kyiv province. See, NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B). Most probably he was appointed Deputy Starost when the Voivodeship of Bratslav was just being established (1566). Jermolaj Meleszko, who figures among the servants of the Korecki family in 1560-64 (undoubtedly he was taken into their service in the late 1550s), was granted a charter by Prince Bohusz for the estate of Zalesie (later known as Łuka Meleszkowska) with a clearing, apiaries, and the Czomoszowski fishery pond on the River Czapla in the Powiat of Vinnytsia (DAVO: F. 470, op. 1, spr. 356a, f. 1126-7: 24 June 1560, and 5 June 1564, as Korecki’s servant. See also Niesiecki, 1841 6: 397. Litwin was mistaken, when he insisted that Jan Oryszowski, the Cossack hetman in 1580-91 and the founder of the first Cossacks’ register book, a Polish gentleman by descent who had come to Bratslav territories from the Crown, and who converted later to Orthodoxy and started to use Ruthenian version of his name Jan - Ivan, was ca.1568 expelled by Jermolaj Meleszko from Łuka (de facto Zalesie, as the name Łuka appears from the 1580’s), which he kept from the Meleszkos as a lease [Litwin, 2000: 112]. Oryszowski was Łuka (Zalesie)’s tenant only on paper, and yet after the death of Jermolaj (d. 1570). Jermolaj Meleszko was the legal proprietor of Zalesie already in 1564 on the basis of the abovementioned royal privilege, which confirmed the earlier endowment of Zalesie from B. Korecki in 1560. It is possible that Litwin grounded his opinion keeping in mind the digest of 1594, published by Jabłonowski [ZDz., 1896 21: 391], which will be discussed later on. This digest clearly stated that Oryszowski managed to get a royal charter on Łuka from King Stephan Báthory, thus his endowment could not have been dating earlier than 1576). The document, issued at Vinnytsia on 24 June 1560, was later confirmed.
Mikulinski and Raina née Czeczel, widow of Horodij Mikulinski, also took the same oath.7 Jermola’s career in the service of the king and the princely Korecki family, along with the endowments of property he received, laid the foundations for the family’s substantial status in the Bratslav territories. He consolidated his position by marrying Zofia Olechnówna née Mikulinska, widow of Bohdan

by Sigismund Augustus at Bielsk on 5 July 1564 (According to Petrenko [PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 8-10], the mentioned in the charter Czornoszowski fishery pond, took its name after the name of Vinnytsia burgher Czornysz Stepankowicz [ibidem, 10 = AntonovichGramoty, 1868: 160-63 Appendix no. 5: an entry of the charter dated 5 June 1564 entered in the Vinnytsia territorial court series on 1 June 1797). Already as Deputy Starost by Korecki’s appointment, Meleszko received the deserted village of Ometyñee with its apiary, in the Powiat of Bratslav. Korecki’s document, issued at Vinnytsia on 8 July 1566, described Meleszko as a “good and honest man in this our Ukraine, in the neighbourhood of Bratslav Castle, who had earned special merit in a certain business on our behalf.” On the intercession of Korecki and Prince Roman Sanguszko, Voivode of Bratslav, at the Sejm of Warsaw in 1570, Sigismund Augustus confirmed this donation to Meleszko (21 July) (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2, spr. 120, f. 15-16v. = ibidem, f. 1-2; MW, F. 389, op. 1, no. 192, part 1, f. 27v.-28v. = MW Edition 2002: 240 [book 2, no. 17, f. 27v.-28v.] (here the digest of the document) = AGAD: Tzw. ML, sig. I A – 26 [VIII-I], f. 5v., fol. 27. See also VL, 1859 2: 398 (privilege confirmed by the Diet of 1601); Niesiecki, 1841 6: 397; PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 20; ZDz., 1897 22: 727. Most probably Ometyñee was a dowry property, which Jermola got when marrying Zofia of the Mikulinskis, widow of Bohdan Słupca. Thus Korecki’s deed could only confirm Meleszko perpetual ownership of this village). Still alive in December 1569 (he died in 1570), he appeared in a judicial act but with no title on 22 August 1568. He may have resigned in that year in favour of A. Sadowski, with whom he jointly held a lease for the village of Skórzynce. The royal commissioners cited both of them on 8 August 1568 and 5 December 1569 in connection to their litigation against the townspeople of Vinnytsia regarding border dispute (PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 10. The delimitation decree dated 22 August 1568 mentioned among the parties apart from Jermola and the Vinnytsia burghers Stanislaw Komorowski and Michal Szandyrowski). Meleszko was summoned to appear in court in relation to the case of a newly settled village of Zalesie (later known as Luka Meleszkowska) and a house built on a meadow close to the Czemiszowy alias Czornoszowski fishery pond on the Czapla River (Otamanovs’kyi, 1993: 172: 5 December 1569. Petrenko concludes that Zalesie was founded on the meadow situated on the premises of a farm (Rus. hutor), which belonged earlier to Vinnytsia burghers. The said farm was located “behind the Vinnytsia woods” on the River Czapla. The burghers questioned Meleszko’s deed of privilege, as they did not acknowledge Korecki’s endowment on the area, which they still looked upon as a municipal ground [PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 10]).

7 ZDz., 1894 20: 102, 103 (the Mikulinskiis). Raina alias Regina Czeczelówna, daughter of Hrehory Czeczel Deputy Starost (Pol. podstarości) of Bratslav in 1584-1604, and widow of Horodij Mikulinski married later Fedor (Teodor) Gniewoszewiez [Koszka] Strzyżowski of the Doigla arms, Deputy Starost of Bratslav in 1604-05 (ZDz., 1896 21: 404-05: 29 April 1598, his wife Raina Czeczelówna’s first marriage to Horodij Mikulinski; CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1386, f. 37-38; 30 August 1623). In 1572 in the Crown Metrica registers the appointment to guardianship (including the power of administration of their estates) over the children of late Horodij - Ivan and Maria the Mikulinskiis was entered. According to this source Jan Jezowski, the second husband of Raina of the Czeezels was to be appointed the guardian. Of all likelihood the Crown Chancery has erroneously changed the name Strzyżowski for Jezowski. From the same source it is known as well, that Horodij made military service in hetman’s (commander-in-chief, in this case most probably of Lithuania) close retinue (AGAD: MK, sig. 304, ks. 1, f. 249-256v.). The same entry regarding the guardianship has been transferred to the Volhynian Metrica series (RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 191, f. 249-251 = MW Edition 2002: 233, no. 47 [book 1, no. 47, f. 249-251]: here regest of the document dated in Warsaw 4 June 1572).
Iwanowicz Słupica [IV/1], and by Zofia had a son Ivan, born in the early 1560’s, the subject of this sub-chapter.

Ivan did not reach the age of majority until the early 1580’s, and that is why following his father’s death in 1570 his mother Zofia assumed the duty to defend the Meleszkos estate against Ivan Oryszowski’s claims. The final verdict of

---

8 RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 195, part 5, f. 343-3v.; ZDz., 1896 21: 399 (1594): Zofia of the Mikulinski widow of Jermolaj with son Ivan. It is known, that Lady Meleszko ca.1580 discharged Michal Mikulinski for the sum 70 kopas of Lithuanian groszs, the latter paid her in accordance with his father Piotr’s legacy as stated in his last will (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 120, f. 141v.). See also on the Mikulinskas Chapter 2/A/2: 89-90 and note 77, pp. 89-90, and above notes 3, p. 278, 7, p. 280.

9 On 8 July 1578 she registered a complaint in the court records of L’viv against Jurij Struš, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. She accused the Starost of unlawfully taking the old and new settlements of Zalesie Wielkie from her and transferring them to Jan Oryszkowski, who had for years been claiming a right to these properties (DAVO: F. 470, op. 1, spr. 356a, f. 1966; PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 11. The entry of the same document is to be found in the Volhynian Metrica (MW Edition 2002: 327 [book 6, no. 42, f. 64v.-65v.]: here digest of the document). Starost defending his position in the royal court based his argument on the fact that Korecki’s endowment for Jermola was only held for life. The case rested unsolved until 1582, when Zofia supported by her son Ivan introduced it before the royal assessors jury (CDIAUK: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 196, part 2, no. 53, f. 110-112; DAVO: F. 480, op. 1, spr. 54, f. 145-146; PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 11-13; the author cites this verdict at length from a copy entered to the territorial court of Vinnytsia in 1819 upon the request of the then owner of Luka Józef Kalasanty Zagórski). In 1582 the assessors’ jury on behalf of King Stephan Báthory issued in Warsaw a final verdict (PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 14: the author’s note suggests that it might have taken place on 11 March 1582). The act dated 4 December 1582 was soon after entered to the Volhynian Metrica series (MW Edition 2002: 361 [book 2, no. 53, f. 110-112]). Oryszowski referred to the King Stephan charter, too. He claimed that the endowment invested to him by Starost Jurij Struš, had been confirmed by the monarch. It is worth to underline that Zofia Meleszko appeared in the decree as Olechno Mikulinski’s daughter without mentioning she was earlier Bohdan Iwanowicz Słupica’s wife. The document stated precisely the situation and economical condition of the property in question. It referred to Zalesie named Luka behind the Czernyszowski Pond on the Czapla and behind the great forest, a mile from Viimytsia. On this premises were newly erected country house (Pol. dwór) and the old village of Zalesie with 70 people founded on the Zaleski ground in the vicinity of the pond. It was also there that lady Meleszko on her expense arranged two smaller ponds and erected two mills (PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 11-12). Acting as plenipotentiary of the defendants, namely of Struš and Oryszowski, Beniasz Dębowski submitted among other documents summons issued on behalf of the King for lady Meleszko, on 2 February 1570 (deposited in Luka by court beadle Semen Sabarowski) and a verdict dated 10 October 1577 at Malbork (RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 194, part 3, f. 154-156 = MW Edition 2002: 272 [book 4, no. 33, f. 154-156]: here digest of the document issued 10 November 1577 at Malbork). The latter due to lack of appearance of defendant before the royal court deprived her of the rights to the property in question. Furthermore, Dębowski claimed that after this verdict was issued Meleszekowa had to resign on her free will, her title to Zalesie for the benefit of Oryszowski. Meanwhile the plaintiff accompanied by her son negated that they could have resign their hereditary estate, and stated that they had been expelled by force in 1577. They proved also that procedural inadequacies were made on the issue and deposition of the summons, a fact earlier referred by Dębowski. The court jury acknowledged procedural inadequacies and urged lady Meleszko to take the oath in order to confirm her legal title to the estate. She produced on this occasion an extract of the entry in the Lithuanian Metrica, which was Sigismund Augustus privilege
1583 was in favour of the Meleszko family, on the basis of both the antiquity of their endowment, which was clearly described as a perpetual tenancy. On 7 June 1594, in a series of reviews of cases pertaining to the Voivodeship of Bratslav, the Lublin Tribunal Court decreed on a complaint brought by Ivan Meleszko against Oryszowski. Meleszko had claimed damages of 500 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (30,000 Lithuanian groats) from Oryszowski for the period when the latter had "forcibly taken from the plaintiff the property Zalesie otherwise Łuka in the Voivodeship of Bratslav, which the plaintiff claimed to be his, and held it." However, Oryszowski was released by the court from liability for damages due to transgression of the time limitation, which had been imposed on the case.

Having defended his right to his hereditary property Łuka, Ivan set about extending his holdings. According to Petrenko, who referred to later entries in the court register of Vinnytsia Castle, Ivan purchased in the Bratslav territories the villages of Ziatkowce and Tymar alias Timar, a property adjacent to the Kuna estate in the neighbourhood of Hajsyn. In 1545 Ziatkowice, a component part of the lands belonging to Bratslav Castle had been in the hands of Myszka alias

for Jermoľaj Meleszko. Oryszowski's plenipotentiary could only show off a Polish copy of the privilege, allegedy issued by the King Stephen, questioned by the jury because of the lack of the original.

The court ordered the Łuka property to be taken away from Oryszowski and to be returned to the Meleszkos, in the presence of a royal envoy, and that the proceedings should be entered in the court register of Vinnytsia Castle. On 15 September 1583 an entry was made by Sebastian Kubricki [Kublicki?], the court beadle for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, reporting the restitution of the Meleszko family to the Zalesie alias Łuka estate. Earlier Bielecki handed over to Struś a king's letter commanding him to obey the royal assessors verdict of the previous year, as well as the verdict issued on 21 July 1583 in Cracow (DAVO: F. 480, op. 1, spr. 4, f. 94v-95v; PetrenkoŁuka, pp. 14-15: the author quotes extensively the document entered to the castle court registers at Vinnytsia on 15 September 1583; MW Edition 2002: 312 [book 5, no. 221, f. 319v.-321v.]; here digest of the document). The royal envoy, Jan Bielecki, and local gentry represented by Nikifor Komar and Oleksiej Diakowski, who was later to become the legal guardian of Jeremij Juriewicz Shipica [VI/6] witnessed the deed.


PetrenkoŁuka, 1998: 15. Oryszowski died before 5 March 1603. On that very day Jurij Struš, Starost of Vinnytsia (by then also Castellan of Halych [Pol. Halicz]) was given by the king a manor house in Vinnytsia, which was said to be after the late Jan Oryszowski (RGADA: MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 202, f. 155v.-156 = MW Edition 2002: 551, no. 146 [f. 155v.-156].

Miśko Mormul. As late as 1606 Roman and Tychon (sons of Michajło) the Mormuls were conducting court proceedings for the delimitation of boundaries of Ziatkowce, Żerdenowka, and Kuźmińce. On 18 May 1609 Ivan entered a deed of perpetual partition into the registers of the Lublin Tribunal for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, to which the other parties were Bohdan Markowicz, and Roman and Tychon the Mormuls. They divided up between them their hereditary lands, with Ivan taking half and the other half going to the Mormol family, in the villages of Ziatkowce, Żerdenrewka, and Kuźmińce. Along with the deed of partition, a deed of delimitation was entered into the court register. On 14 May 1613 Meleszko entered a conveyance to Vasil Rohoziński. He sold him for a sum of 2000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (60,000 Lithuanian groats) half of the village of Ziatkowce and its lands on the River Kublicz. This transaction was directly connected to the marriage of Halszka Semenôwna [VI/1], to Vasil in ca. 1613. The contract contained an explicit statement that Meleszko was conveying this part of Ziatkowce as its lawful freehold tenant, having purchased it earlier from Owdotia (Eudoksja) Mormul née Koźuchowska.

15 SłownGeogr., 1895 XIV: 587 (Ziatkowce).
16 Uruski, 1914 11: 267.
17 Ivan based his right to these lands on the transaction made by Jewdokia (Eudoksja) née Koźuchowska, daughter of Miśko, the Mormuls' grandmother, with the Meleszko family, to whom she had ceded half of these properties (ZDż., 1896 21: 541 [digest] = SłownGeogr., 1895 XIV: 587; Uruski, 1914 11: 267). Relationship of the Mormuls was possible to be determined on the basis of a genealogical tree, which has been drawn up on the reverse of the Czeczel family genealogy. It was drawn to facilitate legal proceedings regarding the case of the Raszków and Kuszczynce estates in the Bratslav Voivodeship (CDIAUK: F. 236, op. 1 [Lubomierscy], spr. 10, f. 6v.). According to this tree Miśko alias Myszko Mormol left daughter a Eudoksja married to Koźuchowski. It was her who ceded a part of the paternal estates, namely the village of Kuźmińce to Ivan Meleszko. Marko Mormol in turn left a son Bodan, who married Jelena Semerenczanka, and a daughter Roksana wife of one Postolowski. The latter being childless passed all her inheritance on her brother's progeny. Bohdan's son Mojsiej alias Michal later donated his part in Kuźmińce to his sister Eudoksja, wife of Matiasz (Maciej) Czeczel. Finally, Eudoksja and Matiasz the Czeczels transferred their rights to Kuźmińce to their sons Semen, Ławrym and Vasil.
18 ZDż., 1897 21: 574 (digest). Besides the delimitation of the Ziatkowce borders, also in 1606, Ivan took part in delimitation procedures regarding the village of Skórzyńce the then property of Andrzej Chrusźlński in the grounds of Vinymyśla Castle and town, which were then in possession of the Starost Strus. The parties in this delimitation apart from the mentioned above were the neighbouring owners Ivan Czelenkowski, Esquire-carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. dapifer) of Bratslav and proprietor of Tiuti and Meleszko, the perpetual owner of Łuca (MW Edition 2002: 533 [book 16, no. 104, f. 147-160v.]; digest of the document, 18 April 1606 at Warsaw).
Contrary to Litwin’s statement, it was Ivan and not his father Jermolaj who in 1615 made a claim to the tenancy of Hajsyn, following the death of Jan Odrzywolski, third husband (from 1613) of Princess Jadwiga née Różyńska, whose first husband was Piotr Świrski, and the second was Adam Tyrawski (d. 1611). Meleszko’s claim is hardly surprising. He had brought litigation against Piotr Świrski on his own behalf for Świrski’s incursion on Ziatkowce. As the legal guardian of the heirs of Semen Słupica [V/1] he brought yet another litigation against Świrski for unlawful occupation, followed by the annexation of land from the Kuna estate to Hajsyn, a matter I shall discuss later. In 1606 Meleszko lodged a complaint against Świrski over Ziatkowce to the Crown Tribunal at Lublin. The case concerned an incident in which Świrski had sent out a raiding party of his servants and subjects from Hajsyn into Ziatkowice. The raiders stole and made off with some of Meleszko’s cattle and sheep. It cannot be ruled out that the motive behind Ivan’s representations to the royal chancellery, which were eventually successful and earned him a charter for Hajsyn, a property adjoining Kuna, was a desire to obtain a better level of security for his and his wards’ estates. Eventually, however, in 1615 Meleszko withdrew his claim to Hajsyn, which remained in the hands of Odrzywolski (d. 1621), who held an analogous charter for this estate.

Just before he died Ivan was again bringing proceedings against his neighbour in Ometynce, Hrehory Baybuza, the court notary (Pol. *pisarz grodzki*, Lat. *notarius castrensis*) in Vinnytsia Castle, for the delimitation of Ometynce and Kropiwna Wyżna. The case was heard before the territorial court of Vinnytsia, which ruled during its St. Michael’s session in 1617, ordering the erection of border mounds to delimit the boundary between the two holdings. Baybuza had claimed that the Ometynce property stretched for just half a mile in the direction of the Kropiwna property, according to the charter obtained by Jermolaj Meleszko for

---


Omitiese, and estimated his losses due to Meleszko’s trespass into his property at 10,000 kopus of Lithuanian groszs (600,000 Lithuanian groats).22 Ivan’s last mention in the court registers is from 1617, when he got a loan for the sum of 6000 kopus of Lithuanian groszs (360,000 Lithuanian groats) from the Żabokrzycki family, using as a security his Łuka estate.23 This loan was probably connected with the devastation caused in previous years by Tartar incursions. Ivan was married to Halszka Rohozińska of Roňo (d. 1623), daughter of Semen Falilejewicz Rohoziński and Anna Massalska.24 The children born from this marriage were a son Mikołaj alias Mikita Iwanowicz (d. 1651), Esquire-carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. dapifer) of Novogrod (Pol. Nowogród) in 1640-51, and a daughter Anna.25 According to Pulaszki Mikołaj married Anna, daughter of Seweryn Kaliński.26 After his mother’s death, Mikołaj brought litigation, which went on for many years against his stepfather, Alexander Piaseczyński, for his maternal inheritance.27 I shall discuss the relations between Ivan and his stepfather later.28


22 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 101, f. 5-6v. Both parties’ heirs continued the dispute in 1622, renewing litigation after the death of Hrehory Baybuza. On Hrehory Bajbuza, see below C/3: 317-20 and 316 (the Baybuzas); NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004: Appendix B.
24 PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 21. Ivan’s father-in-law was a relative of Vasil Rohoziński, husband of Halszka Semenówna Słupiczanka [VI/1]. According to Petrenko, Ivan’s wife was Halszka, daughter of Vasil Rohoziński. It could not be Halszka Semenówka’s husband Vasil Rohoziński daughter, as the couple had only sons. Thus, it must have been one of the Vasil’s relatives from the Voivodeship of Volhynia, most probably Semen Falilejewicz Rohoziński (APKr: A Sang., t. 119/29: The Piasczyński family genealogy from Ławryn, dated 12 November 1639 and entered in the sub-chamberlain’s (Pol. podkomorskie) court registers of the Bratslav Voivodeship and its following variants; here also the Krasnosielski genealogy from Roman). Pulaszki claims that Halszka, wife of Alexander Piasczyński was a daughter of Semen Rohoziński and Massalska (PulaszkiKronika, 1991 2: 145). On Alexander Piasczyński and his wife see below D/4: 367-71. Compare also below the Rohoziński D/2: 329-34.
25 PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 22. Mikołaj Iwanowicz was also a royal captain (Pol. rotmistrz królewski). He got drowned in the Boh in the course of an assault by the Poles on Vinnytsia defended by the Cossacks under Ivan Bohun On 11 March 1651 (see Chapter 2/C/1: 165 and note 169, p. 165). As he died without issue his inheritance passed over to the Iwanicki family (PulaszkiKronika, 1991 2: 145 note 2). Information on Anna Meleszkówna is in BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 139-139v.).
26 PulaszkiKronika, 1991: 2 145. Mikołaj as died childless and his succession going to the Iwanickis.
27 See below, D/4: 370-71 and notes.
28 See below, D/4: 370-71 and notes.
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Ivan Meleszko's contribution to the development of Kuna and the whole of the Slupicas' properties can hardly be overestimated. The best testimonial of this comes from his ward himself, Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], wherein 1612 he discharged Meleszko of his guardianship duties towards himself and his brother Matiasz (d. before 1606) [IV/2]. The deed of discharge is known from an 18th century copy of the entry into the register for the Voivodeship of Bratslav in the Crown Tribunal Court at Lublin, dated on 18 August 1612. The original document had been drawn up in Lublin on 13 August 1612, whereby Tychon Semenowicz Slupica discharged Ivan Meleszko of his guardianship duties ("de tutella sua") in the presence of three witnesses. They were the territorial Deputy Judge (Pol. podseszek ziemski, Lat. terrestrial subiudex) Stefan Zaleski, the then representative of the Voivodeship of Bratslav to the Tribunal, Ivan Bohdanowicz Mikuliński, Notary to the territorial court (Pol. pisarz grodzki, Lat. notarius castrensis) of Bratslav related to Meleszko through his mother Zofia Olechnówna née Mikulińska, wife of Bohdan Slupica and (in her second marriage) of Jermolaj Meleszko, grandmother of Ivan’s wards; and Fedor Kopijowski. Halszka [VI/1], the sister of the Slupica brothers who were Ivan’s wards, was not a party to this deed, since by this time she was already in her majority and had been married (to Vasil Rohozinski) around 1612 and certainly before 1613.

According to Tychon, the siblings “had lived as orphans with friends, without any special order." This state of affairs was a consequence of the sudden death of their father, Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], who died in 1596 intestate, probably being killed in action. After the death of their grandmother, Zofia née Mikulińska, the heirs of Semen Slupica were in the care of their mother, Eudoksja

29 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 7-9v. (the 18th century copy) = ZDz., 1984 20: 107 (digest, here the date 18 August 1612). To this document referred Gawroński, but misdating it to 12 August 1612 (Gawroński, 1915: 225). On Stefan Zaleski see below, C/2: 309-13.

30 In accordance with article 1, chapter VI of the Second Lithuanian Statute (1566) under the title "On guardianships" ("O opiekach") a women reached her majority when she turned 15, while a man was regarded major upon turning 17. This chapter of the Lithuanian Statute was a regulation encompassing all issues related to guardianship over minors both performed by the family members and the guardians appointed by last wills or in other lawful ways (Statut1566 Edition 2003: 133).

31 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 7-9v.
née Krasnosielska, and their uncle Ivan (Zofia’s son by her second marriage). According to the sources, they were Ivan’s wards already in 1596. Ivan also assumed the role of manager of the Shxpicas’ estates, and found them in a state of utter ruin due to Tartar raids as well as to acts of lawlessness committed by relatives and neighbours. That is the conclusion to be drawn from the statement made by Tychon, who testified that Ivan had “undertaken to look after our patrimony, which had been depleted by sundry persons and reduced almost to naught.” Thus, one of Ivan’s principal tasks as guardian, apart from the economic restoration of the Shxpicas’ properties, was the defence of their integrality, which I shall discuss in the next sub-chapter.

Alongside the provision of care for his wards, whom according to the same testimonial he educated at his own expense, Ivan Meleszko also undertook to manage the “estate of Kuna [and] Gusaków [Husakowoe], which lie over the Tartar inroad and are uninhabited.” By the time Tychon Semenowicz took over on Kuna from Ivan in 1612, it had been completely transformed – a fact he made plain in his deed of discharge, listing all that his guardian had accomplished for the Kuna estate, especially in the financial sphere. This list of achievements show that it was to Ivan Meleszko that Kuna owed its economic development, including the introduction of a new system of estate farming based on regulated rents and peasant labour. Finally Tychon bound himself not to make any claims in court against his guardian or his family, offering a deposit of 2000 kopas of Lithuanian grosz (60,000 Lithuanian groats); an assurance, which was a generally accepted procedure. Ivan Meleszko was also the man behind the royal charter granted Tychon Semenowicz by Sigismund III (1587-1632) for the foundation of a town and the erection of a castle at Kuna, along with a permit for the holding of an annual fair. However, as the unique addressee of the charter was Tychon one has to take into consideration a possibility that Tychon had reached maturity already in

32 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 7-9v.
33 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 7v.
34 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 15, f. 8-8v.
35 On the municipal rights for Kuna see Chapter 4/2: 203-05.
1605, and because of unknown reasons (Tartar raids, suspension of the court proceedings) discharged Meleszko from his duty in 1612. According to Rulikowski, Meleszko must have built up a good reputation as guardian of the Slupicz minors, since later a Lithuanian magnate Stefan Sapieha also entrusted him with guardianship duties.36

3. Ivan Meleszko and His Defence of the Jeopardised Slupicas Estate (1604-12).

For almost the entire period of his guardianship, 1596-1612, Ivan Meleszko was compelled to take measures to defend the rights of the Slupica heirs (especially Tychon) to their inheritance. The threat came both from relatives as well as from near and more distant neighbours, who took advantage of the minority to snatch as much as they could from the Slupicas estate. At first the situation favouring this kind of behaviour was the confusion concerning Semen Bohdanowicz's widow and children due to his sudden death. This was largely a result of the fact that Semen died intestate, and hence there was no lawfully appointed guardian for his heirs and to look after the family's affairs.37 Semen's uncle Hrehory Żdan [IV/3] died at more or less the same time, also leaving his children orphans in their minority. This way the family lost its two most vigorous representatives at the same time. Moreover, being a minor provided always an opportunity for relatives and neighbours to settle unfinished business, as the Zasławskis and Slupicas cases from 1562 to 1575 show.38 There are several distinct themes in the legal measures Meleszko took to protect the integrity of his wards' inheritance, and they may be classified according to the party claiming a right to the Slupicas property either by legal means, or by force. Above all, Meleszko engaged in the continuous rebutting of claims raised by the Zasławski family, in particular by Prince Janusz Januszewicz, that the Slupicas had no legal titles to the Kuna estate. The case was

36 Trusiewicz, 1870: 311.
37 A testimony of this is to be found in the above-discussed Tychon Semenowicz's document dated 13 August 1612.
heard continuously in various courts from 1596 onwards. I have already discussed this issue in Chapter 5, and merely refer back to it here.

The next claimant to the Słupicz estate was royal captain Piotr Świrski of Romanów, Tenant of Hajsyn. In 1604 he sent a party of armed retainers from Hajsyn into a place called Kładowe Mogilki, part of the Kuna estate. This was an uninhabited area on the bank of the River Sob near Vitold’s bridge. The aggressors attacked some peasants working in the fields. Five men were killed, and many were injured. Świrski’s retainers seized the horses, cattle, and farming equipment of the attacked, and set about the construction of a palisade defence structure in which their master installed men armed with harquebuses and a cannon. This is the version of the events presented on 30 July 1604 in a complaint before an unidentified court by Semen’s widow, Zofia née Mikulińska, and his mother, Owdotia née Krasnosielska. Neither the court’s response to this

39 Piotr Świrski of the family of Szalawa arms. He took part in one of hetman Jan Zamoyski’s campaigns in Moldavia, perhaps already in 1595, for sure in 1601 (Zółkiewski Listy, 1868: 110, no. 77: here information on Świrski’s participation in 1601 expedition), as well as in the first Dimitr the Impostor (Pol. Samozwaniec) to Moscow in 1605. In the opinion of Pulaski Sigismund Ill’s privilege on the Hajsyn starosty was not granted to Świrski and his wife Princess Jadwiga née Różyska until 1605. On 27 August 1606 at Vinnytsia Świrski bought from Kondrat Chróstowicz Bobułynski the village of Chrystianówka with adjacencies, an issue of conflict later on with Princes Krzysztof and Janusz the Zbaraskis, owners of Niemirow estate (Pulaski Kronika, 1991 2: 225). See also above A/1: 284 and note 19, p. 284.

40 In the inspection survey of the starosties and royal tenancies of the Bratslav Voivodeship („Taryfa starostw y królewszczyzn w Woiewodztwie Bracławskim sytuowanych”) of 1764, the borders of Hajsyn tenancy were described as follows: „[from the south] going up to the ground of the landed property of Old Kuna Town, westwards also up to the ground of landed property, the village of Kunka” (AGAD: Achiwum Skarbu Koronnego <ASK>, Dz. XLVI, sig. 7, f. 35).

41 Podolyanin, 1886: 567. The author does not mention the court in which this claim was entered. Meanwhile the above cited survey („Taryfa starostw...”) of 1764, in its chapter containing noble’s claimants regarding unsolved border conflicts information on this entry is offered. The claim was registered to court records on 30 June 1604, a few years later it was followed by the Crown Tribunal verdict issued on 27 June 1611. The following was written down there: „Born [Lord] Piotr Świrski, at this time Tenant of His Majesty’s Property Aysyn, being helped by Their Lordships his neighbours and friends, he in person, after he had gathered over a thousand of armed men, accompanied by these people entered forcibly the ground of Kuna, which itself was under any disposition [being a hereditary ownership]. And, [he] himself was trying to adjust by force the said ground of the Hereditary and Partial proprietors of the abovementioned [estate] Kuna called Kładowe Mogilky, which widely stretched on the Sob River, near the Vitold’s bridge, to his Tenancy Aysyn. After having wounded the Kuna subjects who had been ploughing their fields, seven of those making wounding severely, and five killing to death, he ordered to take the copses with him. Afterwards, he looted form the hereditary ground of the late Lord Semen Słupica their ploughs, oxes, horses and expelled his successors from their own property. Next, for the better security of this forayed area, he ordered to demolish old houses [situated] in this part of the city of
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complaint nor its outcome are known. It was not until a few years later that Meleszko lodged a complaint on Tychon’s behalf against Świrski, in connection with numerous incidents of assault on, and looting of the Kuna estate, including the destruction of a bridge (probably Vitold’s bridge) on the River Sob. Finally the case went up to the Crown Tribunal. On 27 June 1611 the Tribunal issued its verdict in the case brought by Tychon represented by Meleszko against Świrski’s widow, the Princess Jadwiga née Różyńska, who was ordered to pay the Shupicz 10,000 Zlotys in damages for the seizure of Kladowe MogiŁki and other losses incurred due to Świrski’s interference.

Another claimant to the Kuna estate was Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav and Starost of Kremenets. On 16 November 1606 Meleszko lodged a complaint against him before the castle court of Vinnytsia on Tychon’s behalf for an incursion and seizure of the settlements Źławiec, Husakowce, Jasłowiec, and Świnne in the Kuna estate. The case was to be heard before the Lublin Tribunal in 1607 during the session for the Voivodeship of Kyiv, but Prince Zasławski made an out-of-court settlement with Meleszko. The parties agreed to fix in the next session for the Voivodeship of Bratslav a term for a compromise settlement. However, the compromise was not accomplished due to the death of Prince Janusz in 1608. Left with no other option, Meleszko summoned Prince Janusz’s heirs, the Princes Jurij (Jerzy) and Krzysztof the Zbaraskis, to court, still counting on a settlement. Some kind of compromise seems to have been reached, and the parties annulled the previous verdicts. Nevertheless, when he came of age Tychon decided

---
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to take the matter up again, and in 1612 he summoned both the Zbaraskis before the Tribunal, as we will discuss later.\footnote{CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], no. 108, f. 11v.}

Another verdict Meleszko obtained in a case against the heirs of Prince Janusz Zbaraski was the outcome of an appeal against a verdict issued by the territorial court in Vinnytsia on 10 October 1610. The plaintiffs were Tychon Semenowicz and Ivan Meleszko, and the defendants Prince Jurij (Jerzy) Zbaraski and his brother Krzysztof, Starost of Kremenets. Tychon’s relatives, Jeremij Juriewicz [VI/6], son of the recently deceased Jurij Słupica [V/6], and his mother Marusza née Diakowska, by that time already the wife of Stefan Dziusza, assisted by her new husband, and Miss Fedora Dmitriewna Słupiczanka [VI/5], were co-defendants.\footnote{CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, k. 5v.} The case concerned Prince Krzysztof’s ceding of rights to part of the Nosowce estate to his brother. Fedora’s marriage to Alexander Kruszelnicki during the proceedings added an extra complication to reaching a verdict. Tychon and Meleszko claimed the later’s right of inheritance to half of Nosowce and its adjacentities, and complained that Marusza Juriewna and her son Jeremij, along with Fedora Dmitriewna had in reality more than half the shares in this property. Meleszko called for a new partition to be made, and damages amounting to 30,000 Polish Zlotys. This case, too, was brought to an end by Tychon in 1613.

4. The Słupica Ladies and the Sale of Their Shares to the Zbaraskis (1607).

4.a. Marusza Mikołajewna Słupiczanka, wife of Paweł Prysowicz Zablocki vel Zabołocki (ca. 1607) and of Wojciech Birkowski (before 1621).

On 19 December 1607 a deed of conveyance was entered in the court register of Kyiv Castle, for the sale of part of the Nosowce property, in particular for part of the village of Nosowce:
with a house on the bank of the River Kortyna, and Hruszka near Tołpaczowy wood, which was settled in former times; for the Perczakowski wood and wilderness, the Kozłowski wood and wilderness, the Boreczowski [Borszczowski] wood and wilderness, the site and wilderness called Trostianiec, the Rozwalski wood and wilderness on the River Trostianiec, along with all their settlements, empty places, defence structures, and lands.\(^4\)

The purchaser was Prince Janusz Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav and Starost of Kremenets, who paid Marusza Mikołajówna, wife of Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki the sum of 10,000 kopas of Lithuanian grous (600,000 Lithuanian groats) for these properties.

In accordance to Jablonowski's digest, the sale concerned Marusza's share in the Slupicas' properties, and the conveyance to Prince Janusz Zbaraski was accomplished on 29 May 1609.\(^49\) In my opinion this date is more likely to refer to the entry of the conveyance into the registers by the Prince's sons than to the actual sale. Prince Janusz died in 1608, while the remaining references in the document to the sale cite 1607.\(^50\) The confirmation of this hypothesis is to be found in the 18th century judicial papers concerning the laws suits circulating among the then successors of the Nosowce estate. Accordingly to these papers Marusza Prysowiczowa Zabłocka sold to Prince Janusz Zbaraski a share, which she inherited from her father Miśko alias Mikołaj Hrehorowicz Slupica [V/4]. It constituted of the third part in a half of Nosowce, and the transaction was entered in the castle court registers at Kyiv on 19 December 1607.\(^51\) The same document was entered a second time in 1609. On 29 May a record was made of this conveyance of freehold property in the registers of the Tribunal for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, the parties to the sale being Marusza Slupiczanka Zabłocka and Prince Janusz Zbaraski.\(^52\) A transcript made from this document, de

\(^{48}\) ZDz., 1894 20: 106-07 (digest) = Gawroński, 1915: 227 (here erroneous date of the entry in court register as of 12 December 1607).

\(^{49}\) ZDz., 1894 20: 109 (digest).

\(^{50}\) Wolff/Kniaziowie, 1895: 617.

\(^{51}\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 123, f. 43-43v.

\(^{52}\) ZDz., 1896 21: 549 (digest). Here is spoken of the sales transaction of the property described below. The only differences are in the transcription of places' names (the village of Nosowce with a manor house on the Kortyna and Gruszka, near Palpaczow [Tołpaczow] wood, which was settled in former times; for the Perczakowski wood and wilderness, the Kozłowski, wood and wilderness,
facto a repetition of the 1607’s entry has been found in the Kyivan archives.\textsuperscript{53} It verifies thus the information hitherto known only from the digests published by Jablonowski.\textsuperscript{54} In 1608 in the Tribunal registers at Lublin this transcript of 19 December 1607 from the Kyiv registers was presented for entry by an unnamed servant of the Princes Jerzy and Krzysztof Zbaraski, sons of the, by then, deceased Prince Janusz (d. 1608). The aim of their action was to insure the rights of the young princes against any potential claims on the part of Marusza Słupczanka’s relatives.

The entry tells us that Marusza MiKOłajewna appeared in person before the court of Kyiv Castle to make the entry. Her husband, Pawel Prysowicz Zablocki, who was also a party to the transaction, accompanied her. The deed of conveyance itself had been compiled at Nosowce on 8 May, and it had been witnessed by Jan Aksak, Justice of the territorial court of Kyiv; Iwan Łozka, Notary of the territorial court of Kyiv; Jakub Pawsza; and Ivan Steczka. The transaction was for the properties described in detail by Jablonowski, with a remark that they were Marusza’s “by natural right from her father.”\textsuperscript{55} Safeguarding herself against potential claims from her family contesting the validity of the sale, Marusza added that she was selling her own portion of Nosowce “within the boundaries as they have been and are now, and not leaving even the smallest part unto herself, her children, close relatives and kinsfolk, nor to strangers,” but selling “the entire portion thereof held by me, Marusza Słupczanka Prysowiczowa by the right of inheritance, with all of its dues and belongings by inherited and patrimonial title and authority.”\textsuperscript{56} The Zablocki couple gave Zbaraski a receipt for the full sum of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item [53] CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 1-4 (an extract in Polish).
  \item [54] CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 1v.: in Polish „Siolo Nosowce z Dworem z Ludzmi y Poddanemi nad Rzeczki Korytny y Hruszkę pod Lasem Tolpaczowem dawnych czasow osadzione Las y uroczyszcze Perczakowski, Las y uroczyszcze Kozlowski, Las y uroczyszcze Borszczowska, Grunty y uroczyszcze nazwane Trościaniec, Las y uroczyszcze Rozwalski nad Rzeczką Trościancem y ze wszystkiem Sieliszczami, Uroczyszczami, Horodyszczami”. See above for the same quotation in the text.
  \item [55] CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 2.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
10,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (600,000 Lithuanian groats). They also bound themselves, against a security of the same amount of money, to appear in court in the event of any suits contesting the conveyance. These reservations in the document, along with the set of witnesses “imported” from Kyivan society and the very fact that the deed was registered in the territorial court of Kyiv, suggests that the conveyance was concluded despite opposition from the remaining members of the family. Most probably the persons involved were Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], represented by Meleszko, and Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5]. The reason why the second registration was made in Lublin and not Bratslav was the fact that at the time there were no sessions of the court in Bratslav, as evidenced by the reservation made by Zbaraski’s servant before the Lublin Tribunal.57

Not much is known about Marusza Mikolajewna Słupczanka, granddaughter of Hrehory Bohuszewicz [IV/2]. Before 1607 she married Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki vel Zabołocki, of the arms of (most probably) Białynia. The Zablockis were a large family and used three different armorial devices, but only the line, which used the Białynia arms had property in the part of Podolia that belonged to the Kingdom of Poland.58 Paweł Zabłocki may have been a veteran soldier.59 After his death, around 1617 Marusza married a Wojciech Birkowski of Volhynia, who turned out to be a bigamist. His first wife, Bogumiła née Turowicka, whom he had deserted in the Powiat of Volodymyr, accused him of bigamy. Wojciech, who also appears to have been a professional soldier, moved to

57 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 1, f. 3v.: at the time there were no sessions of the court in Bratslav due to the territorial court judge’s illness, followed by the death of territorial court deputy judge („while presenting this entry for registration the said Servant of Their Lordships Princes Zbarawski [sic; Jerzy and Krzysztof, the sons of Janusz] made a statement asking this entry to be transferred to its own territorial court of the Bratslav Voivodeship. He [testified that] only because of the suspension of court proceedings, first due to the territorial judge illness, and next due to the death of the said voivodeship territorial deputy judge [the entry could not have been registered there]. He asked than, the said entry to be registered also in the Tribunal register books, in order to prevent any doubts which might have arouse in regard to this deed“).
58 See Niesiecki, 1845 10: 8; Żychniński, 1907 30: 111-14.
59 Jabłonowski among the Ukraine colonists – settlements founders (Pol. zasadzca) who recruited themselves from among former military men, mentions one Zabłocki, the founder of the village Stielce in the Kyiv Voivodeship Polesie area, in the Bodyżów estate complex. A dozen or so villages were to be founded in this area at the beginning of the 17th century by veteran soldiers from Tyszkwicz family retainers (ZDz., 1897 22: 124).
the Bratslav territories, where he married the widow Marusza Słupiczanka. On 7 May 1621 an unidentified court issued a decree sentencing Birkowski to a “military penalty, that at the earliest possible occasion, he should be dispatched to the front line to face the enemy.” Turowicka had brought a complaint against him that “having deserted her in the Powiat of Volodymyr, he had taken another wife, Marusza Słupiczanka in the Ukraine.”\(^60\) Indirect evidence for the Volhynian background of Birkowski, who probably originally came from the Kingdom of Poland, is provided in a record entered in the Lublin court registers on 4 July 1615, and involving persons who appear to be members of his family.\(^61\) On the grounds of this document we may assume that Wojciech Birkowski was associated with the Zaslavski Ostrogski family through military service. Three years earlier (1618) Birkowski and his wife Marusza had been accused by Fedora Dmitriewna and her husband Alexander Kruszelnicki of the murder at Nosowce of the minor Jeremij Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6], son of Marusza née Diakowska and the last surviving male representative of the Słupicz family.\(^62\)

4.b. Marusza Mikołajewna née Diakowska, wife of Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica by Her First Marriage, and of Stefan Dziusa vel Dziusza by Her Second Union (ca. 1610-29).

Marusza Mikołajewna née Diakowska married Stefan after the death of her first husband Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica [V/6] that is after 1607, and before 1610.\(^63\) But

---

\(^60\) ZDz., 1894 20: 107-08 (digest) = Gawroński, 1915: 228.
\(^61\) APKr.: A Sang., t. XXX/80 (original in Polish). It is a resignation act written down in the presence of Andrzej Bohowityn of Kozierady [named also Szumbarski, after Szumbar estate], Esquire-carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. dapifer) of Volhynia, Adam Czolhański and Andrzej Miączyński, the Zaslavski’s attorney. By this deed Jan Birkowski, son of the late Ludwik Iwanowicz ceded on behalf of his brother Jerzy his rights to a part of the sum of 100 kopas of Lithuanian groszs endowed to the Birkowskis’ father as a reward by the late Prince Michał of Ostrog Zaslavski for his loyal service. This amount was originally secured against the village of Studylków, in the Powiat of Kremenets. Prince Janusz Zaslavski transferred it later on the village Peremysl in the Lutsk district.


\(^63\) CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 5v. In the above-mentioned case heard on 10 October 1610 in the Vinnytsia territorial court against Princes Jurij and his brother Krzysztof the
just before the second marriage was concluded Marusza sold her portion of the Trościaniec estate to Prince Janusz Zbaraski. Alongside Marusza Mikołajówna Słupiczanka [VI/4], whose first husband was Paweł Pryszowicza Zabłocki, and who, in 1607, ceded also to the Zbaraskis part of the Nosowce properties, she was taken to court and was sued by Fedora Dmitriewna Krużelnicka [VI/5], of which more information will be offered below.\(^{64}\)

The second husband of Marusza, Stefan Kierdej alias Kierdygenowicz Dziusza alias Dziusa of Lachów, came from one of the most ancient families of the Kyiv territory, which used the arms of Kierdeja.\(^{65}\) The Dziusza family was a branch of the highly prolificerous Kierdeja clan (Pol. ród), which had acquired roots in Volhynia (mainly in the Powiats of Lutsk and Kremenets) and Podolia thanks to the endowments granted them by Svidrygiello.\(^{66}\) In the mid-16th century according

\(^{64}\) See below D/3b: 362-66.


\(^{66}\) Andriej Dziusa in 1433 was Marshal to Svidrygiello. A year later Wańko Kierdejewicz of Kwasilów, son ofjesiif Dziusa was invested by the same Duke with the estate Basowo in the then vołast of Lutsk in Volhynia (HaleckiOstatnie lata, 1915: 124, 125, 142, 258, 262, 287; JakovenkoSliakhta, 1993: 129, 130, 133, 357). Boniecki mentions also the purchase in 1434 of the village Pustolów by the above-mentioned Wańko, who in 1434-70 was enjoying the high ranked magistracy of Castellan of Kholm (Pol. *Chełm*) in Red Rus’ (Boniecki, 1902 5: 218). The same Wańko was the founding ancestor of the Dziusza family, while Hrzcza alias Hryćko (Grzegorz) Kierdejowicz of Pomorzan (in Volhynia), Voivode of Podolia (Kamenets’), who died in 1462 was the founding ancestor of the Podolian Kiedrej family branch (HaisigKierdeja, 1936: 121). For
to Iakovenko’s computation based on the *popis* of 1528 and the revisory register of 1545 four of the Dziuszas were able to post 10 horses.\(^{67}\) Stefan was a protégé of the Zasławski of Ostrog family, against which the Shipicas had been in litigation for years over their ancestral lands. In 1615-29 Stefan Dziusza was Deputy Voivode (Pol. *podwojewodzi*) of Bratslav to Prince Alexander Zasławski of Ostrog, who held the office of Voivode in 1613-28, and died in 1629; and next to Stefan Potocki of Potok (in office 1628-31).\(^{68}\) In 1628 Stefan was elected deputy to represent the Voivodeship of Bratslav at the Tribunal of the Treasury in Radom (in the Crown); he also performed the duties of attorney to Prince Janusz Zasławski of Ostrog, Voivode of Volhynia and father of Prince Alexander, representing him at the Crown Tribunal and in the territorial courts of the three voivodeships of the Eastern Borderlands.\(^{69}\) In 1629 Stefan was the tenant of Witwińce or Witwice, a village of 44 “chimneys” in the Bratslav territory, which he held on an endowment from Princes Zasławski.\(^{70}\) Siemion (Semen) Postołowski alias Pustołowski, who

---

\(^{67}\) Iakovenko Sliakhtia, 1993: 125, 127. This following the author this meant that there were 80 families bound to fulfill their duties and obligations on behalf of the Dziusas, what made 240 “chimneys”.

\(^{68}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59, t. XXXIX/5, t. 115/38, VL, 3: 278: here Stefan Dziusza as the Deputy Voivode of Bratslav.

\(^{69}\) BStefanyka, F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4102, III/4105.

\(^{70}\) Litwin, 2000: 44 (Witwica); ZDz., 1894 20: 133 (Witwińce). Stefan was liable to a chimney-tax (Pol. *podymne*) on this property amounting to 22 Zlotys (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 394-412, no. XXIV: with amounts in Zlotys, here 399 [Dzusa]) = ZDz., 1894 20: 130-43; without money accounts, here 133 [Dzusa]. I have not been able to clarify Stefan’s presumable family connections with other members of the Dziusz living in the Powiat of Kremenets in Volhynia, Jan and his sister Raine of Lachōwce (1611, 1615, 1617); and Ivan, Piotr, and Fedor, masters of Nowohorodyszcze and Poczapszczyn in the 1620’s (*Kremenets’kyi zemskyi sud. Opyysy aktorovkykh knih* <KrzemieniecZiemsksíSud>). Butych, I. L., L. A. Protsenko, Z. S. Khomutets’ka, and V. D. Chuntulova, eds. 1965. Vol. III (1616-1625 hh.). Kyiv: n.p. 57 [1 September 1617], 65 [15 November 1615], 116, no. 36 [18 November 1611], 214, nos. 33 [9 July 1621] and 31 [9 July 1621]).
was, together with Stefan Dziusza, in the group of relatives trying to enter Kuna in 1615 to retrieve the corpse of Tychon Semenowicz, must have been related to him. Despite Stefan’s sister was Anna married first to Constantine Baybuza (d. ca. 1643), son of Ivan Hrybunowicz, likewise his father the notary of Vinnytsia castle court, and next to Alexander Parul.

On 1 October 1620 in Kuna Stefan Dziusza lent Halszka Semenówna and her husband Vasil Rohoziński, who were “in serious want of money,” the sum of 1,500 Polish złoty “in ready cash for a direct repayment of debt.” Witnesses to the deed were Alexander Piaseczyński, Hrehory Roskowski, and Jan Tyszkiewicz. On 2 August 1622 the Tribunal issued a verdict in a case brought by Alexander Kruszelnicki, who wanted Stefan Dziusza banished (outlawed) for resisting a confiscation order for the village of Witkowce (Witwińce). The matter must have been settled out of court, evidence of which is provided by the fact that Dziusza witnessed the financial transactions of the Kruszelnickis with the Rohozińskis. On 14 January 1624 in Vinnytsia Stefan Dzusza was a witness to Fedora Dmitriewna Kruszelnicka’s receipt from Vasil Rohoziński of the blood money for the murder of Tychon Semenowicz.

B. Tychon Semenowicz (before 1596 - 1615), Master of Kuna (1612-15):

Upon reaching maturity, Tychon Semenowicz decided to follow sue a few cases his guardian Ivan Meleszko had brought before the courts concerning

---

71 This surname was most probably taken over from the village of Pustołów, which in 1434 was in possession of a common ancestor of the Kierdejs Wańko Kierdejewicz of Kwasiłów, Castellan of Kholm (Boniecki, 1902 5: 218). In 1623 it was recorded by Wojciech Pustołowski, who then was endowed with the village of Głuchowo (Uruski, 1931 15: 86).
72 See below on the Baybuzas, C/3: 316-17, and especially 319.
73 BStefanika: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 97-98v.
74 ZDz., 1896 21: 615 (digest; Kruszelnicki and Dziusa without names).
75 BStefanika: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 123-123v.
violations of the integrity of his estates. Like his guardian, Tychon would be facing powerful adversaries, the magnate houses of Zaslawski and Zbaraski, and therefore like Meleszko he chose to pursue a policy of compromise and out-of-court settlements. Prince Janusz Zbaraski died in 1608 leaving two adult sons, the Princes Jerzy and Krzysztof (born in 1580), who continued most of their father’s litigation. On the other hand Prince Janusz Januszewicz Zaslawski, who in 1604 became the Voivode of Volhynia, now spent less and less time in the Bratslav area and entrusted his legal affairs to a series of attorneys. Nonetheless, he never missed an opportunity to underpin his claim to the Kuna estate.

1. Tychon Semenowicz’s Litigation against the Princes Zbaraski (1607-15).

Already in 1612 Tychon Semenowicz summoned Prince Janusz Zbaraski’s sons to the Crown Tribunal in Lublin. The case concerned the final settlement of the complaint against the incursion of 1606 and occupation of the villages of Rzawiec, Husakowce, Jaslowiec, and Swinne, which were part of the Kuna estate. Since the case was not heard during the Tribunal’s session in 1612, it was adjourned (after three appeals) to the session for the Voivodeship of Bratslav the following year. His attorney Ivan Kędzierski represented Tychon in Lublin, while he himself was away preoccupied by another case against the Zbaraskis. The attorney representing Prince Janusz’s heir, Prince Jurij (Jerzy) Zbaraski, Starost of Pińsk and Sokal (and his brother Krzysztof), was Józef Fryk. On 10 May 1613 the Tribunal issued a decree, which was the outcome of an agreement by the parties to settle the dispute. The parties designated a new term at the forthcoming session for the Voivodeship of Kyiv to conclude the agreement, adding the provision that in the event of failure to reach a mutual understanding, the case would return to the Tribunal.

76 See above A/3: 288-91.
77 See below in this sub-chapter.
78 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 11-12 = ZDz., 1894 20: 107 (digest) = ZDz., 1896 21: 570 (digest, fol. 507).
On 23 April 1613 the verdict was announced in the case brought by Tychon Semenowicz and Ivan Meleszko, who was still referred to as Tychon’s guardian, since proceedings had been instituted around 1609, against Prince Jurij Zbaraski, Starost of Pińśk and Sokal, and Crown Carver (Pol. krajczy koronny). In Lublin Tychon Semenowicz attended in person, while Tomasz Ochrymowski represented Prince Jurij. This verdict was the outcome of an appeal lodged against the decree issued by the territorial court of Vinnytsia on 10 October 1610. Then the same plaintiffs brought the case against Princes Jurij and Krzysztof, the Zbaraskis to whose Jeremij Juriewicz, his mother Marusza née Diakowska (who had married Stefan Dziusza by that time), and Fedora Dmitriewna Słupiczanka were co-defendants. It concerned the Zbaraskis claim to part of the Nosowce estate. In 1607 Marusza Mikolajewna Słupiczanka [VI/4], whose first husband was Pawel Prysowicz Zabłocki, had ceded part of the Nosowce properties to the Zbaraskis. Now Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5], married to Alexander Kruszelnicki, was contesting that conveyance.

In earlier proceedings (1606-10), Tychon and Meleszko had claimed that Marusza Mikołajewna née Diakowska and her son Jeremij Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6], and Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] had come into the possession of more than half of Nosowce, whereas Tychon was the sole freehold owner of half of the Nosowce properties. Therefore Tychon was suing for a new partition of Nosowce, and damages amounting to 30,000 Polish Zlotys. The verdict issued on 23 April 1613 dismissed Tychon’s application on formal grounds, and postponed the case to the forthcoming Tribunal session of the Voivodeship of Kyiv, acquitting the defendants for the time being. Meanwhile the Zbaraskis justified their previous failure to appear in courts by the fact that they had been away “on His Majesty’s and the Commonwealth’s service.” On these grounds the Vinnytsia court gave them 12 weeks after their return from the war to complete the proceedings.

79 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 5-7.
80 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 5v.
81 On court proceedings between Marusza Prysowiczowa Zablocka and Fedora Dmitriewna now Kruszelnicka see below D/3b: 360-61, 364-66.
However, Tychon’s attorney appealed against this verdict to the Lublin Tribunal, the outcome of which was the already discussed decree. Walenty A. Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav, made a similar appeal against the verdict on behalf of his former ward (in the period of 1610-13), Fedora Dmitriewna. The Vinnytsia court allowed the appeal, but ordered Jeremiasz, the descendant of decased Jeremij Słupica to appear in court for the next session, “to be recognised as of his age” [of his actual age]. Tychon Semenowicz, who could not agree with the court’s decisions, also lodged an appeal. Most probably it was in connection with the legal expenses involved when in 1614 he took a loan from Stefan Zaleski, using part of Trościaniec estate as a security. 82

2. Tychon Semenowicz and His Efforts to Refute the Claims of Prince Janusz Zasławski of Ostroróg (1612-15).

On 30 June 1614, on application from Prince Zasławski, Voivode of Bratslav, the territorial court at Vinnytsia served yet another summons, this time on Tychon Semenowicz and his sister Halszka Semenówna, wife of Vasil Rohozinski, as “unlawful but violent heirs” to the “patrimony” of Prince Janusz Zasławski of Ostrorog. The Prince’s “patrimony” comprised the new town of Kuna “near Bratslav and Vinnytsia”, with its appended villages and settlements, Jasłów, Karpów, Kaletyn, Derenkowce, Loryńce, Nosowce, Husakowce etc. 83 The siblings were to appear in court at Vinnytsia for the St. Michael’s session. Zasławski yet again referred to the story of how Bohdan Słupica [IV/1] had surrendered Bratslav to the Tartars in 1551, the transfer of the properties to Prince Kuźma Zasławski, and Semen and Hrehory Ždan’s expulsion of the Zasławski from the estate in 1575 (and 1585). He also reiterated the financial claims his family had made for their deprivation of the enjoyment of the estate after 1575. Finally he recalled the litigation brought by the Zasławskis against the Słupicas, including the most recent cases, in which Meleszko represented the interests of the Słupica siblings. The

---

82 CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1341, f. 8v.
83 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
Prince explained the fairly long intermission in Zaslawskis' actions by the fact that he and his relatives wanted to take legal measures, but were prevented from seeking justice in court by the frequent failure of the Bratslav territorial court to hold sessions, and also for other reasons, circumstances which had befallen the Commonwealth. 84

But before Tychon Semenowicz had a chance to respond to this latest summons, he fell victim to a dispute in the family, while the Prince Voivode took the opportunity to renew his demands.

C. The Foray against Kuna and the Killing of Tychon Semenowicz, 1615:

The events of the attack against Kuna on the night of 22 – 23 January 1615 may be accurately reconstructed thanks to the exceptional abundance of extant material connected to the incident. These documents provide a wealth of fascinating details, which help to put the pieces of the story together and determine the motives for the participation of each of the perpetrators. These materials also bring a number of contradictory points, depending on the particular character's intentions. The contradictions call for confrontation and comparative analysis. Most of the originals of the summonses, complaints, declarations related to the incident are in the Sanguszko Archives. 85 They make up two sets: one of summonses and complaints brought by members of the family and more distant relatives, and the other summonses suits brought on behalf of Prince Janusz Zaslawski, who took advantage of the ensuing confusion to launch a final bid to recover “his” Kuna properties. Remarkably, he proved faster by four days in submitting a document to the court (25 January, as opposed to the family’s complaint against the foray, dated 29 January).

84 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
85 APKr.: ASang, the so-called Bronisław Gorczaks’ Roman files, (Pol. tzw. Teki Rzymskie B. Gorczaka); here different signatures.
The most accurate description of what happened in Kuna on the night of 22-23 January is to be found in the complaint submitted on 29 January 1615 to the court of Vinnytsia Castle by Oleksiej Diakowski, on behalf of his ward the minor Jeremij Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6]. The document was presented to the court by Oleksiej's relative, Tychon Diakowski. It is on the basis of this document that I shall relate the events of the foray, with supplementary information from other documents basically confirming its account. The additional documents include first and foremost the complaint brought by Alexander Kruszelnicki and his wife, which was not submitted to the court of Vinnytsia Castle until 26 May 1615. One may get the impression that the Kruszelnickis account was agreed with Diakowski, or transcribed with his consent from his complaint. I shall also review all the contradictions in the documents related to the foray, especially those, concerning the participants and those accused of taking part in the attack. Thanks to these documents the motives of particular individuals will be easier to determine. Finally, I shall take a closer look at the persons directly involved in the events. Nevertheless, before I start my story it is worth of quoting here what Beauplan wrote on forays and out-of-court agreements, as his account complements what will be discussed below:

In private quarrels, they [the nobles] are not obliged to seek satisfaction at sword-point for insults they may have received. However, when someone feels he has been insulted, he gathers all his friends, together with the most courageous of his subjects, and marches out with as much [armed] force as possible, so that if he should meet his enemy, he may fall upon him and defeat him if he can. He does not lay down his arms until there has been a battle, or until mutual friends have intervened and reconciled the two adversaries. Then, instead of a saber, each takes in hand a glass of Tokay wine, to drink the other's health.

1. Preparations for, and Developments during the Foray.

All the summonses and complaints concur in naming Vasil Rohoziński and his wife Halszka Semenowna [VI/1] as the chief inspirers and perpetrators of the foray.

86 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58 (Polish copy), t. XXX/59 (original in Ruthenian).
87 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74 (original in Ruthenian).
88 Beauplan, 1999: 106.
and the murder of Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3] committed during the event. Oleksiej Diakowski enumerates Ivan Meleszko and Stefan Zaleski, Deputy judge of the territorial court (Pol. podsądzi ziemski, Lat. subjudex terrestris) of Bratslav, and Vasil Žityński as accomplices. But the complaint lodged by the brothers Jermolaj and Fedor the Łysohorski and dated 4 February 1615 accuses only the Rohoziński couple. On the other hand, the last of the complaints, brought on 26 May 1615 by Fedora Dmitriewna and Alexander Kruszelnicki, blame Meleszko, Zaleski, Žityński and ... the Łysohorsi brothers, alongside Rohoziński and his wife, for the attack.

These discrepancies show that the main cause of the incident was a series of disputes over property, which started most probably when Tychon Semenowicz ceased to be a ward of Ivan Meleszko (1612) or even earlier. Perhaps in 1612 (surely before 1613), Tychon's elder sister Halszka Semenówna married Vasil Rohoziński, who appears to have been in animosity against his brother-in-law right from the start. The sources show that at the beginning the newlyweds lived at Kuna with Tychon. It was there that a bitter quarrel erupted between Halszka's brother and husband, in connection to her dowry, which had been settled while Tychon was still Meleszko's ward. According to the later account, Halszka had resigned of her right to a share in the Kuna properties. This fact must have been a source of frustration for her husband, especially as under Meleszko and Tychon, Kuna had raised in status and prosperity from a desolate village into a town at the centre of a thriving estate. Besides, as it is known also from the later account, Halszka unsuccessfully continued the litigation being brought by her mother Owdotia against her brothers the Krasnosielskis and regarding her dowry. Perhaps the 1613 sale of half of the village of Ziatkowice, which neighboured on the Kuna estate and which Ivan Meleszko ceded to the Rohoziński couple had been an

89 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/61 (original in Ruthenian). On the Łysohorski see below D/1: 323-28.
90 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74.
91 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/61. The Łysohorski brothers in their complaint of 4 February 1615 claimed that “Lord Rohozinski, our brother-in-law with the late brother of us Tychon Shipica living there together in the town of Kima came into a certain animosity and one gave the other an answer on throat.” This conflict was in their opinion the reason for the foray.
attempt to mitigate the family dispute. The fact is that from 1613 Halszka and her husband lived in Ziatkowice.

In his complaint Oleksiej Diakowski declared that having an evil and disgraceful intent in mind, all of them [Rohozński and his wife, Meleszko, Zaleski, and Żityński] [conducted the foray] to get the Kuna estate, and had all conspired to kill the late Lord Tychon Slupicz, gentleman [and master of Kuna].

The events were presented in a similar way in the Kruszelnicki complaint, which said that the culprits had committed the crime “with an evil and disgraceful intent in mind to get the Kuna estate.” The ultimate proof that the motives were to grab Tychon’s property and the rights to it, is obvious by the particular interest the assailants showed for the deeds in Kuna Castle, especially the charters to the estate. Diakowski went on in his complaint to say that having attacked and looted Kuna Castle and town, Rohozński and his wife, Meleszko, Zaleski, and their retainers, along with other accomplices they had drawn into the plot, took Tychon’s movable assets; his chest with his charters for the Kuna estate; his money in cash; his bills, securities and deeds, both from Lady Rohozinska for the waiving of her rights to Kuna when she received her dowry, as well as from other persons; and his silver, gold, robes, tapestries, guns and firearms, riding and draught horses, and all of his equipment whatsoever, depriving him of the lawful enjoyment thereof, installing themselves in his place and still holding all of it.

The preparations for the foray centred on Ziatkowce. Perhaps that is why Diakowski and the Kruszelnicki couple named Ivan Meleszko, joint owner of this village, as a co-organiser and participant in the foray. However, it seems unlikely that Tychon’s former guardian, who had worked so actively in rebuilding the estate, would be involved personally in a plot to murder him. Both families lodging a complaint overlooked the fact that the Rohozińskiś held half of Ziatkowice. However, it is hard to believe that Diakowski and Kruszelnicki could have been unaware of the property situation in their neighbourhood and family. One has the

---

93 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
94 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74.
95 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
impression that they wanted to implicate Meleszko, and thereby eliminate him from the competition for Tychon’s estate. In his description of the several days of preparations for the attack on Kuna, Diakowski emphasised that these developments took place at “Ziatkowce, Lord Meleszko’s town.” The Kruszelnicki account had a similar description. According to Diakowski, Vasil Rohoziński and his retainers, along with Meleszko and Zaleski and their servants, hayducks and Cossacks hid for several days at Ziatkowce. From there, to carry out their evil deed all the more effectively, they secretly sent messengers to Lady Rohozińska and to one Stefan called Mszański [or Olszański in Kruszelnicki’s version], the late Lord Słupica’s administrator in Kuna, the late Lord’s property, to learn all they could; and the said Lady Rohozińska and the administrator, as had been agreed, would be staying at Kuna to inform Lord Rohoziński and the other conspirators by the said messengers of the whereabouts of the Lord Słupica and when they would be likely to find him at home in the Kuna Castle.96

Mszanka alias Olszański has already been mentioned in the sub-chapter on the Słupicas clients.97 It is much harder to explain and rationalise Halszka Semenówna’s part in the arrangements, especially as no other sources corroborate this information. Perhaps, feeling that she had made a mistake when she waived her right to a share in the family estate, she again took up residence in Kuna to “spy” on her brother, but she could surely not have reckoned with his murder, of which the later court proceedings bring ample proof. The extent of her knowledge of, and involvement in her husband’s plot cannot be established beyond all doubt on the basis of the extant documents.98 It seems more likely that Rohoziński bought the services of Stefan, administrator at Kuna. The complaining parties must have wanted to incriminate Halszka. With Tychon dead, she was the sole legal heiress of the entire estate of the “senior” Słupica line, as Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] and Jeremij Juriewicz [VI/6] were members of the “junior” line.
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96 APrk.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
97 See Chapter 3/3: 186 and notes.
98 See below D/1: 323-28 on the Lysohorski brothers. There is their mother Marusza Bohdanówna [V/2]’s case of waiving her right to a share in Kuna discussed (p. 328).
I shall describe the developments of the foray itself after Oleksiej Diakowski’s complaint, in view of the detail it provides.

Then, having received news from Lady Rohozinska, Lord Rohozinski and all those who were there of their own free will or on orders of Lord Meleszko and Lord Zaleski, a total of over 100 men armed with sundry weapons proper to war against the enemies of the Holy Cross [Tartars or Ottoman Turks], set off at midnight on the night of Wednesday to Thursday, 22 January in the current year of 1615, from Lord Meleszko’s town and house in the Ziatkowce estate, and sneaked up to the Castle from its rear, river side [from the River Sob], and having scaled the palisade using ladders they had brought from Lord Meleszko’s town of Ziatkowce reached the room where the late Lord Shipica was sound asleep, like any lawabiding man secure in his rights and sense of public order, not suspicious of any ill from anyone, nor of that armed posse either from his sister Lady Rohozihska and her husband, or from his relatives Lord Meleszko and Lord Zaleski, or any of the others, with just one small boy in attendance.\(^9\)

The Kruszelnicki account of the attack was pretty similar.\(^1\)

The assailants had carefully chosen a time for the surprise attack, making it even more unexpected by pretending to be Tychon’s retainers and that a Tartar invasion was imminent. Diakowski went on as follows:

having surrounded the bedchamber, Lord Rohozinski pretended to be one Kozlowski, servant to Lord Słupica, calling out, ‘Master, danger, for God’s sake, the Tartars are breaking into the town!’ At this point Lord Słupica, having woken up, asked who was outside and, on learning it was his servant Kozlowski and not suspecting treachery, opened the door into his chamber. Thereupon on the very threshold Lord Rogozinski [stood with] his men, with neither concern for the fear of God, nor mindful of the law and its severity, acting deliberately as the principal plotters had agreed and performing the evil deed they had set their minds to Lord Rohozinski himself shot a couple of bullets at Lord Słupica from his musket, and then slashed him with his dagger from the throat right down to the waist, as a consequence the latter fell to the ground. Then they all most cruelly, mercilessly and tyrannously shot at, and with their knives stabbed the victim lying on the floor, whereupon Lord Słupica immediately gave up the ghost from the vehemence of the shooting and stabbing. And having so villainously slain the said Lord Słupica, they usurped his estate and still do hold it now.\(^2\)

From the expressive description in the source, a point is missing. Already on 5 February 1615 the brothers Jermolaj and Fedor the Łysohorski entered Kuna

\(^9\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
\(^1\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74.
\(^2\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
Castle and town. There is nothing about them at all in Diakowski’s account, while Fedora Dmitriewna and Prince Zasławski accuse them of participation in the foray. If so, then the assailants named by Diakowski could not have held Kuna for longer than a fortnight, until 5 February. The Łysohorski brothers were next in the line of succession after Halszka Semenówna to the estate of Tychon. Their title was more appropriate than Fedora’s or Prince Zasławski’s on grounds of consanguinity with Bohdan Słupica [IV/1], as I shall describe in detail below.

There can be no doubt that it was Vasil Rohozinski who personally killed Tychon, as all the available sources and the court verdict say. An interesting detail is the failure of the attempt made by friends and relatives who were not implicated, and wished to give Tychon a “Christian burial” to retrieve the body. Perhaps the body was not handed over to them because it had been mutilated so badly that the assailants were afraid its condition would only aggravate their situation in the face of the inevitable court proceedings. Diakowski wrote that the day after he had received news of Tychon’s death he

together with others, friends [of the deceased], that is My Lord Stefan Dziusa, Deputy Voivode [Pol. podwojewodza] of Bratslav; My Lord Hrihory Baybuza, Court Notary of Vinnytsia Castle; Lord Alexander Kruszelnicki; Lords Tichon and Siemion Diakowski; Lord Siemion Postołowski; and the court beadle Hrihory Jewchimowski and other friends and relatives had ridden to Kuna, wanting to give the body [of Tychon] a Christian burial. There Mr. Rohozinski, his wife, and all their men, being well-armed with the weapons of warfare, not only did not allow them to see the body, but did not even let them enter the town of Kuna. Indeed they sent out a party of the deceased man’s servants, Staś Skrypka and servants of Lord Zaleski, Siemion Repieccki and others up to a few score men, who remained unidentified by name, and who were instructed to inform their Lordships not to approach lest they should come by the same fate as the late Lord Słupica, whereupon Lord Diakowski and the friends, since they could not accomplish what they had come for, turned away even before they reached the town fearing for their well-being.
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102 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/62 (the Łysohorskiis), t. XXX/74 (26 May 1615, the Kruszelnickis), t. XXX/75 and 76 (27 May 1615, Prince Zasławski).
103 APKr. : ASang., t. XXX/74.
104 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58.
The Kruszelnicki added in their complaint that after the relatives and friends were sent away, the attackers “secretly buried the body [in the source “wsobie” means ‘in Sob’ = in the River Sob?] without handing it over to the deceased’s relatives and friends, and it is not known where they disposed of it.”

2. Participants in the Foray: Stefan Zaleski and Vasil Žityński.

Stefan Zaleski of Woronowica (died after October 1615 and before 26 April 1617) was not only a relative of Ivan Meleszko, but also a close neighbour of the Šupicas of Kuna. Most probably it was none other than Tychon Semenowicz who had granted him a share in Trosčianiec as a security in 1614. By his marriage to Halszka née Jeżewska he had four sons, Horodyj, Michał, Alexander, and Jurij. Zaleski figures in the documents as the territorial deputy judge (Pol. podszędek ziemski, Lat. subjudex terrestris) of Bratslav and Vinnytsia for the period

---

105 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74.

106 Apart from Woronowica and part of Zalesie or Luka, he also owned the town of Czerepaszyńce on the River Pustola in the Powiat of Vinnytsia, and held the Kamieniohorka estate and part of Trosčianiec in the Nosowce estate as a security from the Piaseczyński family against a loan. For Woronowica and Luka alias Zalesie see 6/A/1: 270-79 on the Meleszkos. See also Aftanazy, 10: 499 (the author connects Woronowica in the late 16th and at the beginning of the 17th century only with the Łasko family). On Kamieniohorka see below note 108. On Czerepaszyńce see, Oleg Mal'chenko, Ukripleni poselenia, 2001: 284-85. The author lists the town owners following Jablonowski (ZDz., 1897 22: 703), the Zaleskis (1602), and the Kalinowskis (1614). See also Aftanazy, 10: 55. Besides the mentioned above villages Stefan held a share in Kopijówka, which he had no doubt acquired from the Kopijowski family. The Kopijowskis in turn held the village of Kopijówka on the Sob in the vicinity of Dąszów (1545) and the village of Hoptyńce on the River Sielnica in the Powiat of Bratslav (1602, 1618). The latter used to be referred to as well as Kopijówka or Kopijowce (ZDz., vol. 22, pp. 629, 717). Stefan might have owned only some shares in this second village.

107 CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potocky], spr. 1341, f. 8v.

108 BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4102, f. 78; ZDz., 1896 21: 597 (digest): Stefan Zaleski’s will was entered in the Crown Tribunal registers on 26 April 1617. He left to his four sons the following shares. To Hordziej – Zales alias Zalesie, to Michał and Alexander a part in Woronowica, to Jurij a part in Kopijówka with adjacencies and sub-settlements (Pol. przysiółek) Stepanówka, Soroczyn and others. His wife was given 6000 Polish Zlotys secured against the village of Kamieniohorka, which was situated on both banks of the Boh, and which had to pass later to Alexander as hereditary estate. The second entry of the will is to be found in Cracow (BCzart.: ms. 2468, f. 197).
1611-16/17. In these years he received summonses and declarations from Prince Zasławski concerning Kuna in the territorial court.

In 1602 the Crown Tribunal had issued a series of decrees concerning subjects (mostly peasants). The first, of 17 April, involved Stefan Zaleski, who was suing Jurij Struś of Komarów, Starost of Bratslav, Vinnytsia, and Zvinogrod. The case concerned an assault during a fair at Vinnytsia, when Zaleski’s subjects from Zalesie had been beaten up and robbed by the Starost’s men, of the wheat and other produce they were trying to sell. In turn on 30 April, Jurij Struś lodged a complain against Stefan Zaleski for a violent foray against a house in the village of Denesówka [Denisówka?] and the beating up his servant there, most probably in revenge for the earlier incident against Zaleski’s peasants. We do not know whether the Deputy Judge himself founded Czerepaszcze, but at any rate he made a good deal of effort to develop it, as evidenced by a number of cases involving his peasant subjects from the place.

In 1603, as we learn from a decree issued by the Tribunal on 14 August, Adam Guminski lodged a complaint against Zaleski for sending his men from Czerepaszyńce into land, Guminski was holding on a lease in the village of Pawlica, where Zaleski’s men dismantled the buildings and carried off the local peasants to Czerepaszyńce. Guminski alleged that Zaleski had unlawfully claimed the cultivated land and wilderness at Pawlica as his, and had deliberately obstructed him in the settling of his (Guminski’s) peasant subjects there. However, Zaleski managed to prove his right to the disputed land and was acquitted by the

---

109 IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 190 (1611-16); APKr.: ASang., t. XXIX/3, 80, 86, t. XXX/37, 39; ZDz., 1896 21: 554, 597.
110 ZDz., 1896 21: 419 (digest), 430 (digest).
111 ZDz., 1896 21: 441 (digest). On 13 May 1609 the Tribunal at Lublin issued a verdict, which probably was a continuation of the case regarding an assault on Zaleski’s subjects at Vinnytsia. This time Zaleski summoned the descendants of the late Starost Jurij Struś, daughters Malgorzata, Halszka and Helena, as well as Walenty Alexander Kalinowski (as husband of other daughter Elżbieta). He accused them of excluding a requisition in the Julowce Castle of the Struś family, which had been ordered by the court verdict issued at Kremenets, and had to satisfied the loss inflicted by Zaleski (ZDz., 1896 21: 536).
On 20 May 1609 Zaleski appeared before the Tribunal at Lublin on a summons brought by Walenty A. Kalinowski, then Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. He was charged with having sent an official from Czerepaszyńce to the Mieziaków property (of Vinnytsia starosty), which Kalinowski held on a lease, and stealing several score of his beehives. On 22 May of the same year a verdict was issued against Zaleski in a case brought by one Witkowski, who had summoned Zaleski to return the peasants who had absconded from the village of Hulów (also known as Niemiryńce) to Czerepaszyńce. In the same year, on 19 August, Zaleski obtained a decree from the Lublin Tribunal related to the return of some peasants from Czerepaszyńce who had fled to the town of Machnówka, property of Fryderyk Tyszkiewicz and his wife Zofia née Zasławska, and to the village of Medwedówka, property of Seweryn Bolanowski and his wife Marusza née Szandyrowska. Finally, around 1614, Zaleski sold or conveyed Czerepaszyńce to Walenty Alexander Kalinowski as a security. Later Walenty’s son, Adam held the property (1618).

In 1612 Stefan Zaleski acquired the village and country house of Stara and Nowa Kamienohorka, upstream on the Sob from Kuna, on a security of 6,000 Zlotys from Alexander Piaseczyński. Seven years later, on 20 November 1619, Alexander Piaseczyński sued Stefan’s widow Halszka née Jeżewska and their sons for the harm done to his peasants in Kamienohorka. At the same time he was demanding damages of 20,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (120,000 Lithuanian groats) to be paid to his brother Jakub Piaseczyński, lawful heir to this property, for the losses. But according to his last will, Stefan had regarded Kamienohorka as his own, inheritable property, and issued instructions to his wife to convey it to

112 ZDz., 1896 21: 456 (digest).
113 ZDz., 1896 21: 542-43 (digest).
114 ZDz., 1896 21: 544 (digest).
115 ZDz., 1896 21: 146 (digest). On Bolanowski see also Chapter 2/B/2:113 note 102, p. 113.
116 ZDz., 1897 22: 708. On 12 June 1618 at Lublin Kalinowski got a verdict related to his case against Fryderyk Tyszkiewicz, from whom he claimed the return of absconed subjects from the town of Czerepaszyńce to Machnówka (ZDz., 1896 21: 283 [digest]).
118 BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4102, f. 78-80.
his son Alexander Zaleski when he reached the age of majority. On 4 April 1621 the brothers Alexander and Jakub the Piaseczyński entered a deed to account for the guardianship the elder brother, Alexander, had exercised over the younger, Jakub. The document concerned the pledging of Kamienohorka. Jakub released Alexander from his legal responsibilities to redeem Kamienohorka from the deceased Zaleski for 6,000 Zlotys. In 1614 Stefan Zaleski had also appeared in court as the holder on a security of a share in Trościaniec part of the Słupica estate.

It remains to be asked what it was that Zaleski wanted to gain by taking part in the foray against Kuna. Perhaps he had a dispute over boundaries with Tychon Semenowicz, a likely occurrence, since in the year Tychon became the heir to Kuna, Zaleski acquired Kamienohorka, on the boundary with Hajsyn, from the Piaseczyński family. We know that the Słupica family had brought litigation for land in this area against Piotr Świrski, tenant of Hajsyn, already in 1604. It cannot be ruled out that the Lord Zaleski mentioned by Diakowski as one of Tychon’s servants from Kuna, who in 1615 took the side of the assailants, was one of Stefan’s sons, and almost certainly closely related to him.

It is not clear how closely related Stefan Zaleski was to Stanisław and Stefan Zaleski, married to Fedora Sołtanówna and Nastazja Dmitriewna (?) respectively, who were rewarded by Sigismund III, for their merits with the feudal tenancy of Zalesce along with “the wilderness known as Bartkowskie siedlisko” in the Powiat of Nowogród in the Siewierz territory (Lithuania proper). An undated document shows that they later sold it to Alexander Piaseczyński, who is accorded the title of Castellan of Kyiv in this document, suggesting that the conveyance

120 BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossolinscy], spr. III/4105, f. 93-94, and the same f. 95-96.
121 CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoczy], spr. 1341, f. 8v.
122 APKr.: ASang., t. XXIII/58, 59.
must have taken place after 1635. Likewise, we do not know whether there were any family ties between Stefan and the royal secretary Remigian Zaleski, who appears in documents dated 1626-28 as holder of the Starosty of Ostrz in the Kyiv territory.

In 1599 (15 December) one Žityński was an administrative official at Kuna. Ivan Meleszko, guardian of the minor sons of Semen Bohdanowicz Słupica [V/1] had probably installed him there, but he may well had become associated with the Słupicas much earlier. The Žityński family were related through the Korotkis to the Krasnosielki family, so Žityński may have come to Kuna with the retinue of servants accompanying Owdotia Krasnosielka, Semen Bohdanowicz’s wife. The Žityński alias Žytyński family, of the arms of Abdank, is known to have come from the Powiat of Lutsk in Volhynia, and to have held inheritable property which was a share in the estate left by the Korotkis. The Žityński title to these lands was based on the marriage of Roman Žityński to Marusza, one of the daughters of Bohusz Korotki, whose other daughter became the wife of Juchno Iwanowicz Krasnosielki. Jablonowski lists the Žityńskis in the group of middle gentry for the Powiat of Bratslav. In 1569 they held the village of Witawa near Vinnytsia, but by 1629 they only had a share in Witawa, Majnów, and Sutyska alias Sutyski, properties, which made up part of the Sutyska estate. By the close of the 16th century the Žityńskis were one of the parties to the dispute over this estate. The dispute erupted when Marianna Komarowa Tryszczyna, widow of Denis Komar, sold the entire Sutyska estate for 3,000 kopas of Lithuanian grosz (180,000 Lithuanian groats) to Ivan Žityński, her son by her first marriage. Perhaps the
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125 APKr.: ASang., t. XXIII/59 (Polish copy).
127 RolleZ dziejów, 1890: 9. According to other sources her sister Duchna was to marry Juchno Iwanowicz Krasnosielki. See Chapter 5/B/6a 267.
129 ZDz., 1897 22: 711.
130 RolleZ dziejów, 1890: 12-13. In 1617 Ivan Žityński held as a lease from Andrzej Ossoliński the village of Korytna (KremenetsZiemskiSud, 1965, 3: 144 [12 November 1617]). On 8 July 1621 brothers Krzysztof and Jan the Horajns entered in the Kremenets Castle court registers the contract of perpetual sales on behalf of Žityński of their share in the village of Wyższe Bereżyce for 2,000
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administrator of Kuna was a close relative of Vasil Żityński of Witawa, whose name had been entered alongside Hrehory Ždan’s in the 1569 register of gentry in the Voivodeship of Bratslav.\textsuperscript{31}

Vasil Żityński was named in 1615 and subsequent years in virtually all the summonses, declarations, and decrees concerning the foray on Kuna and the killing of Tychon Semenowicz, as one of the organisers and participants of the attack. His first appearance in such a document was in the complaint brought on 29 January 1615 before the court at Vinnytsia Castle on behalf of Jeremij Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6] and Tychon and Oleksiej Diakowski.\textsuperscript{132} He was mentioned in a second complaint, brought before the court of Vinnytsia Castle by Alexander Kruszelnicki and his wife Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] on 26 May 1615.\textsuperscript{133} Finally his name appeared in the decree issued by the castle court of Vinnytsia on 22 May 1623.\textsuperscript{134}

By 1615 there were three bonds of marriage making the Żityński kinsmen to the lords of Kuna. Through the Krasnosielski family the Żityński were also related to the Koszka and Rohoziński families. On 11 August 1612 Nastazja née Krasnosielska, daughter of Vasil and wife of Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, judge in the territorial court of Bratslav, brought a suit before the court in Bratslav against Ivan and Horodij the Żitynskis for having failed to allocate her portion of the property she was entitled to, by right of inheritance from her mother, and causing damage to it. The property in question concerned the villages of Sutyska(i), Szersznie, Tywrów, Janków, Witawa, Żukowce, Woroszyłowce, Borsuki, Dzunków, Hubin, and Wołkowce, which belonged to the Sutyska estate.\textsuperscript{135} The Żityński family contributed also to the public affairs of the Bratslav territories. Ivan held the office

---

\textsuperscript{31} Polish Zloty. On the same day Ivan’s wife Nastazja entered in the same registers her own deed by which she donated to her husband the villages of Bohdanówka, Młyny and others (KremenetsZiemskiSud, 1965 3: 214).
\textsuperscript{131} ZDz., 1894 20: 101.
\textsuperscript{132} APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59 (original in Ruthenian).
\textsuperscript{133} APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74 (original in Ruthenian).
\textsuperscript{134} BStefanyka: sig. III/4105, f. 36-41v.
\textsuperscript{135} ZDz., 1896 21: 556 (digest).
of Military Curator (Pol. wojski, Lat. tribunus) of Bratslav in 1617-25.\(^{136}\) In 1629 his son Horodij was W. A. Kalinowski’s plenipotentiary in the Starosty of Bratslav.\(^{137}\)

3. Tychon Semenowicz’s Family and Friends not Involved in the Foray.

The list cited in Oleksiej Diakowski’s declaration of the murdered man’s friends and relatives who tried to retrieve the body calls for special attention. I will discuss most of them in this sub-chapter, except for the Diakowskis and Kruszelnickis, whom I shall deal with later.\(^{138}\) I have already discussed Tychon’s servants in Chapter 3.\(^{139}\) Of those named in the list, Dzjusza, Kruszelnicki, and the Diakowskis were close relatives of Tychon. Postolski belonged to the same armorial clan of gentry as Dzjusza.\(^{140}\) Another individual who is to be regarded as Dzjusza’s kinsman is Hrehory Baybuza, notary of the court in Vinnysia Castle, a neighbour of the Slupicas and the most controversial character in this list.\(^{141}\) Baybuza held the office of notary at Vinnysia for an exceptionally long time, from 1572 to 1620.\(^{142}\) All the evidence indicates that whilst handling the affairs of the Slupicas by virtue of his office, he was also a client and confidant of Prince Janusz Zaslawski. Like the court beadle and Stefan Dzjusza (quite apart from his family links), he may have been sent to Kuna by the court to act as a witness. If so, then he would probably have also been working as an “observer” for Zaslawski. An indication in support of such a hypothesis is the letter of 31 October 1617, preserved in the Sanguszko Archives, and addressed to Prince Janusz Zaslawski, then Voivode of Volhynia, by his “humble servant” Hrehory Baybuza.\(^{143}\) In it Baybuza informed the Prince of the outcome of his endeavours to procure the

\(^{137}\) ZDz., 1894 20: 134. Horodij paid then the chimney tax for Michałówka, Witawa, Majanów and Sutyska(i).
\(^{138}\) See below C/3: 32-23 [the Diakowskis] and D/3: 352-53 [the Kruszelnickis].
\(^{139}\) See Chapter 3/3: 186-89.
\(^{140}\) See above A/4b: 296-98.
\(^{141}\) We do not know exactly when Hrehory Baybuza’s son Constantine married to Anna Kierdej Dziuszanka (of the Dziusza family). Most probably the wedding took place around 1615.
\(^{142}\) See NykielBratslavStarosts, 2004; Appendix B.
\(^{143}\) APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/62 (original in Polish).
The Baybuzas, owed their status to Michał Hrybunowicz, who had done many years of military service under Prince Michał Wiśniowiecki and thanks to the latter’s support had obtained a charter for land of the Rivers Sula, Udaj, Solonica, and Lużek (Luzhek) in the territory of Cherkasy. The charter was confirmed by Stephen Báthory, a fact mentioned in an act of Sejm passed in 1590. Michał’s sons, Semen and Tychon, “senior officer” (= commander) in the Zaporoże (Zaphorozhian Cossacks) force, augmented this endowment after 1590. Most probably they had Turanian (Turkic) roots, while their name was derived from the name of the River Bajbuzka, a tributary to the Tyklicz Uhorski River. In the 16th century they merged into the Hrybunowicz family. In the mid-
16th century they appeared in the Pobozhe area. The next members of the Baybuza family mentioned in the records are the brothers Hrehory and Ivan, who on 16 September 1582 redeemed a quarter portion of the Ostolop property in the Powiat of Vinnytsia from Lazar Bohdan Deszkowski. In 1599 the Baybuza family held part of Buszyńce, and around 1600 they acquired the village of Kropiwna near Bratslav from the Ziałowskis. Next they purchased Rajgrod (Rayhrod), a neighbouring property (also close to Nosowce) founded prior to 1599 on Ostołopów land, which they had originally held on a lease from Princes Korecki. In 1606 it was to the Princes Korecki that they ceded their rights to a portion of Kalnik and Cybulów. For years they engaged in litigation against other shareholders over the boundaries in the Ostołopów properties.

On 16 September 1604 the Lublin Tribunal heard the case for the delimitation of a boundary between Kropiwna Niżna and Kropiwna Wyżna and Sitkowce. Hrehory Baybuza, notary of the castle court at Vinnytsia brought this case for the term reserved to the Voivodeship of Kyiv (5 August). The defendants were the Zbaraski brothers, Krzysztof and Jerzy, Starost of Pińsk, sons of Prince Janusz Korybut Zbaraski, Voivode of Bratslav. Ultimately the parties reached a compromise settlement and agreed on a new boundary to be delimited by an arbiter, Ivan Mikuliński, notary of the territorial court of Bratslav and Vinnytsia. For reasons unknown Mikuliński did not mark out the new boundary duct between the Baybuza villages of Kropiwna Niżna and Kropiwna Wyżna, which were

Unicorns. It is the story of a nameless Bajbuza sold by his mother, who used intermediary of an Armenian to the Ottoman captivity. He has been in the Ottoman hands for 20 years. In 1500, a kadi of the town of Bulhad [Berlad in Moldavia?] made a gift of this particular Bajhuza to the Polish envoy Wawrzyniec Fredro (Trustiewicz, 1870: 299-300 and note 67: here quotation from the aforementioned legend).

PułaskiKronika, 1991 1: 2; ZDz., 1897 22: 727: here erroneously in 1572. DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28, f. 59v.-70: delimitation decree regarding the borders between Starosty of Bratslav and Ostołopów estate. Here also (f. 59) a sales contract on the 4th share in Ostołopów inherited after the late grandfather Mikołaj Pietniczański by Lazar Bohdan Deszkowski and sold to Hrehory and Jan (Ivan) the Baybuzas. Written down on 16 September 1582 at Bratslav, entered in the Crown Metrica register on 30 October 1582 at Warsaw.

Trustiewicz, 1870: 299.

ZDz., 1897 22: 631, 727.

See below, 332-21 and notes.
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adjacent to the Ślipicas Nosowce properties, and the land held by the Princes Zbaraski, until 3 July 1606 (a deed was drawn up at Łojowce).

Earlier Hrehory Baybuza had accused the Zbaraskis of encroaching on land from the Kropiwna property belonging to him and annexing it to Sitkowce. The new boundary delimited in the presence of both parties was entered in to the register of the Lublin Tribunal on 23 May 1607. Ivan Krasnosielski of Krzykowce (Krykowce), adjacent to the Meleszko property Ometyńce, and the Obodenski of Woytwowce [Wójtowce] were listed in the deed as their neighbours sharing the same boundaries. In 1617 the said Hrehory Baybuza brought another delimitation case to the territorial court at Vinnytsia, this time against the Meleszkos. On 16 August 1622 the Crown Tribunal at Lublin issued a decree in the case brought by Meleszko’s sons, Constantine, Semen, and Michał, against Halszka of Rohożno, wife of Ivan Meleszko by her first marriage, and of Alexander Piaseczynski by her second marriage, and her children by her first marriage, Mikta (Mikołaj) Iwanowicz and Anna. The verdict concerned the boundaries of Ometyńce and Kropiwna Wyżna.

Hrehory (Pol. Grzegorz) Hrybunowicz Bajbuza (Baybuza), who used an individual armorial device, assumed the duties of notary to the castle court (Pol. pisarz grodzki, Lat. notarius castrensis) at Bratslav and Vinnytsia probably in succession to Oleksiej (Aleksy) Tomkowicz (who is recorded as holding this office in 1569). He was one of the 16th century castle magistrates staying in office for the longest period: from 1572 (after 16 September) until 1620 (before 13 January). He had been appointed to this office by Prince Bohusz Korecki, but continued to hold it under Korecki’s successors, Jurij Struš of Komarów and Walenty A. Kalinowski. He must have enjoyed a particularly strong position with good cliental
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153 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 101, doc. 1, f. 1-4v.
154 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 101, doc. 2, f. 5-6v. (the 18th century extract, in Polish).
155 Litwin, 2000: 212: 1569; Akta unii, 1932: 319; ZDz. 1894 20: 101: here as the castle notary (Pol. pisarz grodzki) of Bratslav and Vinnytsia.
relationships, despite the dissatisfaction shown by the local community. On 6 June the townspeople of Bratslav demonstrated their dislike towards him in connection to the disappearance of some court registers from the Bratslav Castle due to Cossack activities in Bratslav.

Perhaps support from Zaslawski, who was Voivode of Volhynia in 1604-29 played a key role here, especially as Zaslawski was married to Princess Alexandra Sanguszkówna, daughter of Prince Roman Fedorowicz Sanguszko. Hrehory died after 13 January 1620. He was married to Agafia Iwanówna Buszyńska, sister of Semen Buszyński. His office as notary of the court passed to his son Constantine Hrehorowicz, heir to Kropiwna Wyżna and Kropiwna Niżna, Łojowce, and Mielnikowce. In 1629 Constantine, who died around 1643, was married to Anna Dziuszanka. In 1645, when Anna married Alexander Parul as her second husband, Constantine’s brothers sued her for the return of his documents. I did not manage to establish the family relationship between Anna and Stefan Dziusza, second husband of Marusza Słupiczyna [V/6]. Alongside Constantine, Hrehory Baybuza also had two more sons, Semen (Siemion, Symenon), a royal captain.

Litwin, 2000: 212: September 16 1572 – 22 June 1618; Krykun/Piddubniak, 1999: 138: 1595-1619; Boniecki, 1899 1: 79; ZDż. 1896 21: 298: after 22 June 1618; Żychlirski, 26: 13; CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 242, doc. 3: 9 January 1574, F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1340, f. 3v.: 13 January 1620, F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 101, f. 5-6v.: 16 August 1622. Hrehory Bajbuza was appointed to the function of the Vinnytsia castle notary after 16 September 1572 (Żychlirski), as the Bratslav notary he has been reported in the years 1574-98, and as the Vinnytsia notary in the years 1600-05, and 1612-18 (BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4108; APrK: ASang., among others t. 34, 44, 130/5, XIX/60, XXIX/22; Boniecki, 1: 79; ZDż., 1894 20: 122: 1 January 1600). According to Boniecki (Boniecki, 1899 1: 79) and Pułaski (PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 2: here as a territorial notary) he died ca. 1619, however on 13 January 1620 he testified in a document together with the Starost W. A. Kalinowski. In 1616, he was as the castle notary of Bratslav and Vinnytsia in the commission for the revision of castle (grod) and territorial judicial books in Vinnytsia (VL, 3: 141). After his death, his son Constantine Hrehorowicz Bajbuza was appointed to the post of castle notary (1622), and later (after 10 March 1628) became the Deputy Starost (Pol. podstarości) of Vinnytsia (Boniecki, 1899 1: 79).

CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 2: A claimant titled “On the court registers disappearance” (Pol. o poginięciu ksiąg).

PułaskiKronika, 1991 1: 2-3 (here unknown by name Lady Buszyńska); CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 60 (the Buszyńskis of Busza file), f. 57-58v. (an entry in the Bratslav territorial court registers on 6 June 1597; original in Ruthenian) = f. 59-60v. (Polish copy; here Agafia Iwanówna Buszyńska, sister of Siemion [Semen]). On the Buszyńskis see Chapter 2/B/2: note 91, p. 108.


See above A/4b: 298.
and Military Curator (Pol. *wojski*, Lat. *tribunus*) of Bratslav (1629-48?), and Mikolaj, and a daughter Nastazja who married Alexander Sońnicki. On 29 May 1630 the brothers Semen and Ivan Aleksiejewicz [Oleksjejewicz = sons of Oleksiej] Diakowski obtained a decree in the Crown Tribunal against the Baybuza brothers concerning the succession to the Ostolopów properties. Diakowski alias Dyakowski, who bore the family’s individual arms, descended from a Hungarian, one Seško Košlewski, who on 30 September 1442 obtained an endowment from King Vladislaus III of Varna for the properties of Diakowce and Jusupowce in the Powiat of Kamenets’ in the part of Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland. Boniecki’s armorial has a full account of the family’s Podolian line. Several members of this line served in the cavalry units of the ambient defence force. On 26 August 1583 Oleksiej (Alexander alias Aleksiej) Diakowski was a witness to the deed for the conveyance of the Zalesie (alias Łuka) estate to the Meleszko family. In 1594 he was a deputy of the Bratslav Voivodeship sent up to the Crown Tribunal at Lublin. And on 7 June of that year he brought a petition to that court for the delivery of a peasant subject of Jurij Struś, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, who had absconded from Pietniczany to Vinnytsia. By 1598 the Diakowski family, like the Baybuzas and the Princes Korecki, were joint holders of the Ostolopów estate; while in 1582 half of this estate had belonged to Ivan Diakowski. This is why for years the

162 PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 3; Litwin, 2000: 210 (Semen, appointment to office 1648?), 212 (Constantine, appointment date unknown until 1628); LakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 238 (Semen in 1627 among royal captains together with Jan [Ivan] Meleszko, Alexander Plewczynski and one Mikułiński).

163 CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, no. 15, f. 21v.

164 Boniecki, 1902 5: 123. The charter was entered in the castle court registers in Halych (Pol. *Halicz*) together with its confirmation deed of Sigismund I by brothers Damian and Iwańko accompanied by their nephew Olechno = Hrushev’s’kyiMaterialy, no. 39 = ZDM, 1975 8: 234, no. 2431 = AGZ, 10, no. 78.

165 Boniecki, 1902 5: 123.

166 Plewczynski, 1995: 27, 32, 46. They were But Aleksy as of 1549, Jan (Ivan) in 1545, both under the colours of Bernard Pretwicz; Ivan as of 1567, Olechno as of 1558 and Stanisław as of 1552. DAVO: F. 480, op. 1, spr. 4, k. 94v-95v; PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 14-15. The author cites an entire document entered in the castle court registers of Vinnytsia on 15 September 1583.

167 Otamanov’s’kyi, 1993: 149.

168 DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28, f. 39v-70: a delimitation decree regarding boundaries between the Starosty of Bratslav and Ostolopów estate, here f. 59.
Diakowski family engaged in litigation for the partitioning of the Ostolopów properties. On 1 May 1602 the Crown Tribunal issued a decree in the case of Oleksiej Diakowski versus Prince Joachim Korecki and Hrehory Baybuza concerning these properties. The same court issued a similar decree on 2 May 1603.

Ostolopów was also the subject of boundary disputes between the Diakowskis and Walenty A. Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav. In September 1610 Kalinowski sent his peasant subjects from the newly settled village of Horodnica onto the Ostolopów estate, where they seized several score hay-carts. Thanks to the mediation of Oleksiej Diakowski, the case went up to the Lublin Tribunal, which on 3 August 1612 issued a decree ordering Kalinowski to take an oath before the territorial court in Vinnytsia. On 3 May 1613 the court issued another decree in about a case concerning a second incursion of Ostolopów by Kalinowski’s men. In May 1610 some townspeople of Bratslav, and men in the Deputy Starost’s service had encroached on fields belonging to the Ostolopów estate, ploughed them and sowed wheat on them, and destroyed the local apiary. The case was due to be continued before the Tribunal in the following year. However, both proceedings went down to the territorial court of Vinnytsia. Eventually, on 29 July 1615, the Lublin Tribunal issued a verdict in favour of Oleksiej Diakowski, who was to take an oath confirming his right to tenancy, while Kalinowski was ordered to return the property he had seized.

Oleksiej Diakowski was appointed guardian to the Słupica minor (Jeremiasz Juriewicz [VI/6]), on the grounds of his consanguinity to the latter’s mother, Marusza Mikołajewna née Diakowska, whose first husband was Jurij.
Hrehorowicz Slupica [V/6], and whose second husband was Stefan Dziusza. On 29 January 1615 he lodged a complaint in the court of Vinnytsia Castle on behalf of his ward. And on 7 August of the same year appeared before the Lublin Tribunal on the young Slupica's behalf against the Rohoziskis and their accomplices. Oleksiej's sons were Ivan and Semen (Siemion), and a daughter, Nastazja, who married Vasil Krasnosielski before 1668. Semen Oleksiejewicz and his relative Tychon Diakowski were members of the party, which went to Kuna to retrieve the body of Tychon Semenowicz. Semen Oleksiejewicz also presented the already discussed statement on his father's behalf concerning the foray on Kuna in the court at Vinnytsia.

On 18 October 1617 Oleksiej acted as a witness to a deed whereby his neighbour Ivan Romanowicz Krasnosielski (son of Zdanna Bohuszewiczówna [IV/4]) made a gift to his son Bohdan Iwanowicz of half of the village of Krasne together with its manor house and appendages over, as a perpetual usufruct. This is the last document on which his name appears. Thereafter only his sons, Semen and Ivan, are mentioned. In 1629 they are recorded as having paid the tax due on the number of households (=chimneys, Pol. podymne) with hearths from their share in Ostolopów and Pietniczany. On 29 May and 10 June 1630 they obtained from the Lublin Tribunal the already described verdicts against the Baybuzas, related to the partitioning of the Ostolopów estate. The parties continued litigation on this issue until nearly the end of the 18th century.

The Diakowskis were related to the Mormils through the Kożuchowski family, and thanks to this consanguinity they shared property interests with the
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176 See above A/4b: 295-96 and passim.
177 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58, 59, t. XXX/92.
178 Boniecki, 1902 5: 123.
179 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59. Boniecki does not mention Tychon (Boniecki, 1902 5: 123).
180 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58. Boniecki does not mention Tychon (Boniecki, 1902 5: 123).
181 AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 409, no. 24: Jan paid the chimney tax of 6 Zlotys out of 12 chimneys, of a part in Pietniczany, while Semen paid the same amount for 12 chimneys from his shares in Ostolopów and Pietniczany.
182 CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, f. 21 (29 V 1630); DAVO: F. 792, op. 1, spr. 63, no. 28, f. 59 (10 June 1630, Stefan Iwanowicz Baybuza).
Meleszko family. Marianna née Koźuchowska was married to Oleksiej’s son, Ivan Diakowski. The couple had two sons Dmitr and Andrzej. On 5 July 1645, before the Lublin Tribunal Marianna, her two sons, their paternal uncle Semen Oleksiejewicz, Fedora, daughter of the deceased Ivan Oleksiejewicz and wife of Andrzej Cyryna, and Stefan Diakowski, drew up a deed with Daniel and Andrzej the Mormils for the partitioning of their property.

D. The Kuna Properties in 1615-29. Claimants to the Estate of Tychon Semenowicz:

1. Fedor and Jermolaj Iwanowicz, the Łysohorski Brothers, 1615.

The extant documents do not mention the Łysohorski brothers until 23 January 1615, when they appear as claimants to the estate of the murdered Tychon Semenowicz. Abundant information on their efforts to take over Kuna is included in the documents in the Sanguszko Archives. However, these papers do not provide the legal grounds for the Łysohorski’s claim. These acts compiled up with a thorough genealogical investigation shed light to the legal arguments supporting the Łysohorski’s bid for the estate. Thus, we learn that the brothers Fedor and Jermolaj (alias Hermolaus) were sons of Ivan Łysohorski (Łysogorski) of the possibly individual arms, who died before 1615, and of Marusza Bohdanówna Ślipiczanka [V/2], sister of Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. Since Halszka, Tychon’s sister and nearest relative, was accused of complicity in the attack on Kuna and Tychon’s murder, the Łysohorski brothers were next-of-kin, closer relatives than Fedoera Dmitriewna [VI/5], and were fully entitled to lodge a claim to the estate, all the more so, as the deceased was around 20 at the time of his sudden death and in all probability intestate.

183 CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, no. 15, f. 21v. On 29 May 1630 brothers Semen and Ivan Aleksiejewicz the Diakowskis obtained a verdict in the Crown Tribunal in the case brought by them against the Baybuza brothers regarding the hereditary rights to Ostolopów property. Eudoska (Owdotia) of the Koźuchowskis was Miško Mormil’s wife.
184 CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, no. 15, k. 21v.
Marusza Bohdanówna’s husband Ivan came from a family of Lysohorce, a village in the Starosty of Khmelnik in the Powiat of Latyczów in the part of Podolia belonging to the Kingdom of Poland. This property, a crown tenancy (Pol. królewszczyzna), was held in 1565-78 by an unnamed Lysohorski, who might have been identical with Ivan. His sons Jermolaj and Fedor Iwanowicz, along with the sons of a Jeremij Lysohorski (perhaps Ivan’s brother?), Grzegorz (Hrehory), Bazyli [Vasil], Józef, and Jan, appear in documents dated 1615 as joint holders of Lysohorce. In 1618 Jan Lysohorski held the office of Boundary Deputy Sub-chamberlain (Pol. komornik graniczny) for Podolia. In 1637 a Mikulińska (most probably either Marianna or Krystyna, daughters of Jerzy Meleszko Mikuliński) brought proceedings against Jermolaj Iwanowicz Lysohorski and Vasil and Józef, sons of Jeremij Lysohorski, for the looting of the village of Poczapiace in the Powiat of Vinnytsia. Neither the summons issued at Vinnytsia on 25 January 1615 on the application of Prince Janusz Zaslawski, Voivode of Volhynia, nor a similar petition lodged in the court of the Vinnytsia Castle on 29 January 1615 by Oleksiej Diakowski, guardian of the minor Jurij Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6], mention the Lysohorski brothers in the list of assailants participating in the attack on Kuna. They do not appear among the perpetrators of the crime until the

---

186 Boniecki, 1913 16: 193. In the opinion of Uruski they used the family name Łysoskórski of Łysoskórnia. Yet, the author most probably mistakenly interpreted the source material, mixing up the Łysoskórski family with the Łyskogorski alias Lysohorski and placed the representatives of one family under two somehow different family names (Uruski, 1913 10: 77).
187 Boniecki, 1913 16: 193.
188 Boniecki, 1913 16: 193. In 1629 Alexander Mikuliński paid the chimney tax from Poczapiće (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 409, no. XXIV). On 10 February 1631 an extract of a decree issued in the case of Jerzy Meleszko Mikuliński’s murder was entered in the court registers in Warsaw. The killed was father and brother to the defendants, who were his siblings Alexander, Jan, Marianna and Krystyna the Meleszko Mikulińskis and their paternal uncle and legal guardian Stanisław Meleszko Mikuliński. The culprit was Alexander Prusinowski, who has been accompanied while committing the murder by Alexander Karabczewski, Jan Prusinowski, Alexander Odziemicki (?) and Mikołaj Struś. The murder took place on 18 June 1630 in the country house of Prince Piotr Kozika (CDIAUK: MW, F. 398, op. 1, spr. 211 part 1, f. 60-60v. = MW Edition 2002: 664, no. 30 [book 25], f. 60-60v., see also ibidem, 683, no. 73 [book 26], f. 67-70: 15 February 1635).
189 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58 (25 January 1615; the 17th century Polish copy), t. XXX/59 (29 January 1615; original in Ruthenian).
petitions brought by Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] and Aleksander Kruszelnicki on 26 May 1615, and by Prince Janusz Zaslawski the next day.\textsuperscript{190}

Jermolaj and Fedor the Łysohorski entered the competition for the succession to Tychon's estate on 4 February 1615. On that day they lodged a complaint in the court of the Vinnytsia Castle against Vasil Rohozinski and his wife Halszka.\textsuperscript{191} In this document they describe Vasil as their “brother-in-law”, and Tychon as their “brother”. They accused both Rohozinski and his wife of Tychon’s murder and based the events on a dispute, which went back to the time when the couple lived in Kuna with Tychon. The issue was not the amount of Halszka’s dowry, but the fact that she had not received the share due to her in the family estates, although entitled before Tychon came of age (1605 (?) surely 1612). According to Diakowski’s information she had rescinded this right (most probably in writing) when she received her dowry.\textsuperscript{192} There are relatively few details of the developments during the foray in the Łysohorski complaint compared to the other complaints. The Ruthenian expression “as we are informed” (\textit{iako maiem vedomost’}) shows conclusively that the Łysohorski brothers had to rely on hearsaying, thereby also ruling out their involvement in the foray itself.\textsuperscript{193}

On 6 February 1615 Marcin Strzelczycki (Strelczyński), Beadle-General (Pol. \textit{woźny general}) for the Voivodeships of Kyiv, Bratslav, and Volhynia, appeared before the court of Vinnytsia Castle to deliver his report on the conveyance he had made a day earlier in the town of Kuna. Thereby the Castle magistrate was given official notice that the Beadle-General had formally conveyed the tenancy of the town of Kuna to the brothers Jermolaj and Fedor the

\textsuperscript{190} APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74 (26 May 1615; original in Ruthenian), t. XXX/75 and 76 (27 May 1615; original in Ruthenian and its Polish transcript).
\textsuperscript{191} APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/61 (original in Ruthenian).
\textsuperscript{192} It is well known from other sources, that Halszka shared the house in Kuna with her brother in the period of her maidenhood. Perhaps she continued to live at Kuna’s castle for a while soon after her marriage to Rohozinski ca. 1613, as already in 1613 the couple moved to Ziatkowce, a half of which they had just acquired from Ivan Meleszko. See Diakowski’s account (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58, 59).
\textsuperscript{193} APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/61.
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Lysohorskis. The conveyance itself had been conducted in unusual circumstances. Up arriving at Kuna with two customary witnesses, the noblemen Stanislaw Podgórski and Jan Opuski, as well as the interested parties, the Beadle-General found the gates of the town closed. However, a group of townspeople and the town’s bailiff (Pol. wójt) came out to meet them. The Lysohorski brothers declared that they were the successors to the estate of their slain brother, the late Tychon Słupica, and that therefore they wanted to take possession of the property and authority over all the people of the town.

Confronted with a magistrate armed with the appropriate document, the townsfolk, who must have been terrified and confused by the recent events (both the foray and the unsuccessful attempt to retrieve Tychon’s body), let the Lysohorski brothers into the town, treating them as the legitimate heirs. Their confusion is evidenced by the beadle’s account. “Having taken his counsel”, as the beadle reported, the townspeople of Kuna said that following the death of their lord, the deceased Słupica, they were like lost sheep, ever since they had been left on their own, with no-one wanting to speak to them; that they were of peasant stock, helpless without a lord and head, unable to govern their own affairs; and that therefore they were glad of their [the Lysohorskis’] arrival, and would gladly open up the town for them and submit to their authority, if they had a legitimate right to this.

Thus, escorted by the group of townsfolk, the Lysohorski entered Kuna Castle and faced no opposition or protest, so the Kuna estate was conveyed to them. There are two issues to note, in this affair. Firsts the mentality of the townspeople, the majority of whom in the borderland zone were indeed recruited from the peasantry, from which originated their fears of being left without a lord-protector, and seconds, we have to appreciate and give due credit to the Lysohorski for the speed and efficiency of their move. The documents cited

\[194\] APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/62 (original in Ruthenian).
\[195\] APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/62.
\[196\] APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/62.
below indicate that they (or more precisely their mother) retained a quarter portion of Kuna at least for a couple of months.

Meanwhile, already on 27 May 1615 (the day after the Kruszelnicki complaint), Prince Janusz Zaslawski added the Łysohorski to his list of unlawful claimants to the Kuna estate. In the complaint Walenty Przyłuski brought on Zasławski’s behalf the Łysohorski were accused alongside the Rohoziński of “the unlawful making of decrees and bringing forth summonses” concerning their unlawful tenancy of Kuna and its adjacencies. Zasławski continued his action with another complaint, this time before the Crown Tribunal, where on 25 July 1615 his attorney Andrzej Miączyński accused the Rohoziński and Łysohorski of conspiracy and undertaking unlawful judicial proceedings in connection to the murder of Tychon and the seizure of the Kuna estate. The previous day, the deputies appointed to hear the cases brought to the bench for the Voivodeships of Bratslav, Volhynia, and Kyiv, including the case submitted by Rohozinski and his wife against Jermolaj and Fedor the Łysohorski, had refrained from judging the case in view of the above-mentioned complaint by Zasławski’s attorney. Unfortunately we do not know what the final outcome of these two cases was.

On 9 July 1618 a decree was registered in the Kyiv court related to a case brought there by Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] and Alexander Kruszelnicki against the Rohoziński couple, Vasil Zityński, and Hermona (Jermona) and other members of the Łysohorski family. Kruszelnicki and his wife were suing them for the attack on Kuna launched from the town of Ziatkowce, during which the aggressors had made off with sundry goods including the charters for the Kuna properties. Unfortunately the verdict issued in this case is unknown, too. Perhaps already by the end of 1617, or maybe in 1618, following Halszka’s acquittal of complicity in her brother’s murder, Marusza Bohdanówna Łysohorska [V/2], mother of Ivan and

197 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/75, 76.
198 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/86 [117] and [118] (original and a copy of an extract).
199 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/86 (original in Ruthenian; the verdict signed by deputies).
200 ZDz., 1896 21: 314 (digest).
201 For the year 1618 there are no extant castle and territorial court records for Kyiv in CDIAUK.
Jermolaj, ceded her quarter share in Kuna to her niece. Like Halszka, she had acquired the right to a quarter share following the death of Tychon without issue. This conveyance might have been connected with her sons' attempt to take over Kuna and the accusations of their involvement in the murder made against them by the Kruszelnickis. Marusza also had a share in Nosowce, which she jointly owned with her brother Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1]. She must have resigned of this share before 1615 on behalf of the siblings Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3] and Halszka Rohozińska [VI/1]. The latter became after 1615 the only successor of the whole part, as at least claim so the 18th century judicial accounts.

I was unable to trace the Łysohorski brothers' activities after 1615 due to the lack of source material, thus nothing can be said of their fate afterwards, especially in the context of the on-going competition for the Kuna estate.

2. Halszka Semenówna and Her Husband Vasil Rohoziński, 1615-29. Vasil [Dmitrowicz?] Rohoziński (d. 1647) and His Family.

The attack on Kuna and murder of Tychon Semenowicz in 1615 put the Rohoziński couple in an extremely difficult and costly situation. They had to counteract a series of attempts to take possession of the Słupicas legacy in the following years, by both family (the Łysohorski and the Kruszelnickis, the latter also making use of the minor Jeremiasz Juriewicz Słupica, until 1618), and by powerful neighbours – the Princes Zasławski and Zbaraski, who wanted to increase their holdings at the Rohozińskis' expense. Thus, in 1615-24 all their efforts centered on refutating these claims. The battle waged in the entire judicial apparatus range available – from the local, territorial and castle courts, right up to the supreme court, attached to the Sejm. The end result was a substantial impoverishment, both for the Rohozińskis as well as for the rival party, the Kruszelnickis.

---

202 This was the so-called „fourth part” (Pol. czwarczna). See Chapter 5/6a note 145, p. 270.
203 Podolyanin, 1886: 568.
204 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 123, f. 42.
Moreover, the slaying within the space of three years of the last two male representatives (Tychon and Jeremiasz Juriewicz) of the house of Slupicas, with just successors in the female line left, put the entire estate assiduously accumulated since the 14th century in jeopardy of dissipation. As the estates of the Zbaraskis, Kalinowskis, Koniecpolskis, and other noble (or rather magnate) families were growing in the vicinity, it was a question of time before the two Slupicas heiresses, Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] and Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5], and their descendants, would be faced with the need to gradually sell their property. Before I move on to a detailed examination of the consequences of the foray and the endless litigation that dragged on in the courts for years, I shall devote a few paragraphs to the chief perpetrator of the fall of the house of Slupicas, Vasil Rohoziński, husband of Halszka. Since his ancestral family had branched off into numerous lines providing an abundance of extant sources, especially for the principal Volhynian line, I shall focus on the general information and the Bratslav line of the family.

The Rohoziński family of the arms of Leliwa was one of the most ancient in Wolhynia and had its roots in the village of Rohozna in the Powiat of Lutsk (near Beresteczko), where the family burial ground was situated, in the Orthodox churchyard of St. Mary’s. There is no further information available on the particulars of the earliest endowments of property to this family, hence it is hard to say when the Rohozinskis first came to Wolhynia and whom they had to thank for their original tenancies. At any rate, by the 16th century they had acquired the status of middle gentry, with family ties with such Wolhynian houses as the Borzobohaty Krasieński, the Bóbas Rostocki, the Jełowicz Bukojemski, and the Liniewski. They did not appear in eastern Podolia until the late 16th century.

205 Accordingly to the will of Vasil Iwanowicz Rohoziński (different form Vasil of our interest), dictated to the castle court judge of Lutsk, on 20 March 1580 at a manor house in Woronicze, he ordered relatives to bury him in a yard in front of S. Mary’s (“Svetoe Prechystoe”) orthodox church in Rohozna, close to his first wife Maria Iwanówna [Borzobohata] Krasieńska (Demchenko, Lyudmila. 2004. “Maynovi rozporiazhennia volyns’kykh shchliakhtychiv za materialamy testamentiv ta reestriv spadkovoho mayna XVI st. <DemchenkoTestamenty>,” Arkhivy Ukrainy 1/2: 112-47, here 139, Annex no. 6).

206 Uruski, 1931 15: 225; ZDz., 1896 21: 104.
Here they enjoyed the patronage of the Piaseczyński of the arms of Lis, a family aspiring to the magnate status, which had also come to the Bratslav territory from Volhynia, and which also became involved in the Słupica successors' affairs. Perhaps the Rohoziński's (or the one Rohoziński) eastward migration was connected in some way with their religious adherence, since at least some of them followed Arians (Anti-Trinitarians), a radical offshoot of the Protestant Reformation. According to Lewicki, Vasil Rohoziński was an Arian. The problem is that we have no way of identifying the Vasil in question as the one in the Kuna story, since he appears in the documents without his patronymic. However, it is more likely that the decisive factor determining the Rohoziński’s appearance in Podolia was related to the marriages they concluded.

At first the only property the Rohozińskis held in the Bratslav territory was Rohoza (alias Rohožna). The similarity of the name with that of their ancestral seat in Volhynia seems to be purely fortuitous. The Bratslavian Rohoza was situated in the Powiat of Bratslav, and in 1509-16 had been the subject of partitioning among the members of the Koszka family. Most probably it came into the possession of the newcomers from Volhynia, who regarded it as their ancestral seat already, by the early 17th century, by way of legacy from husband to wife, in outcome of the marriage of Fetjanna (Tatiana) Rohozianka, daughter of Ivan Rohoziński and sister of Danilo, Vasil, Dimitr, and Falelij, to Andriej Juchnowicz Koszka, son of the Juchno Iwanowicz Koszka who collected the family shares in Rohoza. Subsequently this family relationship was

208 Lewicki, 1923: 15.
210 On the Koszka see Chapter 2/B/2: 106-08 and notes 86, 87, 89, and note 90, 110-12 and note 98, p. 111, 115-16 and note 107, pp. 115-16, 118-19 (Juchno Smenenowicz), 119-22 (Ivan Juchnowicz).
211 Both Andriej Juchnowicz as well as his older brother Ivan Juchnowicz Koszka, the territorial court judge of Bratslav, ceded their title to the whole of paternal estates to Prince Constantine Ostrogski. Ivan initially gave it only as a loan. One may assume that Rohoza must have been consisted a dowry estate of Fetjanna, thus was not the subject of the mentioned above deal. Ivan died childless, and his property was to pass on the son of Andriej and Fetjanna alias Tatiana – Jan (Ivan) Andriejewicz. The latter sold the share which he inherited from his paternal uncle to Prince Janusz Zbaraski, again as one may assume excluding Rohoza (APKr.; ASang., t. 115/49: The
strengthened by further marriage bonds, between Ivan Jermolajewicz Meleszko and Halszka of Rohoźno, and between Vasil Rohoziński and Halszka Semenówna Shupiczanka, followed by Vasil’s second marriage to Anna née Krasnosielska, widow of Jakub Piaseczyński.212

The first Rohoziński mentioned in the armorial compendia, is the Volhynian Iwaszko Iwanowicz, married to Katarzyna Rylowiczówna, and his sister of unknown name.213 Perhaps Ivan was the son of Iwaszko and Katarzyna. In 1545 Iwan’s sons, Danilo, Vasil, Dimitr, and Falelij alias Falentij (in order of seniority) held two horodnia structures in Lutsk Castle, and another three on the great bridge over the Styr. The eldest, Danilo Iwanowicz, took part in person in the compilation of the 1545 revisory record for Lutsk Castle, in which he is mentioned in the group of landowning gentry for the Powiat of Lutsk.214 The 16th-century registers for the territorial and castle courts, especially for Lutsk, have a spate of entries in which the Rohozińskis appear, especially in connection with their litigation (as of 1548 by the latest) for the demarcation of boundaries. In 1570 all four of Ivan’s sons were still paying the conscription tax (Pol. pobór) on Rohozna, but by 1583 the only taxpayers left were Matwiej and Vasil, sons of Dimitr.215

The key problem is establishing Vasil’s identity, since his patronyme does not appear in any of the documents associated with the Shupicas’ properties. Most probably he is the same as Vasil, son of Dimitr Iwanowicz alias Piotr, and he is

---

Koszka family genealogy). Tatiana alias Fetyjanna was mentioned in the last will of Vasil Iwanowicz Rohoziński, the Lutsk Castle court judge, registered in the castle court at Lutsk on 20 March 1580. She appeared there as daughter of Ivan and sister of Vasil married to Andriej Koszka. It was exactly her brother Vasil who entrusted his daughter Hanna into her guardianship (DemchenkoTestamenty, 2004: 140, Annex no. 6).

212 For the Vasil’s second marriage see below 334-36. Also below I shall be presenting only a selection of the documents, to reconstruct the family tree and estimate the assets of the line leading down to Vasil, husband of Halszka Semenówna Shupiczanka.

213 In 1518 they resigned their properties of Demidów and Batków on behalf of their brother-in-law Vasil Ryłowicz (BonieckiPoczet, 1887: 283). The Ryłowicz alias Ryło family can be identified most probably with a boyar family in the Vitebsk province of Lithuania proper of the Wieniawa arms. Of these Vasil bought off Batków and received Demidów in 1518 from them (Uruski, 1931 15: 351).

214 ZDz., 1877 6: XXXI, 21: here as Daniley Rohozycki.
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certainly not the same as the Vasil Iwanowicz who died in 1580. His alleged change of religion supplies indirect evidence for this hypothesis. Although, only for Dimitr alias Piotr Rohozinskí there is a surviving record confirming his conversion. Lewicki and Jablonowski consider Vasil who flourished in the 1630’s, as an adherent of Arianism.216 We may thus assume that Vasil’s father, Dimitr otherwise known as Piotr, was the one who changed his religion, the fact to be confirmed also by the change of name. This event, alongside his relatively recent settlement in the Bratslav territories, would explain the absence of Vasil’s patronymic in the source documents.

According to the digest cited by Jablonowski, this Dimitr Iwanowicz who died after 5 August 1572, married Orynia, a widow recorded as paying conscription tax in 1581 on the village of Wysokie in the Voivodeship of Kyiv.217 Orynia’s personal information may be identified on the grounds of Dimitr’s alias Piotr’s last will.218 Piotr, according to the will, left his wife, the Lady Orynia Bołbasówna an interest for life on a portion of Rohozna, Woroniecze, Wołkowicze, and Kaziniwy (?), along with the manor house at Wołkowicze.219 As states an entry in Slownik Geograficzny, two sons Matwiej and Vasil survived him. In 1583 they paid a tax on their share in Rohozna.220 Dimitr’s younger brother

217 Trusiewicz, 1870: 310. The author relies on the beadle’s account of the burial ceremony of Dimitr Rohozinskí; ZDz., 1894 20: 45 (1581): “From lady Dimitrowa Orynia Rohozinska the village of Wysokie...” Wysokie was situated between the villages of Słuczyna and Czertenia. As Jablonowski states it belonged to the Rohozinskí already in 1569 (ZDz., 1897 22: 619). Yet, on 5 August 1572 Dimitr witnessed together with his brother Falelij the last will of Andriej Iwanowicz Rusyan. See below, note 219.
218 It was drawn up under the latter name in Wołkowicze on 21 March 1572 and subsequently was entered in the Volhynian Metrica. The change of name was probably on account of Rohozinskí’s change of religion. Although the last will mentions his “spiritual father” a priest Vasil Martinowski who also was its witness, thus Piotr might have also converted again shortly before his death. For the will signatures see below.
219 MW, F. 389, op. 1, spr. 194, part 2, f. 81v.-85v.: an entry of the will of Piotr Rohozinski. As witnesses appeared: Michajlo Kory cientyi [Koryciński], Castle court notary at Lutsk; Pawel Koryciński [Koryciński]; Jan Bołbas Rostocki; Marko Zbranyj, Court Beadle of Powiat of Lutsk; Vasil Martinowski “a priest from Rohoza my spiritual father” = MW Edition 2002: 269, no. 13 [book 4, f. 81v.-85v.] = AGAD: Tzw. ML, sig. III/315-III/327 [book 4], f. 81: Piotr Rohozinskí’s will. As guardians to widowed Oryna of the Bołbas Rostockis were to act, the youngest of Dimitr’s brothers Falelij Iwanowicz, Fedor alias Grzegorz Bołbas Rostocki, Territorial Court Notary of Kremenets, possibly Dimitr’s brother-in-law, and Michajol Markowicz Żurawnicki.
220 SlownikGeogr., 1900 XV, part 2: 546. The other shareholder was Mikołaj Chrenicki.
Falelij Iwanowicz had a surviving son Semen (d. before 2 July 1635).²²¹ According to Pułaski, Semen Falilejewicz was married to Anna née Massalska (d. before June 1619), though as claims Boniecki around 1588 he married Katarzyna, daughter of Jakim Liniewski of Liniew in the Powiat of Lutsk, of the arms of Przyjaciel.²²² Both are right, since Semen was married twice. By his first wife, Liniewska, he had a son Jan and two daughters, Halszka, who married Jan Zając (Zajec) Zdzieniecki, and Raina, who married Mikołaj Borowski. By Massalska he had a surviving daughter, Hanna.²²³ Semen Falilejewicz's daughter was the Halszka [Rohozina] of Rohožno who married Ivan Jerolałejewicz Meleszko as her first husband, and Alexander Ławrynowicz Pisaczyński in her second marriage.²²⁴ These circumstances suggest a hypothesis that Ivan Meleszko, legal guardian of the Słupica minors, arranged a marriage for Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] with Vasil

²²¹ APKr.: ASang., t. 199/30: here under date 2 July 1635 appears the son of late Semen Falilejewicz – Jan Rohoziński, who referred to his father’s first wife Princess Anna Massalska as his stepmother. I have not been able to identify Semen’s mother.

²²² Boniecki, 14: 266 (the Liniewskis). The founding ancestor of the Volhynian line of Princes Massalski was Ivan Wasilewicz (d. after 1552), son of Prince Vasil Fedorowicz. Married to Princess Hanna Iwanówna Korecka (1528–32), daughter of Ivan and Fedka, heiress of estates in Volhynia, who accordingly to Wolff died without issue (Wolff, Kniaziowie, 1895: 173, 232, 234). In 1532 due to the long lasting conflict with her paternal brother Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki, she got with her husband the King’s consent to sell half of the paternal Korze estate, the second half of which belonged to Bohusz Korecki. Yet probably Prince Ivan Wasilewicz had with Hanna Korecka (we have no data suggesting he might have been twice married) a few sons. Surely one of them was Vasil Iwanowicz married to Anna, daughter of Ivan Iwanowicz and the others were probably Ivan and Bohdan. The latter married twice, first to a Princess Czetwertyńska, secondly to Nastazja of the Koszkaras, and had two sons Ivan and Jurij. Wolff does not mention, while discussing the Massalski family, that Anna was married to Rohoziński (Wolff, Kniaziowie, 1895: 235). It is known however, from the Lutsk territorial court register, that Anna Rohozińska was related to Prince Vasil Massalski, and bore the patronymic Juriewna. Thus, she might have been daughter of Jurij Bohdanowicz, while in 1619 her son Semen Falilejewicz Rohoziński sued because of his maternal estates Princes Kiryk Juriewicz and Vasil, referring to the latter as to his mother’s brother. The explanation of these family relations is to be offered by the described below case of 1635, when Jan Semenowicz Rohoziński went to the court with Anna’s brothers Princes Kiryk, Vasil and Ivan, all of them children of Prince Jurij Bohdanowicz.

²²³ In the judicial papers of Semen Falilejewicz in his case against Princes Massalski, there is no mention of his offspring.

²²⁴ PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 21. The author states that Ivan Meleszko’s wife was Halszka, daughter of Vasil Rohoziński, Halszka Semenówna’s husband. As it was underlined above (A/1 note 24, p. 285) there is no doubt that her father was Vasil Iwanowicz (d. 1580), of the Volhynian line, who did left a daughter named Hanna. See also Demchenko Testamenty, 2004: 138-41, Annex no. 6. According to the above-mentioned genealogy of the Krasnosielski (APKr.: ASang., t. 119/29) Anna of the Krasnosielski was a daughter of Ivan and Marianna née Czerlenkowska. Meanwhile Pułaski is of the opinion, that she was a daughter of Vasil and that in 1637 she was already widowed (Pułaski Kronika, 1991 2: 150). The same scholar also claims Alexander Pisaczyński’s wife Halszka was a daughter of Semen Falilejewicz Rohoziński and Princess Anna Massalska (ibidem, 2: 145 and note 2).
Rohozinski, his wife’s cousin. However, it cannot be ruled out that Vasil Rohozinski had already met the Shipicas earlier, through the Piaseczyński, or more precisely through Sub-Chamberlain (Pol. podkomorz, Lat. subcamerarius) Ławryn Piaseczyński, father of Alexander and Jakub, whose the Deputy Sub-chamberlain (Pol. komornik ziemski) was Hrehory Ždan Słupica [IV/2]. Moreover, the Piaseczyńskis were already related to the Słupicas through the Krasnosielski family. I shall also discuss what happened to Vasil after the death of Halszka Semenówna, which occurred between 1638 and February 1639.

After Halszka Semenówna died Vasil Rohozinski entered soon into marriage to Anna of the Krasnosielski of Krzykowce, widow of Jakub Ławrynnowicz Piaseczyński, Cup-Bearer of Bratslav and brother of Alexander, since 1633. Vasil witnessed on 20 October 1618 at Lutsk, Alexander Piaseczyński’s deed on behalf of his newly-wedded bride, from whom the bridegroom had borrowed 20,000 of Polish Zlotys against security in his paternal estates. Next, beside Olbrycht Kochanowski, territorial Judge of Bratslav; Stefan Russyan, Royal Secretary; Ivan Kleszczewski, Esquire-Carver of Bratslav; Vasil and Bohdan the Krasnosielski’s brothers-in-law, has been appointed one of guardians of Jakub Piaseczyński’s issue. Jakub mortally ill wrote down his last will at Vinnytsia during the St. Trinity court hearings in 1631, asking to testify his deed the then Esquire-Carver of Bratslav Ivan Kleszczewski, the Krasnosielski brothers and Constantine Hrehorowicz Baybuza, the Vinnytsia Castle Notary.

The repeated meeting of the future spouses took most probably place on the occasion of the delimitation of properties between the Krasnosielski brothers Vasil and Bohdan owners of Krzykowce and Krasneczkie and Olbrycht Kochanowski, Territorial Judge of Bratslav and Stefan Russyan, Military Curator of Bratslav. Since both parties appointed then Vasil Rohozinski as one of the arbitrators. Under

---

226 BStefanyka : F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 89-90 (an entry in the Lutsk court registers on 29 November 1619).
227 BStefanyka : F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 166-169v. Witnesses of the last will were members of the territorial court of Bratslav Olbrycht Kochanowski, a judge; Michał Kropiwnicki, a deputy judge; and Sylwester Czerlenkowski, a notary.
this capacity he signed at Żywotów, a delimitation act, which followed the
delimitation procedures conducted on 13 November 1638 on the field „near the
mounds of Lords Piaseczyńskis”.

On 28 February 1639 Vasil acting as husband of Anna registered on her
behalf the last will of her late husband Jakub in the Vinnytsia Castle court
registers. A claimant against the rest of the family accompanied the testament.
Anna accused them of “keeping and not passing so far the testament to be entered
to the local court registers due to the lack of legal knowledge”. From the very
moment of Jakub’s death Anna entered in a fierce conflict with her daughter
Marianna and son-in-law Jan of Łukoszyn Chlebowski, as the latter was claiming
Marianna’s dowry in accordance with the provisions made in Jakub’s testament.
The quarrel continued till late 1640’s. On 29 December 1644 among other
accusations the Chlebowskis entered a writ in the castle court of Kremenets
(transferred next to Vinnytsia Castle court registers, 1 February 1645) against their
mother and her second husband Vasil, accusing them of not fulfilling Jakub’s last
will resolutions in terms of his daughters’ dowries as Marianna had also sisters.
The Chlebowskis claimed damages amounting to 10,000 of Polish Zlotys. Most
probably in connection to this case Anna, on 20 May 1645 designated Vasil and
five attorneys to represent her in territorial and castle courts in Vinnytsia and in the
Tribunal of Lublin.

---

228 APKr.: ASang., t. 115/39. Yet on 6 October 1638 Anna of the Krasnosielskis appeared in a writ assisted by her four sons as widow of Jakub Piaseczyński.
229 BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/1405, f. 166-169v. and f. 170-173v. (The second entry of Piaseczyński’s last will by Vasil Rohozinski).
230 PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 150. According to Pułaski, Marianna’s husband was Jan Walerian Chlebowski of the Poraj arms, a royal captain. Due to this long lasting conflict and impossibility to settle down all property issues Jan and Marianna did not secured reciprocally their life pensions, until 3 January 1652. Second daughter of Anna was to be married to one Chodakowski or Michał Jankowski.
231 BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4106, f. 3-4v.
232 BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4106, f. 1-1v. Two days later (on 22 May) the castle court of Vinnytsia authorised an appellation to the Crown Tribunal at Lublin related to the case brought by the Chlebowskis against the Rohoziński. On 17 May 1646, an account of the court beadle was registered there of the delivery of the next claimant from the daughter. The document was handed over to her mother at Zorniszcze (BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4106, f. 38-39v. [1645], f. 29-30v. [1646]).
Soon after his second marriage around 1638/39 Vasil gradually retired from his Kuna plans, transferring the responsibility to his sons, especially the oldest one Matwiej. Of all likelihood he settled down then in his second wife’s property, and got involved into her conflict with her children. Apparently from the very beginning Rohozinski took over the complicated matters of Anna and her progeny, as he used to be one of their guardians. He also acted on behalf of Ivan Meleszko’s children.  

2.a. Prince Janusz Zasławski of Ostróg: His Final Attempt to Take Over the Kuna Estate (1615-22).

Following the murder of Tychon Semenowicz Prince Janusz Zasławski of Ostróg, Voivode of Volhynia, obtained a royal summons at Vinnytsia on 25 January 1615, thus he turned out to be faster in initiating the proceedings then Tychon’s family members. The Prince’s summons was addressed to Halszka Semenówna, sister of the deceased, and her husband Vasil Rohoziński, described in it as the “null and void, unlawful tenant” of Kuna. The summons ordered the Rohozińskis to appear in court before the Lublin Tribunal on the session for the Voivodeship of Volhynia. The case brought by Zasławski concerned “the said estate of Kuna and its appendages, on behalf of the right of its unquestionable heir.” The pretext for Zasławski’s renewed efforts was, of course, the death of Tychon Semenowicz.

Both parties had appealed against the verdict issued by the territorial court of Vinnytsia in 1614, and now Zasławski was demanding a conclusion to proceedings at the next session of the Tribunal. He claimed that in the previous year his attorney had obtained an order of eviction on the defendants. They

233 In 1629 he paid the chimney-tax for Łuka and Ometyńce for 213 cottages amounting to 106 Zlotys and 15 groszy (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 411, no. XXIV: with amounts in zlotys’ [Łuka i Ometyńce] = ZDz., 1894 20: 142: without money accounts [Łuka i Ometyńce]). In the tax register he was recorded as acting on behalf of Lady Meleszkwowa, who might have been identified with Anna, daughter of Ivan Jeremajewicz Meleszek, stepdaughter of Alexander Piaseczyński.

234 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58 (the 18th century Polish copy of the summons) = ZDz., 1894 20: 107 (digest dated in 1615).
immediately replied that the order had been served on them "without their knowledge thereof", and as a consequence it had been annulled. Zasławski’s attorney was now appealing to the Lublin Tribunal against the annulment. Soon afterwards members of the family made complaints and petitions against the Rohoziński family. First, on 29 January 1615, Oleksiej Diakowski on behalf of the minor Jeremij Juriewicz [VI/6], and next on 4 and 5 February the Łysohorski brothers, sons of Marusza Bohdanówna Słupiczanka [V/2]. Next, on 27 May, the day following the registration of the Kruszelnickis complaint, another of Prince Janusz’s servants, one Walenty Przyłuski, appeared before the court to protest against Halszka Semenówna and the Łysohorski brothers, accusing them of conspiracy and the procuring of unlawful decrees and summonses concerning the Kuna estate.

The Rohoziński couple and Zasławski (or more precisely his attorney Andrzej Miączyński) met in court before the Lublin Tribunal in July 1615. The other parties summoned by the Prince were Ivan Czerlenkowski and Stefan Zaleski, respectively Judge and Deputy Judge of the territorial court of Vinnytsia, who had heard the cases concerning Kuna the previous year (1614). The summons addressing the magistrates accused them of procedural errors. First, they had not admitted Zasławski’s appeal to the Tribunal against the annulment of the eviction for the session after St. Michael 1614. Secondly, they had not sent the case to the session of the delayed proceedings bench (Pol. konserwanty), but directly to the court of the Voivodeship of Bratslav. Zasławski in his summons put the blame for the foray and homicide of Tychon Semenowicz on both husband and wife, and

235 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/58, t. XXX/85.
236 On 1 March 1615 Semen Wasilewski, Beadle-General for the Voivodeship of Bratslav appeared before the court of Vinnytsia Castle and presented a report related to Prince Zaslawski’s summons of Rohoziński and his wife for the Tribunal. The deed was handed over on 2 February at the Kima Castle (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/63: the 17th century Polish copy of the beadles’ account).
237 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/75 (original in Ruthenian).
238 The direct sending off the case to the Bratslav bench of the Lublin court was warranted in an eviction case, which in this particular subject was not the case. Especially, when Zaslawski registered initially his summons among the cases of the Volhynia Voivodesip. Also the delegated magistrates while defending their earlier decision to send the case to the konserwanty bench, cited the Tribunal’s ignorance of the fact that this was an eviction case as their grounds.
thereby declared them unlawful occupiers of the estate left by Tychon. The verdict
issued on 20 July concerned the right of tenure of Kuna, Jasłów, Karpów,
Kaleytynce [Kaletycze], Derenkowce, Loryńce, Nosowce, Husakowce, and other
places, settlements, and uninhabited areas. Yet again it recounted the Zasławski
version of the story of the Kuna estate from 1551. The estimate of the value of
these assets for 1575 and 1615 was 2640 of kopas of the Lithuanian groszs. The
decree confirming the validity of the decision made by the territorial court of
Vinnytsia mentions a fine of 100 grzywny levied on the Rohozinski for damages
sustained by that said court due to the accusations regarding the judgement it had
issued. The magistrates also petitioned for damages against Zasławski, claiming
that both parties had made groundless accusations against them. However, the
ownership of Kuna remained an open question.

On 7 August 1615 Prince Janusz’s attorney, Andrzej Miączyński, lodged
another protest. This intervention in turn was caused by the announcement of a
hearing for the case brought against the Rohozinski for the killing of Tychon by
Oleksiej Diakowski on behalf of his ward Jeremiasz Juriewicz [VI/6]. On the
previous day (6 August) Zasławski personally met the Rohoziński. This meeting
was a result of a decree issued at the previous delated proceedings bench (Pol.
konserwancy) session for the Voivodeship of Volhynia (on 20 July 1615). The
responsibility of Kuna’s current tenants for the death of Tychon seemed to support
Zasławski’s argument of their illegal possession of the Kuna estate. In his
summons they were now referred to as the “tenants of Kuna.” Zasławski himself
gave a virtually word-for-word recapitulation of the allegations concerning the
unlawful possession of Kuna and its appendages by the Słupica family since 1575.
However, the delegated députâtes upheld the annulment of the eviction order by

---

239 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/85 (original in Ruthenian of an extract with deputies’ signatures).
240 Here I shall pass over Zasławski’s intervention in July 1615 in the Rohoziński case against
Walentyn A. Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia in connection with the latter’s
assumption of the rights of Andriej Pilawski to reclaim his men who had absconded to Kuna. This
case, which was heard before the Lublin Tribunal, will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4/4a: 213-
17.
241 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/92 (original in Ruthenian of an extract with deputies’ signatures).
the previous Tribunal decree that Zaslawski had obtained against the Rohoziński, and allowed Halszka and Vasil to continue their proceedings.

Moreover, having heard both parties, they recognised the Rohoziński version as nearer to the truth, and ordered them to take an oath confirming their right to the Kuna property. The oath was to be taken, de facto by Halszka on her own, since she was the heiress. She had to appear before the territorial court of Vinnytsia, in the presence of six witnesses, “gentlemen of equal status”, within a term of six weeks of the current verdict. The wording of the oath was to mention Sigismund Augustus’ restitution of the Kuna estate to the Słupica family (1556), and their freehold on grounds of “the ancient land laws.” The further proceedings required after the taking of the oath were to be conducted by the territorial court.242

It would seem that Prince Janusz had lost the case for good. However, he was not giving up, and waited for a suitable pretext. On 11 January 1617 the territorial court of Vinnytsia convened to execute the Tribunal’s decisions.243 The subject was the Kuna estate and the right to its freehold. Prince Janusz appeared personally before the territorial court of Vinnytsia, attended by his attorney A. Miączyński. As soon as the Tribunal’s decree had been read out, he demanded the Rohoziński take the oath as required.244 The latter had arrived with their witnesses, Ivan Meleszko [sic]; Fedor Szandyrowski, Deputy Steward (Pol. podstoli, Lat. subdapifer) of Bratslav; the Kopijewski (Kopijowski) brothers - Bohdan, Treasurer (Pol. skarbnik, Lat. thesaurarius) of Bratslav, and Fedor; Andrzej Juszkowski; and Kiryk Koszka.245 Of this list, Meleszko and Juszkowski

---

242 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/19 (original in Ruthenian of an extract with deputies’ signatures).
243 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/40 (original of an extract in Ruthenian). The current session was an outcome of the decree the Tribunal had issued on 16 August 1616, and recorded in the registers for the Voivodeship of Bratslav (APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/40, f. 1 = CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 13-14v. and the same document f. 15-16v. = ZDz., 1894 20: 107 [digest, dated 16 August 1616] = Gawroński, 1915: 229, here misinterpretation of the events at Kuna, erroneous dates of 1615 and 1618).
244 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/40, f. 3.
245 1) Fedor Szandyrowski, Deputy Steward of Bratslav (Pol. podstoli, Lat. subdapifer) in 1616-38 (Litwin, 2000: 209: 5 October 1617-20 October 1638). Married to Krystyna of Wielhor, and had two sons Waclaw and Mikolaj and a daughter Katarzyna. The latter married first to Florian Kranosielski and next to Piotr Drabkowski (CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1, spr. 1, nos. 92, 95, F. 221, op. 1,
spr. 54, f. 12-13). Niesiecki mentioned only Fedor, Treasurer (Pol. *skarbnik*, Lat. *thesaurius*) of Bratslav (without offering date of his magistracy), who in 1658 was also Captain of a light horse (Pol. *rotmistrz pancernej*). He was reputed to take part in all military campaigns during the reign of John Casimir (1648-68) (Niesiecki, 1841: 599). Perhaps this Fedor is identical to the Treasurer of our interest, as Fedor Szandyrowski is recorded keeping this magistracy in 1638-39, what is also in co-relation with his previous function of Deputy Steward. Under the same name, as Treasurer of Bratslav he was also recognised by Litwin (Litwin, 2000: 211: 20 October 1638 - January 1639). In 1635-42 the Szandyrowskis estate was being administered first by Stefan Russian, and then by the Kochanowski family. This fact resulted from acknowledgement of Andrzej alias Matiasz Szandyrowski, Military Curator (Pol. *wojski*, Lat. *tribunus*) of Bratslav in 1629-30, as a traitor; his properties similarly to Bohdan Sulpica were the subject to forfeit (Pol. *kaduk*) (Litwin 2000: 144, 210). See also Chapter 2/B/5: 142 and note 182, and Chapter 5/B/2: 246-53.

2) Brothers Bohdan and Fedor the Kopijowskis represented the Kopijewski alias Kopijowski family of individual arms of Kopijówka alias Hopitylińce (formerly Kopijówka Nowa) in the *Powiat* of Vinnytsia. According to Boniecki, they presented themselves from Kopijew alias K[H]opijówkinie in the Bratslav territory and were sons of Jacek, who in 1587 resigned Kopijówka with other properties to them. Fedor Jackowicz was in 1616 one of the commissaries appointed for the revision of Bratslav court register books. Married to Marusza of the Mikulihskis. The latter was in her second marriage with Prince Fedor Czetwertyński. Fedor Kopijewski in the opinion of Boniecki and Uruski was to be killed in 1621 by his nephew Mikołaj (Boniecki, 1907: 120; Uruski, 1914: 11: 60). In reality he was killed together with his brother Bohdan on 9 July 1621 in the course of a foray organised by his sister-in-law Nastazja of the Lisiewiczs and the abovementioned Mikołaj. A detailed account of the event is to be found in a summons entered in the castle court registers at Vinnytsia on 21 July 1621 by Marusza of the Mikulihskis, Fedor’s widow, who “being very ill and crestfallen because of unsupportable sorrow, almost half-dead weeping enormously atestated moumiully and summoned...”. She accused Nastazja, by then already wife of Paweł Bernaszewski and her son Mikołaj of conspiracy and for the preparation of the foray in the town of Hopitylińce. During the event the brothers Fedor and Bohdan were killed in their manor house and their corpses were desecrated. On this occasion the attackers stole all documents and deeds of privileges for the Kopijewskis’ estates, among which Fedor’s deed entrusting to his wife a life possession of estate in Hopitylińce and a part of Kopijów. The foray was conducted with a force of “up to several hundred” [an amount as usually in summonses highly overestimated] Cossacks recruited out of different regiments of Zaporohian army assembled in the neighbouring Nesterwar [the Kalinowski’s estate] due to the mobilisation on the eve of the anti-Ottoman campaign (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1340, f. 2, spr. 1344, f. 1-2v.: an entry in the castle court at Vinnytsia on 20 July 1621). Bohdan Jackowicz is recorded as Treasurer of Bratslav in 1616-18. He was married to Nastazja, then entered a second marriage as wife of Paweł Bernaszewski (the wedding ceremony took place before 20 July 1621), and a third one as wife of Andrzej Dzik (1624). Besides the aforementioned Mikołaj (who in 1625 faced the Crown investigator [Pol. *instigator koronny*] being accused of the preparation of unlawfully intrusions into the Wallachian territories) Bohdan also had a daughter Regina (alias Raina) (Boniecki, 1907: 120). The latter was married twice, both times to Poles from the Crown Mikolaj Kamięński and Stanisław Skarżyński (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 30, f. 11: the Kopijewski family genealogy; F. 49, op. 2, spr. 1344, f. 1-2v.), On 13 January (an entry in the territorial court registers on 14 January, at Vinnytsia) 1620 both Kopijowski brothers conducted division of their hereditary Hopitylińce estate from the then belonging to Walenty A. Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia Nesterwar. As witness to this delimitation appeared among others, Hrehory Bajbuza (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 1340, f. 1-2). On Hrehory Bajbuza see above C/3: 315-19. Bohdan owned also the Kunicze estate, which bordered with the Obodowskis grounds. This property was sold to Walenty A. Kalinowski, by his son Mikołaj in 1628 for 170,000 Zlotys (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2 [Potoccy], spr. 30, f. 11-12; PułaskiKronika, 1991: 87: the town of Kopiówka alias Optylınce with settlements Orłówka and Kopijówka and a country town of Kunicze alias Kozince with adjacneties). See also ZDzn., 1897: 22: 629, 717, 727.

3) Andriej Juszczkowski represented the Juszczkowski family of Juszczowce in the *Powiat* of Lutsk in Volhynia. Boniecki mentions as owners of Juszczowce Bazyli (Vasili) and Mikita (Mikołaj) in 1569,
were relatives of the Rohoziński skis (through the Mikuliński skis). The presence among
the designated witness of the former Tychon’s guardian Ivan Melszko, being
accused by the Kruszelnickis of participation in the foray of 1615 creates doubts,
which however cannot be cleared on the basis of extant sources. The Kopijewski,
Juszkowski, and Bohdan Kunicki, who had been called to supplement the list of
witnesses, held shares in the village of Kopijówka alias Hopitlińce adjoining the
Kuna estate (its Kamieniohorka and Rachny area).

Zaslawski immediately lodged a protest against the list of witnesses the
Rohoziński skis presented, in particular against three individuals. He said that persons
who were implicated in the infamous case of assault, looting and robbery could not
take the oath with Lady Rohozińska.246 He meant Kiryk Koszka, who had been
accused of assault and theft. To support his allegation, the Prince produced a Lady
Radziszewska as a witness.247 She testified that she recognised Kiryk Koszka as
one of the perpetrators (together with his brothers Ivan and Alexander) of an
assault and robbery committed against her and her husband as they were returning
home.248 The assailants had killed Lord Radziszewski. Zaslawski also alleged that

---

246 He meant Kiryk Koszka, who had been accused of assault and theft. To support his allegation, the Prince produced a Lady Radziszewska as a witness.
247 She testified that she recognised Kiryk Koszka as one of the perpetrators (together with his brothers Ivan and Alexander) of an assault and robbery committed against her and her husband as they were returning home.
248 The assailants had killed Lord Radziszewski. Zaslawski also alleged that
Fedor and Bohdan the Kopijewskis had committed homicide.\textsuperscript{249} To confirm his accusation he referred to the decrees issued to the Żabokrzycki family, who had brought two complaints against the Kopijewski brothers, in 1613 and 1616, for eviction from their property, and in 1617 for the murder of Ivan Żabokrzycki.\textsuperscript{250} The court had no option but to admit the Voivode’s arguments and evidence.

In the circumstances Halszka nevertheless determined to take the oath, “steering clear of all controversy”. She was of the opinion that the case had already been settled in the Tribunal, and therefore she asked the magistrates to send the beadle for the words of the oath. Then a discussion was conducted during which Kiryk Koszka tried unsuccessfully to clear his name.\textsuperscript{251} To avoid unnecessary hindrances, the court agreed to replace Koszka by one of the 24 gentlemen present.

\textsuperscript{249} APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/40, f. 4: In the Kopijewskis case “is also this note on excessus prede et homicidie” [murder], the original extract of which from the court registers, although is not available at the moment, will be however brought up from the Vinnytsia Castle court registers by tomorrow, to show that they are charged”.

\textsuperscript{250} In 1613 and 1616 the Żabokrzyckis accused the Kopijewski brothers of performing a foray in Terekowska [Torkowska = of Torków] estate and evicting them from this property; in 1617 of the murder of its lawful owner Ivan Żabokrzycki. Torków bordered with Kopijówka Stara and Nowa (the latter known also as Hoptylifce) of the Kopijewskis, and most probably the reason of the foray was in long lasting neighbours conflict regarding the borders. On 6 May and 17 September 1616 were registered in the Vinnytsia Castle court complaints against the Kopijowskis (APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/11, t. XXXI/29). Before Żabokrzycki was killed, on 13 January 1617 in the castle court of Vinnytsia (other entry in the territorial court registers on 30 January 1617) Prince Zaslawski entered in the registers Żabokrzycki’s compliant dated 6 May 1616 against the Kopijowski brothers regarding the foray in Torków (APKr.: ASang., t. 205/24). The confirmation of the described above accusations is to be found as well in residuary extant extracts from the so-called Black books of Vinnytsia Castle. They served to collect among others the testimonies obtained from the culprits in train of torment. On 26 April 1616 Vasil Jaworski, the Beadle-General of Bratslav Voivodeship presented for registration a testimony made in Nesterwar before the public execution by “jobless” ("nieroobotnych") brigands and thieves Bartko and Bukara. They confessed while being tortured that: “when we made our way through Kopijewka we stopped for the night by the subject of Lord Bohdan Kopijowski named Stepan Reznik, as confessed to us both Bukara and Bartko, Lord Bohdan Kopijowski kept both of these thieves in hiding and it was him who send them to Lord Ivan Żabokrzycki in order to kill him and to extort his manor house”. However Stefan and Piotr, the sons of murdered Ivan managed to stay in possession of Torków (CDIAUK: F. 36, op. 1, spr. 5, no. 9, f. 12-16; here numerous decrees from 1602-68).

\textsuperscript{251} In the II Lithuanian Statute of 1566 an article was titled: “On the witnesses, against which somebody would like to speak” ("O svedkoh, kotorym by khto szcito ku nim khotel moviti"). It offered a bench of procedural acts disqualifying a witness, among others by reproofing his good fame (Pol. nagana czci) (Statut1566 Edition 2003: 116). In this particular case it was Chapter 4, Article 54 of the II Lithuanian Statute (on the qualifications of witnesses), which was invoked.
The man chosen was Bohdan Kunicki. Since Zasławski could not produce any material evidence to support his allegations against the Kopijewski brothers (he was in the process of gathering transcripts from the court registers), the magistrates admonished him for “bringing forth unfounded accusations.” But not wishing to offend the powerful lord, the magistrates agreed to adjourn the taking of the oath for one day. Now Zasławski accused Halszka herself of coming into the possession of the Kuna estate unlawfully, on the grounds of her complicity in the foray of 1615. He then asked the court to redirect the case to the Tribunal where, he said, he would produce more witnesses to confirm his allegation. The Rohoziński, who were afraid of the possible outcome of the one-day postponement, also lodged a petition for the case to be re-directed to the Tribunal. They must have been convinced of the truth behind allegations against the Kopijowski, but formally claimed that the postponement Zaslawski had obtained was unlawful. Meanwhile, on 13 December 1617 (on the second day after this hearing), Zaslawski personally presented a transcript of a document dated 6 May 1616 from the register of the Vinnytsia castle court transferred to the territorial court in the town. It contained a complaint by Ivan Žabokrzycki against the Kopijewski brothers for their foray on Torków.

252 The Kunickis of the Bończa arms, using the by-name Golian used to live mainly in Volhynia, where their family seat was Mokre. The above-mentioned Bohdan should not be identified with Bohdan Sylwester, who in 1560 was the hereditary owner of Kopijowc in the Powiat of Bratslav, but he might have been his son (Urusi, 1911: 204). Mikołaj Kunicki of Kunice alias Kunice (in the river basin of Berszadź, in the Powiat of Vinnytsia) served in cavalry troops of the ambient defence structure since 1558, under the colour and command of Mikołaj Potocki. As one of the six towarzyszy from the Bratslav territories he was mentioned in the Bratslav Castle revision of 1545 in the group of “older boyars” („starsi bojarzy”). In 1569 he took the oath on the Union of Lublin with the gentry of Powiat of Bratslav (Plewczyński, 1995: 56, 65, 75).

253 With reference to Chapter 4, Article 52 of the II Lithuanian Statute. This was the article titled “On proofs and disapproval” (“O dovodekh i otvodekh”), in which proofs to guilt and disapproval was discussed. Also the introduction of witnesses was to come forth in the restricted time assigned by the court jury. In the case of missing the fixed date by one of the parties without offering, in advance, in front of the jury, the necessary explanation, proof or witnesses produced by this party would be automatically dismissed (Statut1566 Edition 2003: 115-16). APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/40.

254 It is clear from the complaint that a Wawrzyniec Juszynski supported the Kopijewski, and the foray was a consequence of a quarrel over the seizure of the Žabokrzycki ground. Earlier the Crown Tribunal acknowledged Ivan’s rights and ordered the Kopijewski to conduct with Žabokrzycki delimitation of the disputable area. In the opinion of Ivan, the Kopijewskis initiated a conspiracy against his life, as in case of his death they would have to do only with his minor offspring. The foray took place at night on 20 April 1616. The brothers came to Torków in the assistance of a
For reasons I have not been able to identify, there were no further encounters of the two parties in the Tribunal court at Lublin. This made Zasławski decide to take the case up to the Sejm (Parliamentary) Court. On 20 December 1617 the Royal Chancery served a summons on Rohoziński and his wife to appear before the Sejm Court on 13 February 1618. This time, apart from making his usual reference to the history of the dispute over Kuna, Zasławski demanded the presentation of the original charter of restitution of 1556, Sigismund Augustus had allegedly issued to the Słupica family, knowing well that the document had perished in the fire of 1580. He was also aware of the fact that it had never been entered in the registers of the Royal Chancery. As a charter granted prior to the Act of Union of 1569, it could only have been recorded in the Lithuanian (Ruthenian or Volhynian) Metrica. Hoping that “Their Lordships of the Council” would not know of this, he decided to yet again question the validity of the 1556 restitution. In case the Rohoziński failed to produce the original deed, he would call for the reversion of the Kuna property to himself, along with 40,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (240,000 Lithuanian groats) in damages. There are no extant records of the hearing before the Diet Court, just as there are none for the appeal before the retinue consisting of their Wallachian servants, private infantry unit, subjects and “playful people” (“ludzmi swawolnymi”), in total over 100 men. Żabokrzycki was absent at the moment of the attack thus the aggressors entering his manor house killed Mikołaj Wierzchowski, a servant of Jan Tyszkiewicz, who had arrived to Torków with a letter from his lord. Later on they imprisoned all Żabokrzycki’s servants, some of which were wounded, some tortured in order to give information on their lords’ hiding place. Next, the assailants plundered the manor house and farm buildings. While they have been looting the place Żabokrzycki’s wife managed to escape, but children were left, so they also, suffered “beating and murder” (“żądż i mordowali”), as the aggressors wanted them to reveal their parents hiding place and where they used to hide deeds of privileges and movables. The total amount of loss Żabokrzycki estimated later amounted to 9,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (APKr.: ASang., t. 205/24: original of an extract in Ruthenian). Neither party had scruples about the way they set about collecting documents, the best proof of which is the already cited letter of 31 October 1617 from Hrehory Baybuza to Prince Janusz Zaslawski (See above, C/3: 315-16 and APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/62: original of the letter). Most probably it was Baybuza who helped the Prince find the entries relating to the Kopijewski. The documents in which both Zasławski and the Rohoziński were interested in 1617 were presumably those, which brought evidence against the Kopijewski brothers.

256 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/66 (the 17th century Polish copy of the summons).
257 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXI/66: “In the previous year of 1616 You [Halszka Rohozińska], who had produced a strange restitution from the mentioned ancestor of Ours the King [Sigismund] Augustus of these properties to the above mentioned Bohdan Słupieca. The one [restitution] not to be found in the Our Chancellery registers [the Crown Chancellery]. Thus, [the court jury] ordered you to take the oath in presence of six witnesses equals with you. The oath that these properties accordingly to the restitution from the King His Lordship and laws were kept by you on the basis of all landed 'oldnesses' and that the restitution deed showed in the Tribunal was a genuine one”).
tribunal. There are also no references to the case neither in any of the other judicial records nor in the literature.

Another four years had to pass before the dispute was ultimately resolved, when the Crown Tribunal returned to the issue of the oath that had not been taken. Vasil Rohozinski was incarcerated at the time in the dungeon of Vinnytsia Castle, serving a 2-year sentence for the homicide of Tychon, convicted in 1621. Thus, in the court at Lublin Prince Zaslavski, Lord Voivode of Volhynia, came face to face only with Halszka Semenówna, who was armed with her husband's "unconditional deed of attorney". Wanting to finally bring the case to a conclusion, the judges allowed Halszka to take the oath ruled by the court in 1618. Rohozinska was to take the oath in the Lublin Town Hall, in the presence of witnesses and Prince Zaslavski, according to the formula, the court beadle of the Tribunal was to administer. The final sentence settled the matter unequivocally:

The Main Tribunal Court acquits the defendant from further summons and acquits the case, and rules that on the grounds of this decree the estate which the plaintiff claimed from the defendant, be given in perpetuity to the defendant.

The summary of deeds pertaining to the Slupica family preserved in the Sanguszko Archives encapsulates this judgement in a typical for the legal language of the period Polish-Latin conclusion, to the effect that the succession to the Kuna estate and its adjacencies was granted to the heirs of the Slupicki Lords, who were also acquitted from further litigation, while His Lordship the Prince [Zaslawski] was ordered to keep silence and not to make any further claims in this matter.

Thus, after 49 years, one of the most spectacular property cases in the Bratslav territory finally came to a close, and a powerful lord had to recognise the supremacy of the law and reconcile himself to the forfeiture of the right to sue for the estate, which was retained by the Slupicas heiress. For Halszka and her

---

260 APKr.: ASang., t. 205/23.
husband Vasil, however, it was a Pyrrhic victory, as the following years would show.

2.b. The Impairment Sustained by the Kuna Properties in 1617-18 and the Financial Problems the Rohozińskiis Faced in the Early 1620’s. The Transfer of the Kuna Estate Management to the Rohoziński Brothers.

In 1617-18, while engrossed in their proceedings against Prince Zasławski and the Kruszelnickis, the Rohoziński couple had also to deal with the attempts to infringe the integrality of their property by the Princes Zbaraski, who took advantage of their engagement in the litigation. On 17 April 1617 Vasil Rohoziński obtained a condemnation order against Wojciech Lewkowski, a royal captain. He accused Lewkowski of attacking the village of Wójtowce (formerly Kunka), which belonged to the Kuna estate, with a troop of soldiers who plundered and devastated the place, looting the inn and stealing goods belonging to the peasants living in the village. Perhaps Lewkowski’s men were one of the units of the confederated army, which had not received its pay. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that they belonged to the private army of the Princes Zbaraski, whose clients the Lewkowski family were. If so, Lewkowski could be suspected of having

261 ZDz., 1896 21: 591 (digest): “the plaintiff’s own property the village of Wojiowce, belonging to Kunin [Kuna”).
262 Jablonowski claims that a founder ancestor of many families in the Ovruch area, among which that of the Lewkowskis, was Ławryn Walewski, a servant in 1443 in the retinue of Kyivan Prince Oleiko Włodzimierzowicz (ZDz., 1897 22: 110, 638). In the 17th century existed in the Powiat of Ovruch a settlement referred to as Lewkowicze, in which there was an orthodox monastery founded by the Lewkowskis and Niewmirzyckis, the burial place of both families (Ko Anto Ni. J. [Rolle, Antoni Józef], 1881. „Dzieje szlachty okolicznej w owruckim powiecie <RolleOwrucz>,” Biblioteka Warszawska 2: 19-39, 183-200, 352-67, here 33, 34). In 1606 both families sued the Piatnicki pop [the Piatnitskiy orthodox priest] because of a foray performed by him with the starost’s consent in their country houses. The orthodox priest took their two horses, three oxes and a bucket of honey, which he claimed to be the families customary gift for the Piatnitskiy Orthodox Church in Ovruch, which they failed to provide (JakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 222). In 1611 was Jakub Lewkowski the Deputy Starost (Pol. podstarości) in Ovruch. He held this magistracy by appointment from Prince Michał Korybut Wiśniowiecki, the then Ovruch Starost and the Princes Zbaraski’s descendant (Matvienko, A. M., and V. M. Moicienko (eds.) 2002. Aktova knyka Zhytomysr ‘koho hrods’koho uriadu 1611 roku. Zhytomir: n.p. 149, no. 22). Another Lewkowski, Jacko was the castle court badle in Zhytomir (JakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 233). The Lewkowski family was living in the Powiat of Ovruch until the end of the 18th century. Litwin mentions this
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attacked Wójtowce on the instigation of his princely patrons. A year later the Rohoziński obtained a verdict in the Tribunal against the Princes Krzysztof and Jerzy the Zbaraskis, whom they accused of seizing a few villages, Rzawiec, Swinne, Jasiowiec, and land belonging to Husakowce in the Kuna estate.\(^{263}\)

Unfortunately we do not know the exact formulation of that judgement. The encroachment was nonetheless a clear violation of the amicable settlement for the restitution of the properties, land and settlements of Rzawiec, Husakowce, Jasłowiec, and Swinne, reached between Jerzy Zbaraski and Tychon Słupica in 1613.\(^{264}\)

In the early 1620’s the Rohoziński couple were again in financial trouble. On 1 October 1620 at Kuna Stefan Kierdygenowicz Dziusza, second husband of Marusza née Diakowska, made a loan of 1,500 Polish Zlotys to Halszka Semenówna and her husband Vasil, who were in “dire straits financially”, against a security equal in value, on Halszka’s ancestral property.\(^{265}\) Witnesses to the transaction were Alexander Piaseczynski, Hrehory Roskowski [Roszkowski], and Jan Tyszkiewicz. The loan and the security described below were strictly connected with the legal expenses the Rohoziński had incurred in recent years, and also with the sentencing of Vasil in 1621 to 2 years’ imprisonment and a fine (“blood money”, Pol. głowyczyna) for the murder of Tychon. On 21 July 1621 Halszka Semenówna appeared before the castle court at Vinnytsia, where she handed the Deputy Voivode (Pol. podwojewodzi) Stefan Dziusa a letter promising to pay him back the loan by Mid-Lent according to the Old Calendar in 1622, suggesting thus, that the loan was to be returned within a year. The letter itself had been signed and sealed by Vasil, who was still in jail, namely in the dungeon of Vinnytsia Castle.\(^{266}\)

\(^{263}\) ZDz., 1896 21; 314 (digest).

\(^{264}\) ZDz., 1894 20; 107 (digest). See B/1; 299-301.

\(^{265}\) See above A/4b; 298.

\(^{266}\) BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 97-98v.
The only security Halszka and Vasil Rohoziński are known to have pledged—first as a leasehold and subsequently freehold—was the village of Kunka alias Wójtowce. Perhaps the original pledge had been made in connection with the plundering of that place by Lewkowski’s troops in 1617. The record entered by the court beadle on 26 July 1621 in the registers of the conveyance of Kunka to its new master relates that the lease had been drawn up a long time before 2 July 1621. On these grounds the new holders of the village were Alexander Tyrawski, Deputy Starost for victuals (Pol. podstarości prowentowy) in Vinnytsia, and Jerzy Strybelski (Stebelski).²⁶⁷ The account says that Kunka was situated near the town of Wielka Kuna, Halszka Semenówna’s ancestral property, “on land on the River Kunka which had in ancient times belonged to the town of Kuna”. The conveyance of 1621 followed a decree of the Crown Tribunal, which earlier had confirmed the claim produced by the new owners. According to the Tribunal’s decree, Vasil Rohoziński had made first the pledge on Kunka, what he later confirmed while signing the conveyance of 1621.²⁶⁸ On 25 May 1621 Alexander Tyrawski registered the pledge on Kunka the Rohoziński couple had granted him, in the register of the Vinnytsia castle court, along with his own pledge and the deed in which his joint tenant, Jerzy Stryblewski, conveyed his rights to the pledge to

²⁶⁷ Alexander Tyrawski was a member of the family, who similarly to their kin the Kruszelnickis settled down in the Bratslav territory, after they migrated from the Crown (Niesiecki, 1845 10). Jerzy Stryblewski represented most probably the Strybyl family, which settled down in the Powiat of Zhytomir in the Kyiv Voivodeship (ZDz., 1897 22: 616). Filon Strybyl was in 1595-1605 Kyiv Castle Justice, and next in 1593-1634 he occupied the office of the Kyiv Cup-bearer (Pol. czesnik, Lat. pincema), while Fedor Strybyl was in 1606-09(?). The Kyiv caste court notary (Litwin, 2000: 206, 211, 212) In 1622 Jerzy Stryblewski acted as an attorney for the Kruszelnickis, whose dispute with the Rohozińskis was still going on, in the proceedings brought before the Crown Tribunal against Prince Zbaraski for the restitution of the men who had absconded from Nosowce (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 108, f. 22v.; here Jurij Steblewski, 1622).

²⁶⁸ Apart from the court beaides, the witnesses to the transaction were Tyszkiewicz (Jan?) and Jan Odrzywolski, the current holder of Hajsyn. The latter was the third husband of the Princess Jadwiga née Różyńska, whose first and second husbands respectively were Piotr Świński and Adam Tyrawski (IakovenkoShliakhta, 1993: 283). All three of Jadwiga’s husbands were tenants of Hajsyn. We may assume that Adam Tyrawski, who died in 1611, was a close relative of Alexander Tyrawski (BSťefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 99-99v.; Litwin, 2000: 101, 192, 200). Litwin as husband of Princess Różyńska and tenant of Hajsyn enumerates once Jan Tyrawski (Litwin, 2000: 101), and once Adam (ibidem, 192). According to him Adam obtained on 20 October 1611 a charter investing him with the village of Tachnisz in the Bratslav Voivodeship (Litwin, 2000: 200). Tyrawski is described in a 1629 register as tenant of Kunka, paying a tax on the 40 cottages (chimneys) with hearths in it (ZDz., 1894 20: 136: here as Aleksander Żyrawski).
In turn, when Alexander Piaseczyński attempted in 1624 to deprive the Rohoziński of the Kuna estate, he obtained a charter from the Royal Chancery (date 28 February), which also entailed Kunka.\textsuperscript{270} The sons of Halszka and Vasil would pursue the policy of making out pledges on their property in Kuna on a larger scale in the 1640's.\textsuperscript{271}

Form the Bratslav Voivodeship podymne tax register of 1629 it is concluded that Vasil Rohoziński until the death of his first wife Halszka (between 1638 and February 1639) acted as a main administrator of Kuna estate. In 1629 he paid chimney-tax for the town of Kuna and sloboda (free settlement) in Krasnopol. For 636 chimneys he paid 318 Zlotys, placing him thus within a middle group of wealthy owners.\textsuperscript{272} Accordingly to Podolyanin soon after the death of Halszka, Vasil was to conclude with his sons an unusual agreement. All his sons were obliged not to alienate their hereditary property, especially the parts of the Kuna estate. It is highly possible that the act has been drawn already in 1638 or 1639 in connection with Halszka's decease and the quick second nuptials of widowed Vasil. A security of 50,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (300,000 Lithuanian groats) was agreed to be paid back by any contract party that would break the agreement and sell his share outside the family.\textsuperscript{273} If at all any such agreement was concluded (there is no trace of it in the extant sources) it might have been executed as well between 1644 and 1647. In 1644 at least few of the Rohoziński brothers (Maciej, Tyrawski.\textsuperscript{269} Soon Kunka acquired a new master, Tyrawski's brother-in-law, Łukasz Kruszelnicki, who purchased the village as a freehold for the sum of 4,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (24,000 Lithuanian groats) from Tyrawski (BStefanyka: F 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 120-121: the second entry of 12 January 1624. Jerzy Curkowski, Jakub Poniatowski and Andrzej Szandyrowski appeared as witnesses on behalf of Tyrawski). Unfortunately, I was unable fix to his relationships with Fedor and Alexander the Kruszelnickis In 1623 in his last will Łukasz Kruszelnicki reverted the right to the sloboda (free settlement) he himself had most probably founded at Kunka back to Tyrawski (ZDz., 1896 21: 629 (an entry in the Tribunal registers in a bench for the Bratslav Voivodeship on 16 June 1623).

\textsuperscript{269} Soon Kunka acquired a new master, Tyrawski’s brother-in-law, Łukasz Kruszelnicki, who purchased the village as a freehold for the sum of 4,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (24,000 Lithuanian groats) from Tyrawski (BStefanyka: F 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 120-121: the second entry of 12 January 1624. Jerzy Curkowski, Jakub Poniatowski and Andrzej Szandyrowski appeared as witnesses on behalf of Tyrawski). Unfortunately, I was unable fix to his relationships with Fedor and Alexander the Kruszelnickis In 1623 in his last will Łukasz Kruszelnicki reverted the right to the sloboda (free settlement) he himself had most probably founded at Kunka back to Tyrawski (ZDz., 1896 21: 629 (an entry in the Tribunal registers in a bench for the Bratslav Voivodeship on 16 June 1623).

\textsuperscript{270} Podolyanin, 1886: 568. The rights granted under this charter were never exercised See below D/4a: 371-74.

\textsuperscript{271} See below 350-51, especially note 275.

\textsuperscript{272} AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 410, no. XXIV: with amounts in zlotys' [Rohoziński] = ZDz., 1894 20: 141: without money accounts [Rohoziński]). An analysis of this document in comparison to other printed data followed by some general remarks regarding the social structure of the then Bratslav territories is offered by Anusik. See Chapter 4/1: 198.

\textsuperscript{273} Podolyanin, 1886: 568. The author offers no source data while writing on this agreement.
Adrian and Mikolaj), who yet in 1639 had appeared as minors came to their majority, and in 1647 Vasil died (after 10 March, before 15 June). The existence of this deed is to be confirmed indirectly by the pledges on property carried on by Vasil’s heirs until the break of the Khmel’nyts’kyi Rebellion in 1648.

Thus, one may conclude that from the early 1640’s, the administration of Kuna and its adjacencies was in the hands of older sons of Halszka and Vasil. In 1644-45 and next in 1647-48 the Rohoziński brothers being forced by the unfavourable circumstances concluded at least a few pledge contracts regarding Kuna Stara [Old] and Kuna Nowa [New]. This might have suggested that most probably as a result of Vasil’s last will they obtained equal shares in their hereditary estate.

274 In the seniority line they were: Maciej (alias Matwiej), Adrian, Mikolaj (in accordance to the legal qualifications all of them were to be born prior to 1622), Alexander, Szymon, Wawrzyniec and Constantine (B. PAU/PAN Kr.: Sig. 4524, no. XVIII/8/40: 7 June 1644, here some of brothers as adults, the rest of them still assisted by their guardians; BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4106, f. 48-49v.: here Vasil still assists his wife Anna in court, ibidem, f. 50-50v.: here Anna of the Krasnopolski 1.v. wife of Jakub Piażeczyński “and of second marriage the late Lord Vasil Rohoziński widow”; CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1 [Bratslav territorial court register book], no. 140, f. 198-199: Adrian Rohoziński with his wife Fruzyna, 29 March 1647). Already in 1647 Adrian was married with Fruzyna alias Eufrozyna Piażeczycka (CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1 [Bratslav territorial court register book], no. 140, f. 198-199). The surname of Adrian’s wife – Piażeczycka appears in the later judicial papers from the 18th century (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 123, f. 42v.). He had from her two daughters Prudentjanna alias Prudencjanna (as in the genealogical literature) and Zuzanna, both of them in 1665 still referred to as maidens. Most probably in the end of 1660’s they were both married. Probably their paternal uncle and guardian Matwiej arranged both marriages. Prudencjanna was to marry Marcin Krzężowski, while Zuzanna one Glinka Wolska. Prudencjanna Krzężowska left a daughter Joanna who was first married to one Strzelecki, and secondly to one Wielgorski alias Wielhorski and died without issue. Zuzanna Glinka Wolska had a daughter Helena, who married first with one Orzewski, with whom she was childless, secondly with Jan Boreiko, with whom she had three children – two daughters and a son. Of her daughters, Anna married to one Barciowski and Zofia to one Struczewski, and a son, Samuel, died without issue (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 123, f. 42v.).

275 The first known example is of 14 May 1644. On that day Matwiej, Adrian and Mikolaj acting also on behalf of their younger brothers (Alexander, Szymon, Wawrzyniec and Constantine) took a loan in amount of 3400 Zlotys against the security on their hereditary estate, namely on Kuna Nowa “with all its people and their duties and revenues”. The new temporal possessor of the town became Wacław Kryński, Deputy Starost of Novogrod to whom the brothers were to pay also an interest in amount of 200 Zlotys per each year of the contract being valid. However, after three years Kryński got into financial troubles and decided to sell back Kuna Nowa to Adrian and Fruzyna the Rohozińska. The couple paid him 3400 Zlotys together with the 3-year revenue making 500 Zlotys, as earlier they had handed him over 100 Zlotys. On 29 March 1647 at Vinnytsia Kryński confirmed the receipt of the above-mentioned sum, to which witnessed Jan Baranowski and Sylvester Czerlenkowski, the Vinnytsia territorial notary (CDIAUK: F. 43, op. 1 [the Bratslav territorial court registers], spr. 140, f. 198-199). Next, in 1645 (registration on 15 May at the castle court Vinnytsia)
Apart from Matwiej (d. after 1664) the eldest son, all the Rohoziński brothers were killed during the Battle of Batoh on 2 June 1652 against the Khmel'nyts'kyi Cossacks supported by Tartars or during the captives' slaughter following the battle. We cannot exclude the possibility that the eldest of brothers survived only because that being then the family head he stayed out of military exploits. In 1664 Matwiej paid the “chimney” tax for the town of Kuna (of 80 house holdings and three mills) in amount of 126 Zlotys. He also paid the same tax for the village of Żerdenówka of 45 cottages and a mill in amount of 68 Zlotys and
for the village of Hubnik of 43 cottages and a mill (both mills were priced for 15 groszs each).\textsuperscript{277}

3. Fedora Dmitriewna and Her Husband Alexander Kruszelnicki (d. ca. 1634/36), in the Period 1615-29.

On the other line of the family Fedora Dmitriewna Słupiczanka [VI/5] married Alexander Kruszelnicki (d. 1634) at about the same time as Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] was wedded to Vasil Rohoziński.\textsuperscript{278} The Kruszelnickis marriage took place between October 1610 and April 1613, shortly after the termination of Fedora’s wardship by Walenty A. Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, her (last?) guardian. Earlier, like the progeny of Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], the daughter of Dimitr Hrehorowicz [V/5] had passed “from hand to hand in her orphanhood.”\textsuperscript{279}

Alexander belonged to a family with roots in the Kingdom of Poland. The Kruszelnickis of the arms of Sas had settled in Red Rus’, chiefly in the area of Peremysl (Pol. \textit{Przemysł}).\textsuperscript{280} The village of Kruszelnica, from which they derived their name, lay on the River Stryj in the former volost’ of Tustany near L’viv, and had been endowed to Jan and Damian the Kruszelnickis by King Vladislau Jagiełło in a charter dated April 1385 and issued from Gliniany near L’viv. In 1556

\textsuperscript{277} AYZR, 1890, VII/2: 538-64, no. XXIX (the edition of the podymne register of 1664 after the entry in the Vinnytsia court registers on 17 September 1670 [in print mistakenly the year 1617]), here 556 [Kuna, Żerdenówka and Hubnik]. As a lease holder of Kuna Nowa the said register mentioned certain Lady Żytowiecka, of whom no data are available. She paid then 48 Zlotys for 30 house holdings and two mills (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 540, no. XXIX). This meant the continuation of the policy of making out pledges on their property in Kima started prior to 1648 by the Rohoziński brothers. Most probably Lady Żytowiecka became the temporal holder of Kuna Nowa in the outcome of the 1652 disaster, thus after the death of all brothers, apart from Matwiej, who in this particular case might have acted on behalf of his wards, the late brother Adrian’s daughters. See Paprocki, 1858: 554.

\textsuperscript{278} Fedora Dmitriewna’s husband died in 1634 (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 51), on 9 June 1636 Fedora appeared in the court as a widow assisted by her children (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 45-45v.; Gawroński, 1915: 314 [1636]).

\textsuperscript{279} CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 25v.

\textsuperscript{280} Boniecki, 1908 12: 351-56, especially 352; Ursuki, 1911 8: 95; ZDz., 1897 22: 633. In the 18th century in the L’viv area a few members of this family (Jan, two Krzysztofs and Maciej) held different magistracies in the territorial hierarchy. See U III/1: 353, and nos. 980, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1121, 1349, 1433.
Sigismund Augustus confirmed his great-grandfather’s endowment, for Andrzej and Maciej the Kruszelnickis. The Kruszelnicki family branched off into numerous lines. I have not been able to establish Alexander’s one.

Eight sons and three daughters came into the world from this union, in order of seniority: Andriej (Andrzej), Augustyn, Stanislaw, Jan, Franciszek, Alexander, Wawrzyniec, and Ludwik (the sons); and daughters Helena, Maryna, and Magdalena. By 1636 Andrzej was married to a Zofia, for whom no further information has been found; and Stanislaw to Marianna alias Anna Paslawska, by whom he had a daughter Zuzanna later married to Mikołaj Krasnosielski. All of Fedora and Alexander’s sons except for perhaps Alexander junior and Stanislaw died without issue. In 1659-63 Alexander junior was a royal captain and Standard-bearer (Pol. chorzęcy, Lat. vexillifer) of Chernichiv (Pol. Czernihów) in the Kyiv province; he died before 4 April 1665. Wawrzyniec is known to have held part of Kublicz. With so many offspring, especially sons, it is hardly surprising that Kruszelnicki and his wife should have shown such determination in their endeavours to annul the sale of part of Nosowce and the Trościaniec property to the Zbaraski, and to assume the succession to Tychon Semenowicz’s estate. To present a comprehensive account of these themes I shall treat them separately and in chronological order.

3.a. The Contest between the Rohozińskis and the Kruszelnickis for the Kuna Estate, 1615-24.

---

282 Information on the birth date of Ludwik, the youngest of sons in 1632 is to be found in the document of 1637, which states that in 1635 Ludwik was three years old (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 51).
283 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, f. 45-47v.; 9 June 1636. Here all children are listed in the order of appearance as above and there is information on Andrzej’s wife Zofia.
Alongside Prince Janusz Zasławski, the most serious competitors Halszka Semenówna and her husband Vasil had to face for the estate of Tychon Semenowicz was her first cousin (on her father’s side), Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] and her husband Alexander Kruszelnicki. Although they were the last to lodge a complaint in the Vinnysia castle court (26 May 1615) related to the foray on Kuna and the slaying of Tychon, the Kruszelnicki couple were the most resolute about their claim. I have already discussed some parts of their petition in the subchapter on the foray itself, and have already observed that the information in it more or less complements with Oleksiej Diakowski’s complaint of 29 January. An essential difference was the inclusion of the Łysohorski brothers among the accused in the Kruszelnickis document. The details in the description part of their complaint show that their knowledge of what had happened was as good as the Diakowskis’. Alexander Kruszelnicki had taken part in the expedition to retrieve Tychon’s body. The fact that their document had the longest list of accused allegedly involved in the foray may be explained not so much by the Kruszelnickis’ ignorance, as by their determination to eliminate all the potential rivals to the succession to Tychon’s estate. In the first place this meant Halszka Semenówna, the sole direct heiress; the Łysohorski brothers, who were next in line (as sons of Semen Bohdanowicz’s sister); and Ivan Meleszko, Tychon’s former guardian. This was an important point, since the young Tychon had probably died intestate.

It was not until 1618 that the Crown Tribunal looked into the matter of Tychon’s murder, at the supernumerary (postponed; Pol. konserwanty) sessions for three voivodeships. According to the decree issued on 18 July 1618, the Kruszelnickis, who had the support of the Crown prosecutor, called the Rohoziński couple to appear before the Tribunal summoned by the territorial court of Vinnysia on 2 April 1618. At the same time a case was being heard in

286 APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/74 (original in Ruthenian, an extract from the castle court registers).
287 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXII/33 (original in Ruthenian; an extract with députâtes’ signatures) = APKr.: ASang., t. XXXII/27 (an extract in Ruthenian from the Tribunal registers, issued on 20
Vinnytsia, brought jointly by the Kruszelnicki couple and O. Diakowski, concerning Wojciech Birkowski’s killing of Jeremij Juriewicz [VI/6], the last male representative of the Słupica family. In renewed proceedings over the death of Tychon, Fedora Dmitriewna claimed that the earlier case (on which there is no extant information) was not resolved because of the death of Jeremij and the alleged negligence of his guardian, Oleksiej Diakowski.

The territorial court’s summons contained a description of the events at Kuna similar to the ones in the earlier complaints, along with a few modifications. Halszka’s role as an organiser and participant in the foray was made more explicit. Both husband and wife were alleged to have stayed at Ziatkowce, though according to the complaints Halszka was in Kuna. From Ziatkowce they allegedly set off for Kuna accompanied by a retinue of servants and bondmen, some from Kuna. The Kruszelnickis intended to establish their right to the estates of both murdered Słupicas. Fedora Dmitriewna was also interested in the estate of Jeremiasz Juriewicz [VI/6], a closer relative of hers than Tychon Semenowicz [VI/1], whose estate amounted also to shares in Nosowce and its adjacencies. Following the death of Tychon, Jeremiasz was the family’s sole surviving male representative and, alongside Halszka Semenówna, the chief claimant to the entire ancestral lands. If Halszka were convicted of complicity in the foray of 1615, Fedora would have the chance to get a much larger portion of the family’s assets than the shares she could otherwise receive. The Tribunal’s decree shows that the judges appointed to the supernumerary bench (Pol. konserwancy), decided to hear the two homicide cases together, which was no doubt an outcome of Prince Janusz Zasławski’s claim. Only after examining the two crimes they would reach a decision as to who would ultimately succeed to the Słupicas fortune. The summons cited in the Tribunal decree also contains information that the Kruszelnickis had petitioned for a verdict of guilty on both Vasil Rohoziński and Halszka, which would have meant a prison sentence for homicide of two years and 24 days in the October 1645) = APKr.: ASang., t. 204/19 (Polish copy of an extract from the Tribunal registers, issued on 20 October 1645).

288 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXII/27, t. XXXII/33, t. 204/19.
dungeon for both of them, to be executed on pain of infamy. On hearing the parties, the judges ordered Vasil Rohoziński to take an oath that he had been the sole organiser of the foray and that he had murdered Tychon Semenowicz. He was to take this oath in Lublin within a fortnight of the decree’s issuance at the postponed session for the three voivodeships. Despite unrelenting efforts by the Kruszelnickis, Halszka was cleared of the charges.\footnote{Somewhat more light is shed on the actions of both parties in the period between the foray of 1615 and this verdict, by the decree issued on 23 July 1618 at the Tribunal’s session for the Voivodeship of Kyiv, prior to Rohoziński’s oath.\footnote{Again the Kruszelnickis were plaintiffs, and the Rohozińskiški defendants. This writ had been issued during the previous session of the Lublin Tribunal, and dated 2 March 1618.\footnote{In it the Rohozińskiški were charged with the attack on Kuna and the murder of Tychon, but this time more emphasis was put on their seizure of the property and its bondmen. Fedora Dmitiewna now figured as the injured party, her assets been taken by force. Thus, she claimed 20,000 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (120,000 Lithuanian groats) in damages (half the sum Zaslawski was suing for) from the Rohozińskiški. The writ stressed that this time the Kruszelnickis claim was related to the killing of Jurij Juriewicz, what ment that they were trying to put blame on the Rohozińskiški also for this death. According to this document, after Tychon’s death Jeremiasz Juriewicz had lived at Kima (after the Łysohorski brothers?), and the Rohozińskiški forcibly removed him.\footnote{The foray did not necessary mean the murder of Jeremiasz, however by joining both cases (the Rohozińskiški’ foray and the one performed the same year by W. Birkowski)}}}
Kruszelnicka gave impression of shared responsibility for Jeremiasz’s death. However, the real murderer of the latter, at Nosowce not at Kuna, was Wojciech Birkowski, second husband of Marusza Mikolajewna  Słupiczanka [VI/4], widow of Paweł Prusowicz Zabłocki, not the Rohoziński. This way Birkowski most probably wanted to take over the resting Słupicas’ shares in Nosowce, large part of which his wife had sold in 1607 to the Zbaraskis.

Halszka Semenówna — if she had known anything at all about the preparations for this second foray — would certainly have felt it her duty to protect the ancestral property of which, as the sister of the murdered Tychon, she was the sole lawful heiress. The minor Jeremij was the sole surviving male representative of the family, but through Hrehory Bohuszewicz’s [IV/3] line. The fact that he — or rather his guardians, the Kruszelnickis and O. Diakowski — made a claim to Kuna is confirmed in the digest of the decree of 9 July 1618 issued by the court of Kyiv Castle. The Kruszelnicki were yet again suing the Rohozyński for the attack on Kuna, this time to the court of Kyiv Castle. At any rate, in view of the Kruszelnickis involvement in other court proceedings, in this case Wojciech Domaniewski represented Fedora Dmitriewna in the Tribunal. Halszka appeared in person, assisted by Vasil’s attorney and relative, Mikołaj Jelowicz Bukojemski. The judges decided to send the case to the next supernumerary session for the three voivodeships because the case of Tychon’s murder and the subsequent oath of Vasil had not been concluded. Thus, notwithstanding a double onslaught by Prince Zaslawski and the Kruszelnickis, the Rohoski managed to steer clear of trouble.

293 See above A/4a: 291-95.
294 ZDz., 1896 21: 314 (digest). The Kyiv castle court registers for 1619 are not extant, so it is impossible to found information in CDIAUK collection.
295 In the digest it is mentioned that the foray at the Kuna Castle was organised from Ziatkowce. The co-participants listed were Bazyli (Vasil) Żytyński and Hermolaj etc. the Lysohorski. It is also stressed in the document that the deeds of the deeds of privileges for this property were intercepted.
296 Mikołaj [Jelowicz] Bukojemski was a relative of Ivan Jelowicz Bukojemski. The latter in 1580 was appointed by Vasil Iwanowicz Rohoziński’s last will as one of the guardians of his children, and was referred to as his paternal brother (Demchenko Testamenty, 2004: 139, Annex no. 6). See also the Jeló [Jelowicz] Bukojemski family of the Piatyrg arms (Boniecki, 1900 2: 240).
297 APKr.: A$ang., t. XXXII/35.
At the supernumerary session the case had to wait until 1621, when the final verdict was pronounced. On 11 May of that year the Tribunal issued a decree, which reiterated the wording of the writ issued by the territorial court of Vinnytsia of 2 April 1618. This document confirmed that Rohoziński was to take the oath (declaring his guilt). However, since he failed to appear in court after being summoned three times by the beadle, the court accepted the arguments put forward by Alexander Kruszelnicki, who spoke on behalf of his wife as well, and ordered the execution of the sentence of imprisonment, which had been passed on Rohoziński in 1617. Thereby Vasil was formally sentenced to two years' and 24 weeks' incarceration in the dungeon for homicide. The sentence was to be served in the voivodeship where the murder had been committed, which meant the subterranean dungeon of Vinnytsia Castle. It was to commence six weeks from the issue of the decree. In addition Rohoziński was bound to pay the Kruszelnickis the “blood money” (Pol. główszczyzna) for the murder of Tychon, amounting to 480 of Polish grzywnas (2880 Polish groats), before the start of his sentence. In case of non-compliance, he would be declared “infamous” (an outlaw), and all of his assets would pass into the hands of the plaintiffs. The reason why Vasil failed to

298 APKr.: ASang., t. XXXIV/32 (original in Ruthenian of an extract with députâtes' signatures) = APKr.: ASang., t. XXXIV/32 (the 17th century Polish copy of the same extract).
299 Yet in the decree the imprisonment period is of two years and 12 weeks of imprisonment. Perhaps because of the fact that Vasil had already spent some time in prison.
300 Beauplan noticed what follows: “A noble thus has the right to come and go [as he pleases], to petition his judges, and even to be present during the examination of witnesses testifying against him, without fear of being arrested before he has been judged. After the judgment has been delivered, however, he may retire promptly to a monastery, which is often the sanctuary sought by offenders who do not have the power to uphold their cause by force [of arms]. Such crimes are usually the murder of one noble by another.” (Beauplan, 1999: 104).
301 Here yet another remark by Beauplan seems to be worth of quoting here: “The sentence is usually death by beheading and the confiscation of all their property. Then it is proclaimed aloud three times that [the accused] must appear and present himself before the court within the hour (but they are not so naïve as to put themselves into the hands of the executioner, knowing that they have been condemned to death). When [the accused] does not appear, infamy is added as well to his sentence. This means that anyone at all may kill him, whether he is found; the same decision provides as well that anyone who eats or drinks with him will be considered guilty of the same crime. At this point the injured party, thinking that he is not sufficiently powerful [to obtain further redress within the law], makes an agreement with the condemned man, and, upon receiving a sum of money, he acquiesces and gives up his claims. After that, the criminal may obtain a letter of pardon from the king, which costs him two or three thousand livres, by means of which [it is
appear before the Tribunal, is not clear (for sure not the one as seen by Beauplan) especially as he must have been aware of the consequences. Perhaps it was because he was involved in military action on the Polish-Ottoman front. There are no documents to explain his absence in the Tribunal. At any rate, he must have sought the protection of powerful friends and patrons to mitigate the Kruszelnickis position.

An interesting document has survived in the former Ossolineum collection, now preserved in the National Library, Warsaw. Unfortunately, its text is incomplete and the part, which would have contained the date, is missing. It is a record of a settlement reached between the two parties on arbitration “by friends” (= out-of-court), and bears the signatures of Alexander Kruszelnicki and his wife, and Vasil Rohoziński in person and on his wife’s behalf. It was drawn up in the house of Vasil’s friend (and distant relative) Alexander Piaseczyński.\(^{302}\) We may assume Piaseczyński performed the services of chief arbitrator. The document was to be kept by him until both parties fulfilled their liabilities as set out in it. Judging by the context and Piaseczyński’s attempt in 1624 to take over the Kuna estate, it must have been drawn up soon after the Tribunal’s verdict in 1621.\(^{303}\)

This document acknowledges Halszka’s innocence, as confirmed by the Tribunal’s decree of 1618. It also establishes the terms of payment of the “blood money” to the Kruszelnickis and the way in which Vasil was to serve his sentence, on far more lenient conditions than it had been previously ruled.\(^{304}\) After the payment of his fine as ruled by the Tribunal, Vasil was to report to the Vinnytsia Castle to serve his sentence in the dungeon, but would be able to leave the prison on short periods of “parole”, provided that he “kept a low profile and make no appearances in public” so as not to put Fedora Dmitriewna’s reputation in jeopardy.

---

\(^{302}\) For the Piaseczyński’s family connection see Chapter 2/B/6: 153-56 (Ławryn) and note 234, p. 157 (Jakub Ławrynowicz), above D/4 note 331, p. 368-69 (Alexander Ławrynowicz).

\(^{303}\) On the case of Piaseczyński’s attempt to take over Kuna in 1624, see below, D/4a: 371-74.

of being suspected of corruption by third parties. Lady Kruszelnicka bound herself to refrain from issuing any further writs against Rohoziński and to respect all the conditions made in the agreement. She was to enter a declaration in the register of the castle court in Vinnytsia acknowledging the fact that Vasil had served his sentence of imprisonment in the dungeon; and she promised not to initiate any further prosecution for the murder of Tychon Semenowicz. It is hard to say what caused such a sudden change in the Kruszelnickis position. If we are to judge by their actions after 1615, it is hardly likely that they were fully satisfied with the “blood money” for the manslaughter of the “late noble Lord Tychon Słupica”. The Kruszelnickis received the 2880 groats due them at Vinnytsia on 14 January 1624. They acknowledged a receipt issued to Rohoziński the same day.

Perhaps there were specific, unknown points concerning the allocation of the property attached to the out-of-court agreement. Or even a fear that Zaslawski might win in court contributed to it. The fact remains that 1624 marked the end of the struggle between the two cousins and their respective spouses. Thereby, in the period between 1622 and 1624 the Rohozińskis came out as double winners, finally removing two dangerous rivals to the Słupicas ancestral lands. However, success came at a high price, and one of its consequences were financial problems.

3.b. The Kruszelnickis Bid for the Nosowce Properties and Part of the Trościaniec Estate, 1615-29.

305 BNarod.: MS 4165/III Varia, vol. 3, f. 121.
306 The Kruszelnickis acknowledged the receipt from Vasil of the amount of 480 of Polish grzywnas ("jedny czterech set y osmi dziesiqt grzywien polskich") in accordance with the Tribunal verdict of 11 May 1621. Stefan Kierdygenowicz Dziusa, Deputy Voivode (Pol. podwojewodźi) of Bratslav and a relative of both parties, Waclaw Terlecki, Kiryn Szwilski [Kiryk alias Kilian Świrski], and Bartłomiej Rydgowski witnessed the deed (BStefanyka: F. 5 op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4105, f. 123-123v). A witness signed as Kiryn Szwilski is in all likelihood identical with Kiryk alias Cyryl vel Kilian Świrski, son of Piotr, Starost of Hajsyn and Princess Jadwiga Różyńska (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 225). For Piotr and his attempts to intercept some of the Kuna estate grounds see above A/3: 289-90.
For years Fedora Dmitriewna tried to invalidate the sale of part of Nosowce and a share in the Trościaniec estate to Prince Zbaraski. The first Nosowce conveyance had been made by her cousin Marusza alias Marusia Mikołajewna [VI/4], daughter of Misiek vel Mikołaj Hrehorowicz [V/4] and wife (at the time) of Paweł Prysowicz Zablocki.³⁰⁷ It is no doubt that the second conveyance mentioned in the Jabłonowski’s digest, the “further conveyances ex devolutione [by devolution] of the estate left by Jerzy [Jurij] Słupica in 1619 to Prince Jurij [Jerzy] Zbaraski, Lord Castellan of Cracow” was made by Marusza née Diakowska, widow of Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica [V/6], whose second husband was then Stefan Dziusza.³⁰⁸ In accordance with the already mentioned the 18th century judicial papers, after the childless death of Jeremiasz Juriewicz Słupica (1618) his share in Nosowce was to pass on both Marusza Zablocka and Fedora Kruszeńicka.³⁰⁹ However, from the context it seems that the 18th century document quoting the entire line of succession at Nosowce mixed Marusza Zablocka, mother of Jurij and Marusza of the Diakowskis, wife of Stefan Dziusza, as this source referred to Zablocka calling her Jeremiasz’s sister.³¹⁰ What more it stated that Marusza Zablocka resigned her share in Nosowce the second time also on behalf of Prince Janusz Zbaraski, this time handing him over a share which she had obtained after the childless death of Jeremiasz, thus this second resignation had to take place in or soon after 1618. Nevertheless Zbaraski became the lawful owner of half of Nosowce shares belonging earlier to Hrehory Źdan [IV/3]’s successors, which constituted the fourth part of the village and its adjacencies. We must bear in mind, however, that

³⁰⁷ See above A/4a: 291-95.
³⁰⁹ See above A/4a: 291-95.
³¹⁰ CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 123, f. 43v.: „when the son of Jurij [Hrehorowicz] alias Jerzy Geremiasz [Jeremiasz] died without issue [„Steriliter Zszedł”] and this succession came after him upon this Marusia [Prywiczowa Zablocka] [the daughter of] Miśko [Hrehorowicz] and upon Fedora [daughter of] Dmitr [Hrehorowicz] both descending the Słupicas. [Fedora] as a spouse of Born [Lord] Alexander Kruszeńicki [and Marusza] being sisters of paternal brothers. This Marusia Prywiczowa testified a dotation [sales], including the part of Jeremiasz, the brother of successor [of Fedora] in rem this His Lordship Prince Janusz Zbaraski". In the following part the document it is stated that Zbaraski came into possession of the fourth part in the village after the two resignations made by Zablocka on his behalf: „although the second donation from Marusia Prywiczowa [Zablocka] in rem Prince His Lordship Zbaraski non reproducit” (ibidem, f. 43v.). Meanwhile, Fedora and Marusza Mikołajewna were grand-daughters of Hrehory Bohuszewicz Słupica, known as Źdan [IV/2], born to two of his sons; while Marusza née Diakowska was their aunt, widow of their fathers’ brother.
prior to the death of Tychon Semenowicz (1615) Hrehory's line only held half of
the Nosowce estate, which had traditionally been used in the Słupica family for its
daughters' dowries.

On 8 May 1617 the Tribunal bench issued a decree in a case brought by
Fedora Dmitriewna and her husband Kruszelnicki against Marusza née Diakowska,
widow of Jurij Słupica and currently wife of Stefan Dziusa. This ruling was the
outcome of an appeal against the verdict issued by the Bratslav and Vinnytsia
territorial court on 18 January 1617. According to the Kruszelnickis, Marusza was
unlawfully holding "certain parts of the villages of Nosowce, Derenkowce,
Kaliczynce, Trosteniec, and other places in the ancestral lands left by Jurij Słupica,
deceased, including properties which should rightly be held by Jurij [Jeremiasz
Juriewicz], his father's lawful heir." The Kruszelnickis were of opinon that the
lawful tenant of Jurij's estate was his son and heir, Jeremiasz, not Marusza herself,
even if she was acting during his minority as her son's legal guardian. Besides, as
they claimed, if Marusza had a life-interest in the property by her late husband,
they as family had a better right to buy her share than Zbaraski. They were thus
calling Marusza to produce the required document proving the legacy of her first
husband and citing the valuation of the property vested to her for life. If Marusza,
now Mrs. Dziuszyyna, could actually present proof of a legacy from Jurij
Hrehorowicz, Fedora was demanding that Marusza would now be paid off to the
amount established by her late husband in the proper valuation, and convey the
said property to the plaintiff (Fedora), as it was her by ancestral right, "on pain of a
fine of 10,000 Polish Zlotys."

At first sight the Kruszelnickis demands look exorbitant. Marusza had been
the lawfully wedded wife of Jurij Hrehorowicz Słupica and mother of his son

311 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 7, f. 17-19 (an extract in Polish) = ZDz.,
1894 20: 107 (digest): adiudicationis of the estates of Nosowce, Derenkowce, Kaliczyn, 
Trostianiec et summae 1000 złp [Polish Zlotys] ac alterius 113 kopas of Lithuanian groszs
Dziuszynej [to Marusza wife of Dziusza] restitutionis".
312 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 7, f. 17v.
313 CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1 [Zamoyscy], spr. 108, doc. 7, f. 17v.
Jeremij Juriewicz. Even if, Jeremij had been of age in 1617 (and we know for
certain that he was still a minor when he was killed in 1618), Marusza would still
have had the right to enjoy her first husband’s legacy, if it had been made out to
her for life. It may have expired on her second marriage, but not necessarily,
depending from the provisions made in her husband’s last will.\(^{314}\) The degree of
Fedora Dmitriewna’s blood relation to the deceased did not give her a better
standing to his estate than the right of his widow and son. The Kruszelnickis were
trying to get the legacy their uncle Jurij left annulled. In the light of the above
citation, this legacy does not appear to have expired automatically on Marusza’s
second marriage, but had lost its validity on the death of one of the parties. In the
opinion of Rulikowski, the key argument the Kruszelnickis could use was that only
the men of “ancient noble houses” had the right of freehold tenure for family and
ancestral lands.\(^{315}\) In the absence of information on a will left by Jurij, and the
likelihood that the legacy he left his wife was a separate deed, we cannot say with
any certainty which of the parties had the stronger arguments. From the point of
view of family interest, the Kruszelnickis would have been in the right trying to
stop the gradual selling out of the ancestral lands to Prince Zbaraski, who was
waiting on the side and slowly collecting up shares in the Słupicas estate.\(^{316}\)

The statement in the Tribunal’s decree says that after much controversy in
the territorial court of Vinnytsia, that court,
having sufficiently heard both parties, did rule on the grounds of the verdicts
issued to both and the legacy, whose term of redemption had not yet come, but due
to mort-main (Pol. “po zmarłej ręce”) the conditions and restrictions thereunto had
ceased to be binding, and therefore since the lawful time had come, the court
ordered the defendant to proceed, against which decree the defendant appealed to
the Lublin Tribunal.

\(^{314}\) Worth of quoting here is another of Beauplan’s remarks: “When a widow remarries, she may, if
she so desires, give all her property to the one who marries her, thus disinheriting her children. This
law compels children to treat their fathers and mothers with obedience and respect.” (Beauplan,

\(^{315}\) Trusiewicz, 1870: 314.

\(^{316}\) Rolle claims that at the beginning of the 17\(^{th}\) century the Zbarakis already possessed the
following estate complexes of Niemirów, Berszadź, Ładyżyn (after the Korotki family) and a part
of Daszów estate (RolleZDziejów, 1946: 12).
The Tribunal qualified the case as redemption of an estate and sent it to be heard at the supernumerary session for the Voivodeships of Kiev, Volhynia, and Bratslav. The Tribunal bench heard the arguments put forward by Tychon Żytkiewicz, attorney for the Kruszelnickis, and Stefan Dziusza on behalf of his wife, and aside from other procedural considerations, held up the verdict ruled by the territorial court of Vinnytsia. This time the Kruszelnickis were bound to pay Marusza Dziuszyńska the sum of 1,000 Polish Zlotys and 113 kopas of Lithuanian groszs (6780 Lithuanian groats) before the territorial court of Vinnytsia, within a term of six weeks of the verdict; while Dziuszyńska, having received the amount settled by the court, was to make the said property freely and fully available to the plaintiff [the Kruszelnickis], paying a fee of three grzywnas [groats], one to the other party, and two to the court.

But the verdict specified that “as regards to the legacy, valued at 3,000 Zlotys, would remain in force and binding in its entirety, leaving decisions concerning it to the discretion of the court the defendant chose”. In other words, while recognising the Kruszelnickis arguments regarding the redemption of Marusza’s shares in Nosowce and villages belonging to the Trościaniec estate, the Tribunal left Marusza a possibility to continue postponing the sale.

The failure to resolve the case was further complicated by the dispute of the Kruszelnickis with Marusza Słupiczanka Zabłocka, dated from 1607. On 9 July 1618 the Crown Tribunal issued a decree, in the case brought by the Kruszelnicki couple, against Marusza lias Marianna Słupiczanka Prysowiczowa (widow of Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki and wife of Wojciech Birkowski by her second marriage) for the murder at Nosowce of Jeremiasz Juriewicz Słupica [VI/6]. The murder had been part of the ongoing family dispute over Nosowce. It was committed by Wojciech Birkowski, Marusza Mikołajewna’s second husband, who according to Gawroński wanted to lay his hands on the whole of Nosowce,

318 See above A/4a: 291-95.
especially as earlier his wife had sold her own share in Nosowce to the Princes Zbaraski. Rulikowski gives indirect confirmation of this, writing that Birkowski had “forfeited” the estate of his second wife. It cannot be ruled out that Birkowski was behind the Zbaraskis transaction of 1607/09, although it is not known when Marusza’s first husband, Paweł Prysowicz Zabłocki, died, and when she married Birkowski.  

Neither can it be excluded that the proceedings of 1621, in which charges of bigamy were brought against Birkowski by Bogumila née Turowicka, were an echo of now unknown litigation against him by the other shareholders in the Słupicas estate (most probably by the Kruszelnickis).

Rulikowski writes as well that in 1615 the Kruszelnickis sold part of the Trościaniec and Derenkowce properties to Walenty Alexander Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, move against their general policy to impede their female relatives from selling out their shares in the family property to the Princes Zbaraski. Perhaps Kalinowski, who had been Fedora’s guardian, had forced her into this sale. At any rate, the period from 1615 to 1623 marks the apogee of land purchases by the Kalinowskis on areas bordering on what would later become the Humań territory. In this way the two magnates joined the

---

320 Gawroński, 1915: 228.
321 See above A/4a: 294-95. ZDz., 1894 20: 107-08 (digest); Rulikowski who had access to the original or an extract of it claims, that the court jury apart from forcing Birkowski to accept “military penalty” ordered him to come back into Volhynia to his first wife Turowicka, at the same time issuing the statement regarding his second marriage. According to the verdict Birkowski’s second marriage was not to cause any harm to the “honesty” of his second wife. The offspring from this second marriage was to be referred to the ecclesiastical court in order to be officially legitimised (“pro legititate”) (Trusiewicz, 1870: 312). However, there is no mention extant on Marusza and Birkowski issue.
323 The property in question neighboured on the Kublicz estate, which Kalinowski had purchased from the remaining successors to the Kozar properties, a part of the “adjacencies” he acquired to the “wilderness of Uman [Humań]” with which he was endowed in 1609. On the transaction with the Kozar family see Chapter 5/6b: 274-77. W. A. Kalinowski was invested with the “wilderness of Uman [Humań]” in 1609 by the Sejm (Diet) special regulation (VL, 1859 2: 466 = PułaskiKronika, 1991 1: 83). Persons of high merits, especially on the defence were granted perpetual endowments on the Ruthenian territories according to the Sejm resolution of 1569 (VL, 2: 368). In 1601 the area of the Kalinowskis’ future Humań endowment was revised by specially appointed royal commissioners, among whose was Kalinowski’s father-in-law, Jurij Struš, the then Castellan of Halych and Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia (VL, 1859 2: 393 = PułaskiKronika, 1991 1: 83).
324 Litwin, 2000: 182: here is the full list of the Kalinowskis’ acquisitions, the estates of Tulczyn (formerly Nesterwar), Humań, Trościaniec, Kunicze, Czerepaszyńce and Kublicz. In 1629 the
Kruszelinickis in their attempts to invalidate the transactions concluded by two of the Shipicas' women – Marusza Słupczanka (Mrs. Zabłocka), 1607/09, and Marusza née Diakowska Słupczyna (Mrs. Dźuszyna in her second marriage), 1617. We cannot discount the possibility of financial problems due to Tartar raids and legal fees accounting for the conveyance from the Kruszelnickis to Kalinowski.325

Grasping occasion, and being already a powerful neighbour of the Kruszelnickis and Rohoziński's Zbaraski also made use of their family dispute (1615-24) to seize more of their property. As states Rulikowski, Prince Jerzy was sued by the Kruszelnickis who had accused him of depriving them of the ground in a mile [at length] called Wielkie pole [Big field], forests and oak woods belonging to Nosowce and Kuzmińce, and of investing his servants with the rights to found settlements on the Shipica grounds, known by different names.326

The Rohoziński's in turn, in 1629 summoned Zbaraski demanding the demolition of a kasztel [a stronghold] erected by him on the Kuna grounds.327 Unfortunately there is no further data regarding his event. Finally, in the face of repeated boundary conflicts, long lasting and costly judicial proceedings (also these regarding the legality of the Zbaraskis transactions with the Shipica women), and because of the number of progeny (the Kruszelnickis – 11 children, of which 8 sons; the Rohoziński – 7 sons) forcing the necessity of making more property divisions they have to accept the new situation and became a mute witness to the

Kalinowskis (namely Walenty Alexander, the Bratslav and Vinnytsia Starost) paid “chimney” (podymne) tax for the former Trościaniec and Oblin estates' territorie from the following places: Trościaniec in the amount of 25 Zlotys for 50 house holdings, the town of Batoh in the sum of 66 Zlotys for 132 “chimneys”, and for the listed below towns – Uście Trościęcia in the amount of 33 Zlotys and 15 groszs for 65 house holdings, Adamgród 382 Zlotys and 15 groszs for 765 house holdings, Nisterwar alias Tulczyn for 751 “chimneys” the sum of 375 Zlotys and 15 groszs, and finally Sławhorod for 396 house holdings in the amount of 198 Zlotys (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 404 [Trościaniec, Adamgród, Nisterwar], 405 [Sławhorod, Batoh], 406 [Uście Trościęcia], no. XXIV: with money amounts in zlotys = ZDz. 1894 20: without money accounts, 136 [Trościaniec, Adamgród], 137 [Nisterwar, Sławhorod], 138 [Batoh, Uście Trościęcia]).

325 As it was already mentioned the years between 1610 and 1615 witnessed an exceptional number of Tartar raids which must have strongly inflicted all of the former Shipicas' estates, thus the part in possession of the Kruszelnickis as well. For Tartar raids see Chapter 2/B/1: 91-103.
326 Trusiewicz, 1870: 313. The case was related here on the basis of entries found in the Kyiv court.
327 Trusiewicz, 1870: 314.
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arbitrary agreement, which resolved in 1629 the conflict between Prince Zbaraski and Kalinowski sparked by the Slupica ladies transactions. This way the sales transactions of the following parts of the Slupica legacy (not forgetting the Kozar and Korotko inheritances) ceased to be solely a family business and became an element of power game between the magnate families already dominating the area.

The high ranked boundary dispute was solved thanks to usual in such cases method – the arbitrary “by friends” agreement. The chief arbitrator turned to be Jakub Sobieski (d. 1646) of the Janina arms, the Crown Carver (Pol. krajczy koronny) and Starost of Krasnystaw, son of Marek, the founder of family power, and father of Jan (John), winner of Vienna Battle (1683) and future King John III. The boundary decree itself was partly written under the date of 9/10 May 1629 in the Zbaraski’s Ładyżyn Castle. The whole of it was completed on 30 May after the arbitrator accompanied by the parties, their representatives and witnesses as well as neighbours (including the Rohozinskis, the Kruszelnickis and Marusza Prysowczowa Zablocka with husband) had completed the delimitation procedures, indicating the new border limits. The document containing the detailed border duct description was registered in the Bratslav territorial court on 16 June 1629.

328 In 1629 Alexander Kruszelnicki paid the “chimney” tax for Nosowce and Michałkowce in the sum of 55 Zlotys for 110 cottages and separately 4 Zlotys and 15 groszs for 9 “serving [subjects]” (“ślubnych”) and mills in Nosowce. In the same time Prince Zbaraski paid for his share in Nosowce 36 Zlotys for 72 house holdings (AYZR 1890 VII/2: 401 [Zbaraski], 403, 404 [Kruszelnicki]), no. XXIV = ZDz., 1894 20: 134 [Zbaraski], 136, 137 [Kruszelnicki]). In the case of Zbaraskis we know also about the foundation of the town of Berszada alias Berszadz on the territory of the former Slupica Trościaniec estate (SlownGeogr, 1880 I: 154 [Berszada]). In 1629 Zbaraski paid for this town the podymne tax in the amount of 137 Zlotys and 15 groszs for 275 house holdings (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 399 [Berszadz] = ZDz. 1894 20: 132). Its promoter or chief organiser (Pol. zasadźca) was the Zbaraski servant Vasil Bosy. He belonged to the Bosy family, of whose Fedor was conducting on behalf of the Zbaraski colonisation of the territory between Sitkowce and Kropiwna in the Powiat of Vinnytsia (ZDz. 1897 22: 124). In 1629 the podymne tax for a part of Ohyryjówka and for Stepanówka in total for 27 cottages in the amount of 13 Zlotys and 22 groszs paid Dimitr Bosy (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 399, no. XXIV = ZDz. 1894 20: 133).

329 The representatives of both parties accompanied Sobieski. For Zbaraski there were his attorneys who used to represent him in different courts in the 1620’s and 1630’s, both court notaries – Józef Fryk of Kremenets and Andrzej Kazimierz Bedoński of Volodymyr. For Kalinowski it was also his attorney Jan Nehrebecki.

330 So far this document was known only form Jablonowski’s shortened transcription (ZDz. 1894 20: 109-17). However I managed to get access to its two independent copies, both of them made on the basis of an entry in the Vinnytsia castle court dated 30 June 1742 (CDIAUK: F. 49, op. 2

Halszka of Rogoźno, daughter of Semen Falilijewicz Rohoziński and widow of Ivan Jermolejewicz Meleszko (d. 1617) married Alexander Piaseczyński of Kuniew of the arms of Lis as her second husband, who in 1624 made a claim to Kuna. Alexander Piaseczyński (d. 1646) when he married Halszka he was just starting his administrative career, culminating to the office of Voivode of Novogrod (Pol. Nowogród). We should bear in mind that Alexander’s brother Jakub, Cup-Bearer (Pol. czesnik, Lat. pincerna) of Bratslav (d. 1633), was married to Anna née Brzasnosielska of Krzykowce, daughter of Vasil, whose second

---

[331] Alexander was the second son of Ławryn Piaseczyński, Sub-Chamberlain (Pol. podkomorzy, Lat. subcamerarius) of Bratslav, and Magdalena née Dubiecka. By Halszka he had a son Jan (Ivan), who married Captain Hrehory Czeczel’s daughter but died without issue in 1679; and a daughter Barbara, who was married to a member of the Olizar family. After Halszka’s death Piaseczyński married again in 1638. His second wife was Elżbieta Konstancja, daughter of Jan Ostrorog, Voivode of Poznań (the Grater Poland province of the Crown). Elżbieta of the Ostrorog family was a daughter of Jan and Princess Zofia Zaslawska (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 145). Alexander’s son, Ivan of Kuniew (d. 1679) was sent in his young days by his father to an educative journey around Europe. After his father’s death he became Starost of Novogrod and Ulanów. He dedicated himself to his military career, and since 1647 was a royal Captain (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 145-50; UrzędniczyCzemihów, 2000: 67, no. 10). Under this office he took part in 1648, in a legation to B. Khmel’nyts’kyi. In 1649 at Ostrog in Volhynia the Cossacks „chopped” many comrades from his colour. In 1651 he took part in the capturing of Krasne, when he was reputed to fight with a famous Cossack Colonel Nieczaj. In 1671 he participated in an expedition against Cossacks and Tartars. On his wife, daughter of Hrehory Czeczel and Anna (PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 149).

Alexander Piaseczyński acted a few times as Surrogator (plenipotentiary) of the Vinnytsia Starosty. In 1607, 1614 and 1620/21 replacing Walenty A. Kalinowski (1607) during his absence, then in 1614 and 1620/21, Alexander Balaban, when the latter was in Tartar captivity, to which he has fallen as the result of the Cecora Battle on 20 September 1620. In 1620-30 Alexander was a royal courtier, and then became in succession, the Starost of Ulanów (1628/29), Novogrod (1633-43) and Garwolin in the Crown (1645), Castellan of Kamenets’ (1631), Kyiv (1635), and finally Voivode of Novogrod (1646). He enjoyed confidence of both Sigismund III (1587-1632) and his brother and successor Vladislas IV (1632-48). In 1630 he was sent with a legacy to the Ottoman Court. In 1632-34 he distinguished himself in the Moscow campaign, and in 1635 was a royal envoy to the Tsar. He died before 5 February 1646, but after 3 December 1645, the date of his last will (BSŁefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossolińscy], spr. III/4106, f. 25: the testament written down at Uładów; an entry on 15 December in Vinnytsia Castle court registers). See, Niesiecki, 1841 7: 281-83; PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 141-49; PSB, 1980 XXV: 800-03; Uruśki, 1916 13: 311; U III/3: 224, 69, no. 213; U III/4: 189, 17 and 30, no. 96; UrzędniczyCzemihów, 2000: 67, no. 9.
husband was Vasil Rohozinski, thanks to which there were family bonds between
the Slupicas, Meleszko, and Piaseczyhskis.\textsuperscript{332}

Halszka and Alexander were married by 20 October 1618, when
Piaseczyhsk made out a legacy to his bride, and entered it in the court register on
29 September 1619.\textsuperscript{333} On 9 July 1618, already after her marriage to Piaseczyhski,
Halszka obtaobtained an injunction from the Lublin Tribunal against Dimitr
Krasnosielei, brother of Owdotia Semenowa Slupiczyna [V/1], in proceedings in
which she was acting as the legal guardian of the children from her first
marriage.\textsuperscript{334} Alexander Piaseczyhski was managing his wife's property left her by
Meleszko, that is the villages of Łuka (formerly Zalesie), Ometynce, and part of
the town of Ziatkowce, probably already from 1618 onwards.\textsuperscript{335} By obtaining a

\textsuperscript{332} Grandfather of Anna Piaseczyhnska, Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosielel, the then castle judge of
Bratslav (1569-92) was a husband of Hrehory's sister Zdanna Slupiczanka [IV/4].

\textsuperscript{333} He had taken a loan of 20,000 Polish Zlotys from Halszka against a security on the town and
castle of Kuniew with its adjacent villages and settlements, his own property in the Powiat of Lutsk
in Volhynia. Witnesses to this deed were Michal Kropiwnicki, territorial Deputy Justice of
Bratslav, Vasil Rohozinski and Mateusz Kubicki (BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f.
89-90).

\textsuperscript{334} The case had been brought to stay the execution of an order (for the conveyance?) of the village
of Michalewka in the estate of Ivan Meleszko. However, we do not know the causes of the dispute
(ZDz., 1896 21: 313 [digest]: here Halszka as Elżbieta). On the same day (9 July) Halszka and her
husband obtaiobtained a decree of condemnation on Alexander Meleszko and other members of the
Meleszko family, who stood accused by the Piaseczyhskis of having unlawfully charged a toll on
potash transported from Łuka, Ometynce, and Ziatkowce through Mikulicze to Kazimierz (on-
Vistula) – a riverside trading centre (ZDz., 1896 21: 311 [digest]: here as Halszka of Rohozno).

\textsuperscript{335} PetrenkoLuka, 1998: 22. In 1622 Halszka of Rogoźno and Mikołaj (d. 1651) and Anna, her
children by her first husband Meleszko, was conducting litigation against the descendants of
Hrehory Baybuz, notary of the court of Vinnytsia Castle (d. after 13 January 1620 and before
August 1622), his sons Constantine, who had succeeded to his father's office in the court of
Vinnytsia Castle, Semen, and Michal Meleszko. On 16 August 1622 the Crown Tribunal issued a
verdict in a case brought by the Baybuzas, who were suing the Meleszko party for a new partition
of the properties of Kropiwna Wyżna and Ometynce. The proceedings had been launched in 1617
by Ivan Meleszko and Hrehory Baybuz, and were renewed by the latter's sons after his death. The
case was the subject of the territorial court at Vinnytsia during the St. Michael's hearings in 1617.
The then issued verdict concerned the delimitation of the above-mentioned properties, and the
heapin of new mounds alongside the border. Baybuz was of the opinion that, the Ometynce
ground spread only over the area of half a mile in the direction of the Kropiwna grounds, which was
in accordance with the deed of privilege for Ometynce granted to Jermolaj Meleszko. He estimated
his loss from unlawful use of the grounds by Meleszko to the sum of 10,000 kopas of Lithuanian
groszs (60,000 of Lithuanian groats) (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 101, f. 5-6v.). Mikołaj Meleszko
and Halszka's husband, Alexander Piaseczyhski, represented the Meleszko interests before the
Tribunal. For reasons of procedure (misformulation of the summons), the case was adjourned to the
next session of the Tribunal. This 1622 decree was the last in which Halszka was mentioned as a
party (CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 101, f. 5-6v.). Earlier in the same year she had appeared before
royal charter from Sigismund III for Ziatkowce, Piaseczyński triggered a long-lasting dispute with its joint tenants, Halszka Słupczanka and her husband Vasil Rohoziński.\footnote{UrbanśkiPro memoria, 1929: 70.}

Following the death of Halszka of Rohoźno and the question of management of the Meleszko estates, in 1623 a conflict erupted between stepson and stepfather. In 1624 (30 January?) Alexander lodged a complaint in the Vinnytsia court against his stepson Mikolaj alias Mikita Iwanowicz Meleszko for a foray the latter had conducted against Ometyńce on 29 December 1623. In Piaseczyński’s opinion Mikolaj’s younger sister, Anna Melesczanka, who was Piaseczyński’s ward, had the right to tenure of this village, since her mother Halszka of Rohoźno had left Anna a legacy worth of 4,000 of Polish Zlotys on this property.\footnote{PulaskiKronika, 1991 2: 145 and note 2.} Under Halszka’s will Anna was to remain with her guardian until the end of her wardship. In his complaint Piaseczyński also relates that on the following day (30 December) Mikolaj had also made an attack on the village of Łuka, which Piaseczyński held on the grounds of a legacy worth of 3,000 of Polish Zlotys left to him by his wife Halszka in her will.\footnote{Piaseczyński: F. 5 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 139-139v. Here a compliant entered in the court registers of Vinnytsia Castle on 30 January (?) 1635 on behalf of Piaseczyński by his servant Piotr Krasowski; PułaskiKronika, 1991 2: 145 and note 2.} A change in the relationship between stepfather and stepson came in 1628, on the eve of a campaign against the
Tartars, in which both were to serve. There is a surviving document, drawn up before March 1628, enumerating the “Points of Reconciliation between Their Lordships the Starost of Ulanów and Lord Meleszko, His Majesty’s Captains.” The starost must have been Alexander, who succeeded to his deceased father’s office at about this time. The context of the subsequent events and the nature of the points listed, allows us to conclude that the Captain Meleszko mentioned, was Mikołaj. In 1631 Piaseczyński managed to free Mikołaj from the Tartars, who had taken him captive during the campaign of 1628, and subsequently helped him in his endeavour to obtain the office of Esquire-carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. daphifer) of Novogrodek, which he held in 1640-51.

4.a. Alexander Piaseczyński’s Attempt to Take Over the Kuna Estate, 1624.

339 Captain Meleszko in October 1628, in the course of fight was taken captive with a part of his cavalry colour royal. His unit was isolated from the rest of forces under Stefan Chmielecki during a clash on Üdycz Trail (a branch of the Black Trail) with Tartars led by Kievan Pasza (Przyłęcki, Stanisław, ed. 1842. Ukraine Sprawy. Przyczynek do dziejów polskich, tatarskich i tureckich XVII wieku < Przyłęcki.Ukrainne sprawy>. L’viv: n.p. 53-55: Chmielecki’s letter to the King dated 8 October 1628 and „Register of comrades [Pol. towarzystwo] killed or taken captives of Lord Meleszko’s colour”). The problem is that Chmielecki in his letter to the King of 8 October 1628 mentioned, that Meleszko’s name was Jan. However in the context of the described above events, one is to assume, that Chmielecki might have mistaken the names. It is less probable, though not impossible, that these events might have concerned representing the Volhynian branch Ivan (Jan) Melszko, Castellan of Berest.

340 BNarod.: ms. 4165/III Varia, vol. 3, f. 121. In accordance with this settlement Meleszko was to “let go in agreement” his testamental affairs (most probably the subject was his mother’s Halszka of Rohożno last will). He had to stop proceedings in the Crown Tribunal followed by the publication of the Piaseczyński’s infamy and execution adjudged in his properties. In turn Piaseczyński was to acknowledge him receipt of „all court verdicts and appeals“. Meleszko was also to give back to the Starost of Ulanów before March 1628 all robbed movables and to pay to the Royal Treasury “recognition” in an amount of 2600 Zlotys. Piaseczyński as provision against possible new summonses to be made by Meleszko got an assurance that the latter „all and all his own affairs [judicial documents]“ would hand over to one of other captains.

341 Rulikowski mentions a letter written in 1631 while in Turkish captivity by one Meleszko to Piaseczyński, concerns exactly Mikołaj. The latter thanked for offering ransom for him and asked the addressee for financial support to cover necessary expenses for the journey back home (Trusiewicz, 1870: 302 and note 75). Mikołaj’s captivity is being confirmed as well by the fact that in 1629 Florian Potocki was to pay chimney-tax (Pol. podymne) for Ziatkowce “property of Lord Meleszko, royal Captain of His Majesty” (AYZR, 1890 VII/2: 408, no. XXIV). Mikołaj Iwanowicz, royal Captain in charge of cavalry colour got drowned in the Boh on 11 March 1651 during the attack of Polish forces on Vinnytsia defended by the Cossacks under Ivan Bohun (Petrenko Luka, 1998: 22, 24). See also UrzędnicyCzemihew, 2000: 60, 70, no. 25 (her on his magistracy as Esquire-carver). Information on Anna (BStefanyka: F. 5 [Ossolińcey], spr. III/4105, f. 139-139v.).
In 1624 Alexander Piaseczyński embarked on an attempt to take over the Kuna properties from the Rohoziński couple, or more precisely from the heiress, Halszka. He narrowly missed success. The property at stake was Kuna with its adjacencies, and the part of Ziatkowce, he had purchased from the Meleszko family. The fact that Vasil Rohozinski had only recently completed his jail sentence for the murder of Tychon Semenowicz had badly damaged his reputation and diminished his standing and influence in the local community. Taking advantage of his own position and his connections at the King’s court, Piaseczyński obtained two charters from Sigismund III. One was for Ziatkowce, over which he was in conflict with his stepson Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko. The other charter was for Kuna. He obtained the charter for Kuna and Kunka from the Royal Chancery on 28 February 1624 on the grounds of *ius caducum* (escheat). The mode in which he acquired this charter suggests that after Tychon’s death his estate must have reverted to the royal treasury for at least a short time. Piaseczyński based his title to the Shipicas inheritance on the grounds that both Rohoziński and his wife were involved in the murder, and the fact that Tychon died without issue and possibly intestate, as a result of which his property reverted to the Crown. The chances of actually winning Kuna on the grounds of escheat were pretty slim, in view of Halszka Semenówna’s unquestionable right of inheritance as sole heiress in the Kuna line and, since from 1617, she was fully cleared of all charges of complicity in her brother’s murder.

On 7 May 1624 the Rohoziński couple appeared before the session of the castle court at Vinnytsia to lodge a complaint against Piaseczyński’s actions, “which were as good as an abuse of the law”. According to Halszka Semenówna and her husband, the royal courtier

342 The author of an entry “Kuna” in _Słownik Geograficzny_ mentions this attempt without offering details (SłownGeogr., IV: 874).

343 Podolyamin, 1886: 568. In the opinion of the author of the “Kuna” entry in _Słownik Geograficzny_, referring to an information by Iwanicki, this deed of privilege was to be preserved in the domestic archives at Kuna (SłownGeogr., 1883 IV: 874-75); HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 536.
by telling false stories dared to solicit His Majesty the King for her ancestral property Kuna and other settlements and uninhabited lands, which had passed down in her family for centuries by the law of inheritance, as to which there was no doubt at all; and on the pretext of carrying out that order in the [castle] court of Vinnytsia had urged the unlawful seizure of the said property, and later with some document purportedly issued by His Majesty’s court had exhorted and incited the deputies of the equestrian estate, assembled in parliament to seize the said ancestral lands.344

Halszka estimated the damage done by that unlawful attempt to evict her and the legal expenses incurred because of it “without the heritage itself” at 60,000 Polish Zlotys. She also charged the castle court of complicity in Piaseczyński’s illegal dealings.345

On 15 June Vasil Nieborski, court beadle for the Voivodeship of Bratslav, reported Piaseczyński’s summons on Halszka Semenówna and Vasil Rohoziński. Piaseczyński charged them with “failure to comply with the official order and obstructing the apprehension of the Kuna estate [...] on the grounds of His Majesty’s charter.” During the proceedings before the castle court a term was appointed for the parties to appear before the King’s bench at the next convocation session of the Sejm.346 To forestall any prospective moves by the Rohozińskis, on 28 December 1624 Piaseczyński appeared before Adam Kalinowski, Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, and submitted his declaration, to be entered in the court registers. He had earlier presented it before the local dietie assembly (Pol. sejmik) for the Voivodeship of Bratslav. Thereby he forewarned the Starost, the castle court, and the gentry gathered for the sejmik (“publicly in the circle” - „publice w kole”) that “any attestations and documents which Lord Vasil Rohoziński may produce this day before the Gentlemen [Deputies] assembled here to decide on the points to be raised at the forthcoming Sejm” would all be “null and void”. In this way he hoped to prevent the inclusion of a complaint by Rohoziński concerning the Kuna estate to the instructions issued to the parliamentary deputies.347

344 BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 124.
345 BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 124.
346 BStefanyka: F. 5, op. 1 [Ossoliński], spr. III/4105, f. 127.
In the meantime an appeal was heard in the Crown Tribunal. The Tribunal bench imposed a fine on Piaseczyński for abuse of escheat law and obtaining a charter for the Kuna estate on false pretences.\(^{348}\) However, according to the entry for Kuna in the \textit{Słownik Geograficzny}, on 22 April 1625 the Crown Tribunal also issued a decree outlawing Rohoziński for resisting Piaseczyński’s takeover of the Kuna estate.\(^{349}\) Nevertheless, all the evidence indicates that the proceedings were eventually stayed, and the parties resorted to a court of arbitration, perhaps still in Lublin. Unfortunately, there are no extant documents to confirm the way in which the matter was settled. The likelihood of the settlement reached in Lublin is suggested by the fact that the case concerning the Omętyńce property was also concluded in the Tribunal in the same year. On 23 April 1625 before this court Alexander Piaseczyński acquitted Vasil Rohozinski of the charge of expelling him from Omętyńce.\(^{350}\)

\(^{348}\) Podolyanin, 1886: 568. The author does not offer the date of this court session.
\(^{349}\) SłownGeogr., 1883 IV: 874. Also the original of this decree was found, according to this author, in the Jaroszyński family house archives at Kuna; HeleniuszRozmowy, 1873 1: 536.
\(^{350}\) ZDz., 1896 21: 383 (digest).
CONCLUSION

The death of the last Shipica, Jeremiasz Juriewicz in 1618 was not just the end of the Ruthenian family in Eastern Podolia. The story of this family and their activities in Bratslavshchyna reflect the story of many other upper gentry (lords) Ruthenian families who following the political upheavals were forced to get eventually integrated in the dominated by Polish (viz. Catholic) element political system of the Commonwealth, or died out before the mid-17th century.

The history of the Bratslav area has not been thoroughly studied due to relatively scanty sources, a result, undoubtedly, of the perilous living conditions in borderland. Examining thus, the Słupica family and their estate in Kuna, allowed us not only to reconstruct the immediate family and neighbourly connections, but also to examine the parton-client relations of the local Ruthenian lord group, its origin and influence upon the political and economic developments in Eastern Podolia. Although, conducting research on the Bratslav "fluid borderland" area can be very strenuous – there are no full chronological collections of sources, the secondary literature is limited, on the other hand it was fascinating to have a glimpse into a society where the norms – legal, social – we are accustomed to, from bordering regions, are different. The Ruthenian lord would have to build up his economic basis on the land he was endowed with, while constantly fighting legally and physically against neighbouring proprietors and fierce tribal hordes. These conditions and realities are apparent in the Słupica's case. Let us not forget that the extinction of the family came about after raids of other members of the same family, one of them even disguised as Tartar foray.

Because of historical and political developments, described in the introduction and chapter 2 the estate society in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania has been shaped relatively late. The process went on from the end of the 14th century until the mid-16th century. It reached its final form in the Ruthenian lands in the second half of the 16th century as the result of basic state-level reforms, introduced
in the period from 1540's to 1560's. These changes transformed the Grand Duchy, an integral part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from 1569, into a modern state based on the unified noble class authority. The latter got its unified class status about the same period. This "closure of the noble estate" resulted from social transformations enforced by the aforementioned reforms and from the nobles' natural tendency to define themselves as a separate group, distinguished through strictly defined rights and obligations. Until the mid-16th century the distinctive elements of the Lithuanian state were according to Błaszczyk: the monopolized political power in hands of lords - the upper gentry class - and to some extent of princely families; the strong diversification among the boyar group somehow parallel to the lesser gentry in terms of settlement and social and economic status; the existence of an intermediary social stratum between boyars and peasants; the weakness of townspeople, as well as ethnic, economic and religious diversity, especially in towns. In the case of Eastern Podolia all these prerequisites were present. Although we should also add its "border" character, paying more attention to a military aspect of this society organisation and its "border like" mentality. Nevertheless, despite a visible presence of different ethnic groups, the main ethnic component of Eastern Podolian society was the Ruthenian one. The border society was open to different groups, who could not be instrumental, though, in politics or economics, adding much to a local specific cultural, religious and ethnic picture. The slowly growing Polish population became distinctive in the Grand Duchy only after 1569. It was growing more in the Kyiv and Volhynia Voivodeships than in Bratslavshchyna. The latter received newcomers primarily from the Lithuania proper and Volhynia and to a lesser degree from the Polish Crown. Thus, Bratslav retained its Ruthenian character longer than other Ruthenian lands.

The unification and closing of the noble estate in the Ruthenian lands in the mid-16th century owed a lot to its Polish counterpart. The Polish nobility beginning from the early 15th century played an intermediary role allowing the Ruthenians to fit themselves into the Western European model of noble estate. Since the 14th century there was a slow degradation of the status of princely families resulting to
the advancement of lords; the growth of boyar power, initiated in 1560's after a considerable part of them was putted outside the noble society and some of them were upgraded in their status. The consolidated remaining boyars strengthened their political position and were capable of acting as a unified group against the princes and lords.

Within this context it is interesting to investigate the position of the Shjpicas in the local society, especially among the noble estate and how this class evolution influenced their developments. I was not able to determine their roots, but it seems highly probable they were Ruthenians from the Lithuania proper or rather from Volhynia, appearing in Podolia in the Princes Koriatovych’s retinue, thus enjoying one of the oldest settlements in the region qualifying them to what Jablonowski called the “nested gentry”. No doubt they did not belong to princely families, but from the very beginning they became associated with them in the area, being their servants, thus enjoying their power and protection. In the early family history the most profitable of these connections proved to be the one of Paweł [I/1] in 1388-94, the Shjpicas’ founding ancestor to the Koriatovychs. Thanks to this association he reached the high ranked position of the castle voivode in Kamenets’ (Western Podolia), and perhaps earned himself the earliest endowment (most probably from Prince Fyodor [ca. 1386-94] whom Paweł served faithfully). Thus, to Paweł the Shjpicas owed the establishment of the family position in the princely retinue with all the consequences of it. The fall of the Koriatovychs in 1394, which most probably resulted also with the death of Paweł, did not inflict upon the family’s position as severe as expected. In all likelihood, by then, the Shjpicas had already been associated with the Princes Sanguszko’s family originating from Volhynia, which became their protectors until the mid-16th century. The “patron-client” relations with the Sanguszkos had also political consequences. Especially in the period of the civil war of 1430-37, when their protectors partly stayed with Vitold and the king and partly supported Svidrygiello.
Thus, the Shipicas, in the period can be placed in the rather limited group of lords, coming second after the princely families, originating from boyars. The establishment of this lord group has to be connected with the Vitold’s rule as the Grand Duke (1392-1430).\(^1\) Regardless of what happened to the Shipicas after the removal of the Koriatovychs, it is certain that their first confirmed endowments are to be related to Vitold in ca. 1411-30.\(^2\) It is questionable though that Vitold’s endowment or endowments were the first ones they obtained in the Bratslav area (volost’), seen as their homeland since Vitold’s time. The hypothesis that Vitold confirmed earlier endowments made by Fyodor Koriatovych (ca. 1386-94) and to a lesser extent Svidrygiello (1400-02) is quite strong. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the Shipicas owed their position and material status in the mid-15\(^{th}\) century primarily to Vitold and next to the Sanguszkos’ support. There was also a possible association to Svidrygiello, confirmed in the case of Tychon [II/2], the hospodar’s courtier in 1443 acting alongside Prince Vasil Sanguszko, the Starost of Bratslav, who had been appointed by Svidrygiello. Tychon’s participation in the property affairs of the Mikuliński, who owed their endowments both to Svidrygiello and Vitold, and the marriage bounding both families a generation later, is also of significance in this context. All the Shipica representatives in this period namely Ivan [II/1] (ca. 1411-30), Tychon [II/2] (1446) and a bit later Stećko [III/1] (1509?) appeared in the sources as lords or Bratslav landlords (Pol. ziemianie bractawscy) and Sanguszko’s close associates. The same was truth for Bohusz (1516) [III/3] and Ždan [IV/2] (1533) in the first half of the 16\(^{th}\) century.

Vitold’s endowment policy in Eastern Podolia deserves further examination. My own research combined to the latest publication of Kurtyka offer a substantial number of Vitold’s endowment charters issued to nobility in both Western and Eastern Podolia. These charters are important in order to trace in detail the formative period of lord group in both parts of Podolia. In the case of Bratslav territory one has to do with not more than a dozen of families, of which at

---

\(^1\) In the case of Eastern Podolia as its governor from 1395 to 1400, and king’s vassal from 1411 to 1430.

\(^2\) For sure for Ivan [II/1] and perhaps Tychon [II/2].
least 2/3 appeared in my thesis as being closely associated to the Shipicas, mainly thanks to Vitold’s endowments in the neighbouring area.3

Many of Vitold’s endowments were given away as a result of the military exploits of these families’ members against the Tartars.4 The Tartars became an omnipotent factor in the Bratslav territory from the early 14th century until the end of the 17th century. However, their influence has to been double folded. Apparently, they caused havoc and ruined local economy. The capturing of captives in an area, not densely populated, and the devastation of nobles’ estates, numerous examples of which are to be found in my thesis, are some of the immediate results of raids. However, they also gave the opportunity to rise in importance or to change family position as thanks to them many of the endowments in the borderland area have been earned, or to loose everything, which was the case of Bohdan Słupica [IV/1].

The neighbourhood connections created in the Vitold times (ca. 1411-30) soon were transformed into family relations (the Mikuliński, Krasnosielki, Koszka and Słupica families). It should be noted here that the majority of the Słupica intermarriages were among the local Ruthenians equal to them in status and religion (the Orthodox creed), which suggest it was a rule for the lords’ group. Of special importance seems to be the marriage concluded between Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] and Owdotia Kranosielska, the unsuccessful pretender to the Kozar and the Korotko legacies. Undoubtedly, for the Słupica the aim of this marriage was also to repair economically family estates by acquiring and annexing,

3 Timofiej Procił the direct ancestor to the Buszyński; Leś Turkowicz, and Jacko Leckowicz, the ancestors to the Jackowski; Herman, the ancestor to the Kleszczelewski; Redko Jesman, the ancestor to the Krasnosielki; Kostia Kosztyłowicz, the ancestor to the Kozars; an unknown ancestor to the Kropiwnicki; Bohdan Mikuliński, the founding ancestor to the Mikuliński, Andriej Połoz, the ancestor to the Obodeński; and finally the unknown ancestor to the Żabokrzycki. At least in the case of the Koszka, Krasnosielki, or Mikuliński due to relative abundance of source material, studies similar to this one on the Słupicas can be pursued.

4 E.g. the Koszka, Mikuliński, Żabokrzycki and the Słupica families, although in the last case we are in possession of only an indirect evidence.
at least, a part of the neighbouring lands. The first marriage outside the lord circle was the one concluded at the end of the 16th century between Marusza Bohdanówna [V/2] and Ivan Łysohorski, a lesser to the Słupicas Ruthenian nobleman from the Crown (Western) Podolia. This marriage and the one of Jurij Hrehorowicz [V/6] to Marusza Diakowska of local Ruthenian, but lesser family, apart from the mutations in the coat of arms, was one of the indicators of loosing importance and power and becoming "regular" nobles. More marriages with outsiders became common in the first quarter of the 17th century.

This period witnessed the slow decline of the Słupica family, as well as of the Ruthenian lord families in general, as the majority of them faced extinction, mostly a biological one or caused by internal conflicts usually about property issues. This slow decline exactly in the first quarter of the 17th century has to be seen in connection to the social, political and also religious changes which occurred in the second half of the 16th century and allowed newcomers and lesser noblemen to penetrate the shrinking lord circle. Thus, we may observe at that time the marriage of Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] to a Volhynian nobleman Vasil Rohoziński, most probably also of different creed (an Arian?); and of Fedora Dmitriewna [VI/5] to Alexander Kruszelnicki, a Roman Catholic and lesser nobleman originating from the Red Rus', but coming to Bratslav area most probably from the Crown Podolia; finally the unions of Marusza Mikolajewna [VI/4], first to a lesser nobleman Paweł Prysowicz Zablocki, and secondly to Wojciech Birkowski, a Volhynian of probably Polish origin and certainly of doubtful reputation.

In the second half of the 16th century, the Słupicas changed the Sanguszkos patronage to the Korecki princely family. The reason for this change of patrons could be Koreckis gaining of importance in the area. Prince Bohusz Korecki was a long lasting Starost of Bratslav 1548-76, and Vinnytsia in 1571-76. The

---

5 See Chapter 5/6a and b: the Oblin estate from the Kozars and the Ladyżyn estate from the Korotkos.
Sanguszkos slowly were retreating into Volhynia, although yet in 1566-71 Roman Fedorowicz Sanguszko was the Starost of Vinnytsia. As both princely families were related in this period, some of the Sanguszkos’ clients might have changed their patrons on the basis of mutual agreement. In addition, after the death of Bohusz in 1541 who was associated with the Bratslav Starost (1539-44), Prince Semen Proński, the Słupicas faced with the hatred of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia nobles and townsmen towards Proński, were forced to look for another patron. The first Słupica to be related with the Koreckis was Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1], who however lost all the family credit in 1551, when he surrendered Bratslav to the Crimean Tartars. The confiscation of the family estates resulted from this action. The newly arrived from Lithuania proper Meleszko family’s affiliation to the Korecki family must have somehow influenced the decision of Ivan Meleszko to act as guardian to minor Słupicas (1596-1605 or 1612).6 Finally, from the beginning of the 17th century one may observe a close, but not always an easy relation connecting the Słupicas (Hreblog Zdan [IV/3]) and their relatives and successors (the Meleszkos and the Rohoziński) to the Piasczyńskiis, a lord family originating from Volhynia and aspiring from the turn of the 16th century to a magnate status. As to the Słupicas themselves being patrons, the only indication we have is that their servant circle was, until the end of the 16th century, entirely Ruthenian and consisted mostly of local lesser gentry (boyars). The first Pole was in the retinue of Tychon Semenowicz’s [VI/3]. It was probably Tychon’s guardian influence that the family started to employ Polish attorneys to represent them in different courts.7

The main distinctions between lords and boyars were that the lord endowments allowed them to create substantial estates; they possessed a coat of arms; and had a magistrate career, thus active participation in the state authority, even if performed only on a local level. The Słupicas as it is visible in my thesis

---

6 See also Ivan’s father Jermolaj Melszko, the second husband of Bohdan Słupica’s widow Zofia née Mikulińska.
7 This confirms Litiwn’s statement regarding the grooving influx of Polish nobility into Ukraine in the first quarter of the 17th century.
fulfilled all the criteria. Their endowments belonged to the oldest ones in the Bratslav territory and they developed relatively well until the disaster of 1551 resulting in the abovementioned confiscation of the all Š/upci\'s properties. Although, it seems that the whole of the Bratslav region, in the second half of the 15th century, became deserted due to the Tartars activities. The difficulties, and no doubt high cost of the judicial battle from 1555 to 1566, to restore the family property, completed in 1575, must have influenced the decision to divide the family estates, in 1592, between two lines. The value and attractiveness of the Š/upicas properties – the Kuna with Nosowce and Trościaniec estates is apparent by the fact that Princes Zasławski were determined to spend huge amounts of money and time from 1552 to 1622 in order to acquire them for good. The same could be said for all family quarrels over the different shares in the Kuna and Trościaniec estates, or for the interest taken up by the Prince Zbaraski and the Kalinowskis in them.

In regard to the coat of arms, the Š/upicas\' original armorial device - initially only in form of a seal - was counted among the so-called individual ones, and was dating back most probably the early 14th century. This reflects their Ruthenian origin. We also have here an example of adoption of the \"western\" model, surely a result of the unification of Ruthenian heraldic practices to the Polish model. However, the Š/upicas seemed to represent as well, what Iakovenko described, as the late establishment of a heraldic tradition for the Lithuanian and Ruthenian boyars and lords. They did start to pay real attention to the armorial bearings in the mid-16th century, and did not develop them until the 17th century. Thus, we have the examples of two different seals and armorial bearings of Hrehory Ždan [IV/3] of 1576/77 and Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1] of 1596. It is common in the turn of the 16th century for the members of the same Ruthenian family to use different armorial devices, one of them being the family arms and the other(s) borrowed from the Polish heraldic resources. As the Slupica family became extinct in its male line in 1615-18, its members in general did not manage to follow changes, except perhaps Semen Bohdanowicz.
When it comes to the magistracies we have a handful of the family members who were successfully pursuing a public career, although in the case of two of them it ended disastrously. Those who did not take up an office but instead concentrated on the family business and estate management seemed to have been rather forced to do so due to circumstances. For example, Semen Bohdanowicz [V/1], the traitor’s son, first had to get back his share and then concentrated on rebuilding it. The same is true for his son Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3], who inherited the property devastated both by the Tartars and neighbours, but thanks to his guardian Ivan Meleszko, he proved to be quite successful in improving the economic conditions of the hereditary estate.

Most probably all of the Stupicas performed some military duties first of all due to their status and feudal obligations, but also because of the constant danger from the different Tartar hordes, the Moldavians, and to some degree the Cossacks and the wars conducted by the Grand Duchy and the Commonwealth. Especially in the 16th century wars against Muscovy, some of the family members must have taken part. However, direct indication on the fulfilment of military duties can be traced only in the case of Bohusz [III/3], a distinctive member of the ambient defence structure (Pol. obrona potoczna) in its initial stage in 1530’s; and in the case of Matiasz Semenowicz [VI/2] who became a mercenary soldier and spent most of his adult life in the Hungarian army.

The most illustrious magistrate was the Shupicas’ founding ancestor, Paweł [I/1], who from being the Koriatovychs princely Privy Council member (1388-92) advanced to the position of the castle voivode of Kamenets’ (ca. 1393-94), the main castle in Western Podolia, and fulfilled the crucial for Fyodor Koriatovych mission to Skirgiełło. The second of them was Bohusz [III/3], who appeared first in 1516 alongside the Starost of Bratslav and Vinnytsia, Prince Roman Andriejewicz and was referred to as lord; and as Sanguszko’s official in Vinnytsia.

---

8 See stoboda “free settlement” at Kuna in 1596.
9 The foundation of the town and castle of Kuna Nowa in 1605.
This is to be interpreted as being Sanguszko's servant and his temporal plenipotentiary starost at Vinnytsia. Later on, in 1529, Bohusz was to be found in the first place among the ambient defence forces - "guardians of the border" in the Bratslav area, with a 3-horse retinue, which suggests that he played an important role in this newly arranged anti-Tartar defence. Finally, in Bratslav, as the "senior landowner", he was one of the magistrates to the Bratslav Starost Prince Semen Proński. Most probably he was acting as the deputy Starost and commander of the castle garrison. Perhaps, after Proński had fled to Vinnytsia, he also became the starost's plenipotentiary. The death of Bohusz, who was "drowned in the Boh" by the mutinied local townsfolk and gentry, earned him the reputation of a traitor among the local society, but his loyalty must have been recognized by the king and authorities. It was exactly 10 years later that another Słupica -- Bohdan Iwanowicz [IV/1] played the same role of the plenipotentiary starost in Bratslav, this time on behalf of the Bratslav and Vinnytsia Starost, Prince Bohusz Fedorowicz Korecki. It so happened that in September 1551, he became responsible for the Bratslav defence against the entire Crimean Tartar horde under the Khan Devlet Girey. The siege finished after 3 days with the castle's capitulation followed by the devastation of the entire province. Unfortunately, Bohdan was the scapegoat. The declaration of his treason and the confiscation of the family estates was to determine the Słupicas actions in the second half of the 16th century. Nevertheless, despite this unfavourable situation, the next family member displayed skill and energy in recovering the hereditary properties. He also managed to pursue an official career. It was Hrehory Bohuszewicz called Ždan [IV/3] who started his advancement in the local hierarchy thanks to his father's reputation, but owed a lot to his association to the rising in power Piaseczyński family. His first magistracy was deputy sub-chamberlain in 1583-86, which he fulfilled next to the sub-chamberlain Ławryn Piaseczyński, the favourite royal secretary of King Sigismund III, a well-connected man in the royal court. The second Hrehory's magistracy was the castle judge in Bratslav from 1592 to 1595, when Starost was Jurij Struš of Komarów, the first newcomer from the Crown to hold this office.
It should also be mentioned that at least Bohusz [III/3] and Hrehory Ždan [IV/3] while performing their official duties earned enough credit among the local population and authorities. Their reputation was recognised outside the Bratslav territories, both being at least once received at the royal court. Bohusz was recommended by the King Sigismund I to take an active part in the Polish-Moldavian border commissions in early 1540's; and Hrehory was in 1576/77 one of co-authors of the memorial regarding the Ruthenian language that was handed over to the King Stephan.

Apart from researching and analysing an example of a Ruthenian family in Eastern Podolia, the Shipicas, the legal nature of the majority of sources used in this thesis also allow us to gain an insight into their legal and judicial assets of their lives. The Shipicas' legal engagement shed light on the functioning of courts and judicial system of the Grand Duchy and the Commonwealth in general, following its developments on all levels, from the local castle and territorial courts to the Crown Tribunal at Lublin and the Sejm (Diet) assessors’ court. The ways in which the noble class was trying to settle its most common legal cases, such as property or ownership issues, boundary conflicts, absconding subjects, family estate divisions are described in detail. One could observe the legal procedure in court, the issuing of summons or writs, claimants or manifestos, the beadles accounts, the witnesses accounts and the witnessing procedure, and the appeals by the parties as well as the methods to prolong or postpone the proceedings. It should be stressed that most of the cases described in my thesis were to be judged in accordance to the newly introduced revolutionary norms embodied in the following editions of the Lithuanian Statute (1529, 1566 and 1588).¹⁰

Worth of noticing is also the role of out-of-court agreements - arbitrary settlements “by friends”. It is remarkable to notice that these solutions proved to be

¹⁰ Some examples of the functioning of the ducal court and its princely representatives operating on the local level (starostial = princely court) in the late 15ᵗʰ until 1530’s s were offered in chapters 2 and 5, in reference to the Shipicas’ participation as witnesses in boundary delimitations and other proceeding.
more enduring and respected by the parties, compared to the "normal" courts’
verdicts. After usually going through all the stages of court proceedings on all
possible and required levels, which lasted sometimes many years (see e.g. the case
of the Zbaraskis and the Kalinowskis form 1615 to 1629) and must have cost a
fortune, the parties rejected the final verdict (e.g. of the Tribunal at Lublin) in
favour of the arbitrary settlement conducted by their friends and legal
representatives. The reason behind this preference might have been that these
settlements conducted on their territories and witnessed by other interested parties,
such as friends, legal representatives and neighbours, offered more guarantees that
they would be executed and respected in future. One of the weaknesses of the
Commonwealth judicial system was certainly its lack of executive power, which
forced the interested parties to seek other solutions.11 An example of this
incapacity could have been the illegal action of Hrehory Ždan [IV/3] and Semen
Bohdanowicz [V/1] (1575, 1585) against the young Zaslawskis. The foray (or
forays) was performed after all legal ways had been followed and the family
property was officially restored, the restitution itself was guaranteed by the royal
charter. One should not forget, that the legal victory of the Slupicas over the
princely family of the Zaslawskis was only made possible after the introduction of
the I Lithuanian Statute of 1529 equalizing nobles (boyars and lords) and princely
families in the eye of legal proceedings. Despite that, though the Slupicas had to
take illegal actions to get back their property, and they were successful only
because of the temporal weakness of the minor Zaslawskis. It was not until 1622
when they (actually Halszka Semenówna [VI/1] and her husband Vasil
Rohoziński) finally won the litigation brought against them by the Zaslawskis, a
further proof of the above-mentioned legal change.

Another issue to be taken into consideration in this context is the specific
legalism displayed by the "border area" noble community. At first sight it looks as
a schizophrenic type of behaviour. One the one hand all legal measures are taken

11 See e.g., the Piławski’s case against the Slupicas regarding the fugitive subjects and the transfer
of executive rights on Kalinowski.
to secure the ownership rights it is important to get confirmation on paper. Privileges and all kind of property deeds were among the most sought off items by the aggressors during a foray. On the other hand though extreme behaviour is observed, when property issues were at stake. The forays and other unlawful actions seem to have been rather common occurrences. However, it should be stressed that forays were performed usually in internal family conflicts. Such extreme measures applied to neighbouring conflicts were rather rarely, and only happened, if legal procedures were exhausted. All these reinforce the weakness of legal executive power. If one side was of superior power, it could risk and afford long lasting proceedings, in the hope that finally the other side would be forced to sell the property in question or would be deprived of it, any other way. Thus, in this context the Hrehory Ždan’s action against Zaslavskis in 1575 had to be seen as a skilful and well-planed manoeuvre, and it is interestingly enough it, did not interfere with his future career as deputy sub-chamberlain and the Bratslav castle court notary.

The long lasting court proceedings created also financial problems. If procedures continued for too long completed with attacks afflicted simultaneously from Tartars or neighbours and relatives performing boundary incidents or regular forays, added up to serious financial crises. This was the case of the Rohozińskis, Halszka Semenówna and Vasil, who were engaged at the same time in two litigations brought against them by the family (Diakowski and the Kruszelnickis) 1615-24, and Zaslavski 1615-22. They must have paid a fortune for the court proceedings. Although we do not have exact data, there is no doubt that they had to pay many times all kind of court fees, the beadles costs, their own journeys to take part in proceedings in Bratslav, Vinnytsia, Lublin and finally Warsaw, as well as their attorneys to represent them in Tribunal at Lublin. Another question is the “unofficial” spending, such expenses as bribes paid to court notaries or other

---

12 The crown examples to be quoted here are the 1566 Słupicas' restitution charter and the 1581 claimants of Bratslav gentry in order to confirm the lost in fire of deeds of privileges.

13 Apart from the two forays in the Słupica family see e.g. the case of the Kopijewskis; these examples could constitute a long list.
magistrates to get necessary documents - see the case of the court notary Hrehory Baybuza and his letter to Zasławski, proving that both sides were ready to spent a lot to get necessary papers, or offered to witnesses making them testify on their behalf - this must have been the case of some of the six witnesses produced by the Rohoziński in 1617. The same is to be observed in the case of the Kruszelnickis when engaged in court cases against their relatives two Maruszas – Mikołajewna [VI/4] 1.v. Zablocka, 2. Birkowska (1607-15) and Mikołajewna née Diakowska [V/6], 2.v. Dzieszyna (1610-15) as well as the Zbaraskis (1607-24). The result was that both the Rohoziński and the Kruszelnickis were facing in the early 1620’s financial difficulties. Thus they were forced to either borrow money, usually against a temporal loan of some of the properties (the Rohoziński and their sons), or to sell some of their properties the case of Kruszelnickis’ sale to the Kalinowskis.

The condition of Kuna estate in the first quarter of the 17th century under Ivan Meleszko as a guardian and later on under his former ward Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3] was improving. One may say it actually outlived its renaissance with the foundation of the town and brick castle. The most evident answer to the following it rapid decline is the unsolved conflicts into the family, on property issues. As we know they were concluded with two forays in the course of which the last male hairs of the Słupica house were murdered (Tychon Semenowicz [VI/3] in 1615 and Jeremiasz Juriewicz [VI/6] in 1618). These family crimes were followed by costly court proceeding, and the Tartars attacks, especially in 1610-15 aggravated their position. In addition new magnates of the Bratslav Voivodeship, like the princely family of the Zbaraskis accompanied by the Kalinowskis, the Koniecpolskis and others were keen to collect all disputed land. Being extinct in male line, it was only a question of time when the Słupica legacy would evaporate, despite the belated efforts of the Rohoziński and the Kruszelnickis, to keep the estate’s integrity or rather of what was still left of it. The numerous progeny in both families had no luck either. All these children died out apart from one of the Rohoziński brothers, who was inherited by two daughters.
The Kruszelnickis sons and daughters also all died out in male line living only female successor.

The lack of extensive economic sources for the Kuna estate, has only allowed drawing a sketch of its economic activities. It is remarkable that despite the Slupica estate's unfavourable “border” location and “the permanently suspended” Tartar danger so many claimants to the land fought fiercely for many generations for its ownership. Apart from the very favourable location on the river banks (the Sob, Kunka, Kublicz), we know that it possessed densely afforestation and good conditions for animal breeding, and rather fertile soil. Making comparisons to other neighbouring settlements at the time, we can presuppose that until the end of the 16th century their economy must have been oriented first of all on the forest exploitation of all wood products, which offered the main bulk of their income. They must have been engaged also on hunting, especially for furs, honey, fishing, animal breeding and finally land cultivation, primarily to meet their own demands. The introduction of the *fölwark* system and of the crop cultivation on the bigger scale came in the turn of the 16th century, and was rather limited, due to the high cost of transportation, if exported at all, to the local market of the Bratslav Voivodeship.

The story of the Ruthenian family of the Slupicas and their Kuna estate is not by any means a complete one. Further research on other families in the neighbourhood of Bratslav would advance our understanding of the place and its history. Today, very little remains of it glorious past. Kuna is a mere village of roughly 2000 inhabitants mostly unaware of all the history it carries. For the historian though, it never ceases to entail a fascinating journey.

---

14 See the Kruszelnickis and Zbaraskis fight over the Nosowee woods.
GLOSSARY (*)

(*) The terms in brackets do not mean the origin of the word, term or name, they are Polish or Ruthenian versions of the given term or name as recorded in the source material or used in the secondary literature.

A

asesorowie (Pol.; sing. asesor) – an associated judges’ bench in court.
asaul (Pol. and Ruth.) = a Cossack commander
ataman (Pol. and Ruth.) = here a chief of the village or country town located on the Wallachian law. In the Cossack organization ‘senior’ = commander.

B

banicja (Pol.) = a banishment penalty putting a person in the position of outlaws. The announcement (Pol. publikacja) of outlawry meant the person was outlawed in the whole territory of the Commonwealth.
baskak (Tur.) = the khan tax-collector in the Mongol times (the 13th-14th centuries).
bojar (Pol.; Ruth. boiar) = a boyar - a servant; the term of Bulgarian origin. At the beginning boyars constituted the upper part in the feudal ladder, a boyar being an equivalent of a knight (starting with the privilege of 1387 until the end of the 14th century). Thus, in the last quarter of the 15th century in the Ruthenian territories boyar became an equivalent of a nobleman. However, in the course of the reforms of 1540’s to 1560’s and the transformation of the noble state the boyar group started to loose its status, being itself not a coherent one, due to numerous subdivisions in reference to the services performed on behalf of the duke and his representatives and upper lords. This way the majority of boyars became servants and their status was something below a nobleman and upper that of a peasant. In reality what still distinguished them from peasants was an obligation to the military service until 1529, when the putni boyars were relieved from it in exchange for the tiahla sluzhba (the corvée obligations) of 12 days per year and a rent. Thus, some of boyars managed to keep their noble status, while the others turned to peasants. In comparison to other voivodeships the boyar group in the Bratslav territory was a very limited one.
Bracławszczyna (Pol.) = Bratslavshchyna, Eastern Podolia, a territory of the Bratslav Voivodeship since 1566.
Brześć Litewski (Pol.) = Berest or the Lithuanian Berest, a town in the Lithuania proper, later on the chief town of Powiat and a place in which a few of Sejm’s took place.
burmistrz (Pol.) = a mayor
chorągiew (Pol.) = a company or colour; military unit.
chorąży (Pol.) = standard bearer (Lat. vexillifer)
chorąży wielki koronny (Pol.) = the Grand Standard-Bearer of the Crown.
the Crown (Pol. Korona) = the Polish Kingdom
the Crown Podolia (Pol. Podole koronne) = Western Podolia
czajusz (Pol.) = the Sultan's envoy, charged with a diplomatic mission.
cześnik (Pol.) = cup-bearer (Lat. pincerna)
czolem bicie (Pol.) = a courteous bow
czwarćzna (Pol.) = the customary “quarter” part of hereditary estates due to a sister from her brothers or other male relatives while dividing paternal property.
czarnoziem (Pol.) = a very fertile humus soil, under cultivation usually as a result of deforestation.
czynsz (Pol.) = a rent; the amount of which depended in the Grand Duchy after the “drag” reform of 1557 from the category of peasants, the settled ones used to pay ca. 30 of groszs, while the villein ones ca. 14 of groszs.

D
Deputacja Szlachecka (Pol.) = Deputy Office for Nobility established by the Russians in 1802 for the annexed territories in order to verify noble origin of Polish gentry, especially of petty one (Pol. szlachta zagrodowa).
deputat (Pol.) = a deputy from the given district or rather voivodeship delegated to the bench of the Crown Tribunal at Lublin.
diak (Ruth., Rus.) = a psalmist in the Orthodox Church.
drab (Pol.) = a soldier of the light or Cossack type infantry troops, see rota drabska.
dworzanin (Pol.) = a royal courtier
dworzanin hospodarski (Pol.) = a ducal courtier in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.
dwór (Pol.) = a manor or country house.
dym (Pol.) = ‘smoke’ = equals to one peasant house holding (cottage), consisting of one or more families living there. It gave a name to the podymne tax (see below).
dziakło (Pol.) = a compulsory loan in natural products; in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania after the “drag” reform of 1557 an average one was of 1 barrel of rye, 2 barrels of oat, and a of hay.
dzierżawca (Pol.) = in a way an equivalent of starost, although of larger meaning than tenutariusz (starost = captain). Usually occurring in the context of tenancy, thus e.g. a starost without administrative and judicial powers. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania this term was often similar with the starost enjoying full starostial authority.

F
folwark (Ger. vollwerk) = the so-called lord’s reserve; since the 15th century an equivalent of grounds administered by the lord in person within a framework of włość (a complex of villages) adjusted to the exportable agricultural production and based upon the compulsory corvée services; a farming system, comprising an agglomerate estate of several villages cultivating exportable agricultural produce.
fond (Ukr. and Rus.) = archival term, means collection, e.g. fond (F.) of the Potockis.
fortalicjum (Pol.) = a small “fortress”, a defense structure.

G

główssczynna (Pol.) = a fine paid in the event of the manslaughter as a compensation. Its amount differed depending both from the victim and perpetrator.
grod (Ruth.) or gród (Pol.) = a castle, later on also a castle and town being an official siege of judicial and administrative offices.
grosz (Pol.) = a monetary unit; e.g. 60 of Lithuanian groszs = 1 kopa, and 1 kopa of Lithuanian groszs = 75 of Polish groszs
grywna (Pol.) = a counting unit 1 grywna = 48 of groszs·, later on also a fine ordered by the court.

H

hajdamacy (Pol.) = the haydamaks, means mutinied peasants and Cossacks; the term used in the 18th century.
hakownica (Pol.) = a gun of large caliber; a harquebuse
herb (Pol.) =a coat of arm carried by all members of a ród (house or clan) sharing the common ancestor.
herb rodowy (Pol.) = a device carried by all members of a ród (house or clan), or the group of families sharing a common ancestor.
herb własny (Pol.) = an individual device without the name to be found in the traditional armorials as formed since the 14th century onwards. It was equally carried by all members of a ród (clan) or large group of families sharing a common ancestor. The only difference was that such a device had no particular name and was strictly connected to the family name of its bearers.
hetman (Pol.) = a commander-in-chief. The highest rank in the Commonwealth army. There four hetmans in active service, two for the Crown and two for Lithuania. The “older” in rank was hetman wielki [Grand], who had his deputy — hetman polny [Field]. They acted in such pairs both in the Crown and in Lithuania – hetman wieki koronny (of the Crown), hetman polny koronny and hetman wielki litewski (of Lithuania), hetman polny litewski.
horodnia (Ruth.; pl. horodnie) = a house-like edifice built of wood (less often of bricks) within the castle’s walls. Usually it was fortified and most often attached directly to the walls. The owners of horodnias were local noblemen, villagers and burgers. The villagers in the starosty were obliged to build one horodnia for each village. The main aim of these constructions was to store food and mobile property of local population, seeking refuge within the castle’s walls in case of emergency.
horodyszcze (Pol. pl. horodyszcza) = defence structures, usually earth ones of “fortress” type and of “ancient” origin, often located in wild depopulated areas like uroczyszcza (see below).
hospodar (Ruth.) = the Grand Duke; usually the Polish King was at the same time the Grand Duke of Lithuania, the term used by the Ruthenians for the Grand Duke.
husaria (Pol.) = a heavy cavalry; “po husarsku” – as serving in the heavy cavalry regiment.
husarz (Pol., pl. husarze) = a horseman in the heavy cavalry troops, distinguishing himself for the characteristic “wings” attached to the saddle, not to his armoury as is commonly thought.

I

instygator koronny (Pol.) = the Crown Investigator or Procurator, the highest judicial official of the Kingdom. His task was to persecute in the name of the king all the crimes against the state or the sovereign. He used to appear also in private cases, representing the court as a public procurator, but only when there was no judicial authority willing to issue the judgment in the given case.

intromisja or wwiązanie (Pol.) = an official introduction of the new owner to a landed property; official transfer of the ownership titles to the given property on a new owner.

ius caducum (Lat.) = an escheat

J

janczarka (Pol.) = a Turkish gun

K

kaduk (Pol.) = a confiscation or forfeiture usually of hereditary property as the result of a crime, especially against the king and the Commonwealth; escheat - ius caducum (Lat.). However, first of all kaduk was operating when the hereditary property became left without legal heir (the line enjoying the hereditary rights died out) and as “orphaned” went back to the royal domain. The king’s being in disposal of these properties was in right to endow with them whomever he wished.

Kamieniec Podolski (Pol.) = Kamenets’ Podil’s’kyi, the main castle and grod in Western Podolia, the most important starosty of the Crown Podolia.

kamień (Pol.) = ‘stone’ = a measure of weight; the Lithuanian ‘stone’ equaled 40 of the Lithuanian pounds, what made 1280 of łotys.

kasztel (Pol.) = a stronghold

kasztelan (Pol.) = castellan (Lat. castellanus)

Kijów (Pol.; Rus. Kiev) = Kyiv, see Kyivan, e.g. Kyivan Rus’

klucz (Pol.) = a complex of villages making a larger property unit, equal to włość in its later sense.

kniha (Ruth.) = a princess

kniąż (Pol., pl. kniaziowie; Ruth. knez’) = a prince

komornik graniczny (Pol.) = the boundary deputy sub-chamberlain

komornik ziemski (Pol.) = the district deputy sub-chamberlain

koniuszy koronny (Pol.) = Equerry of the Kingdom of Poland

konserwancy (Pol.) = the supernumerary sessions of the delayed or postponed proceedings bench in the Court Tribunal at Lublin for three voivodeships of Kyiv, Volynia and Bratslav.

kopa (Pol.) = a three-score (60) or a bushel = 36, 6 liters; 1 kopa of Lithuanian groszs = 2,5 of Polish Zlotys (the mid-16th century).

Korona (Pol.) = the Crown, a part encompassing the Polish Kingdom, especially referred to in contrast to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania after the Union of Lublin of 1569.

krążyc koronny (Pol.) = the Crown Carver

królewsczyzna (Pol.) = the tenancy of the crown/royal demesne estate.
Krzemieniec (Pol.) = Kremenets the castle and town in Volhynia, after 1564 the Powiat centre.

księga dekretowa (Pol.) = the book of decrees. The chanceries of the courts for nobility, both castle and territorial ones, kept two series of registers (or two sets of entries). This was a series of records for the cases heard and the verdicts issued.

księga potoczno-wpisowa (Pol.) = the general book of records. This one contained entries of statements and testimonials, protests and complaints, summonses and writs, oral statements, and documents submitted to the court by parties.

księgi podkomorskie (Pol.) = the sub-chamberlain’s records = registers of the sub-chamberlain’s court operating in a given voivodeship and dealing with the cases regarding property issues (ownership rights) and border delimitations.

kuna (Pol.) = a marten

Latyczów (Pol.) = Latychov, a castle and district town in Western/ Crown Podolia, the centre of Powiat.

laudum (Lat.) = a resolution issued by the local dietie in public matters, usually being the petition to be passed by the given powiat for the Sejm (Diet) in order to get its approval.

Ławra Peczerska (Pol.) = the Pecherska Lavra, Orthodox Monastery at Kyiv.

łowczy (Pol.) = master of the hunt (Lat. venator)

Łuck (Pol.) = Lutsk the castle and town in Volhynia, after 1564 the Powiat centre.

lustracja (Pol.) = a survey, survey register.

Lwów (Pol.) = L’viv (Ukr.; Rus. Lvov)

magistrat (Pol.; magistracki) = a municipality; municipal

marszałek hospodarski (Pol.) = the Duval (Court) Marshal of Lithuania

Metryka Koronna (Pol.) = the Crown Metrica

Metryka Litewska (Pol.) = the Lithuanian Metrica

Metryka Wołyńska (Pol.) = the Volhynian Metrica = the Ruthenian Metrica

miecznik (Pol.) = sword-bearer (Lat. ensifer or gladifer)

myto (Pol.) = a toll collection.

nagana czci (Pol.) = a legal act performed after somebody’s crime or wrong condition had been proved in the court, requiring as its consequence the reproofing of one’s good fame.

namiestnictwo bracławskie (Pol.) = Bratslav governorship under the Russians; official name of the province and administrative unit created in 1793.

nawiązka (Pol.) = ‘blood or head money’

obrona potoczna (Pol.) = the ambient defence structure, operating in the border areas of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in order to defend them against the
Tartars. It consisted mainly of mercenary cavalry units of the Crown Army acting in the defence structure of the Lithuanian forces supported by the local levy if necessary, see: 

**zastawa litewska and zastawa wołska.**

**osada** (Pol.) = a payment for exclusion form pańszczyzna (Pol.) = the corvée or socage, in the Grand Duchy after the “drag” reform of 1557 in the amount of 30 of groszs.

**ostróg** (Pol.) = a palisade

**otchizna** (Ruth., pl. otchizny; here also materizny [motherlands], didizny [grandfather lands]) = the so-called “fatherlands”, landed properties enjoying hereditary rights; among them were also the lands acquired through sales contracts (Ruth. kupli zemli), which however followed a bit different, more restricted regulations when it came to inheritance issue.

**P**

pametne (Ruth.) – ‘memorable’ = a due or fee to be paid to the court magistrate in order the case could be judged without delay.

**pan** (Pol., Ruth.) = lord or landlord, a member of the lords group within the nobility.

**pańszczyzna** (Pol.) = corvée or socage. The corvée in the case of Ruthenian lands is referred to in the source material as služba tiašla (Ruth.) or služba ciagia (Pol.).

**peresudy** (Ruth.) = different judicial dues and fees paid due to the court proceedings.

**pisarz** (Pol.) = notary

**pisarz dekretowy** (Pol.) = the ‘decree’ notary in the Crown Chancery.

**pisarz grodzki** (Pol.) = the castle court notary (Lat. notarius castrensis)

**pisarz ziemski** (Pol.) = the territorial court notary (Lat. notarius terrestris).

Pobereże (Pol.) - ‘Riverside’ = Poberezhe, Eastern part of Podolia.

Pobože (Pol.) – ‘the Boh area’ = Pobozhe, Eastern Podolia.

**pobór** (Pol.) = a conscription tax

**podczaszy** (Pol.) = cup-bearer (Lat. pocillator)

**poddani ciagli** (Pol.) = villein subjects, the ones obliged to perform their corvée service with their horses or oxes.

**podkomorzy** (Pol.) = sub-chamberlain (Lat. subcamerarius)

Podlase (Pol.) = the northeastern part of the Crown, the Voivodeship of Podlachia.

Podnesterze (Pol.; Ukr. Podnistrove) – ‘the Dnipro area’ = Podnestrove, Western Podolia.

Podole (Pol.; Ukr. Pidillia) = Podolia

**podpisek** (Pol.) = deputy notary (Lat. subnotarius)

**podpisek grodzki** (Pol.) = the castle court deputy notary (Lat. subnotarius castrensis)

**podpisek ziemski** (Pol.) = the territorial court deputy notary (Lat. subnotarius terrestris)

**podśędek** (Pol.) = deputy judge (Lat. subiudex)

**podśędek grodzki** (Pol.) = the castle court deputy judge (Lat. subiudex castrensis)

**podśędek ziemski** (Pol.) = the territorial court deputy judge (Lat. subiudex terrestris)
podkarbi (Pol.) = Land treasurer or the Grand Duchy/Crown treasurer – podkarbi litewski/ podkarbi koronny.
podstarości (Pol.) = deputy starost (Lat. vicecapitaneus)
podstarości prowintowy (Pol.) = deputy starost for provisions, the office in existence e.g. at Vinnytsia.
podstoli (Pol.) = deputy esquire-carver (Lat. subdapifer)
podymne (Pol.) = the “chimney” or “hearthside” tax and tax-registers.
podwojewodzi (Pol.) = the deputy voivode (Lat. vicepalatinus)
pomiara włóczna (Pol.) = the reform initiated by Queen Bona in 1540’s and continued by her son Sigismund Augustus in 1560’s was officially introduced in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1557.
pop (Rus.) = a priest in the Orthodox Church.
popis (Pol.) = the military revue and the register drown up in order to chuck up and fix the number of landlords and their retinues in accordance with their military obligations.
potasz (Pol.) = a potash
Powiat (Pol.) = a territorial and administrative unit emerged from the former castle volost’, usually encompassing the same territory as the latter, but sometimes larger one with the given castle as its administrative center. Officially as an administrative unit introduced in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1564.
Powiat District = the former volost’, Pol. powiat territorial and administrative unit. Notice, a district (Pol. Powiat) was not always equal with the former volost’. In the registers the Latin term districtus used to be referred to a volost’ for the period prior to 1394 (the end of the Koriatovychs rule in Podolia) and exchangeable as volost’ – the castle area or powiat in the period from 1394 to 1430 (Vitold’s rule in Podolia).
powietnik (Pol.) = the landlord belonging to the given Powiat, e.g. the Powiat of Lutsk – powietnik lucki and performing from this Powiat his military service.
pozew (Pol.) = a summons, writ.
"po zmarlej rece" (Pol.) = ‘after the dead hand’ = a mort-main
przysiółek (Pol.) = a sub-settlement
publikacja (Pol.) = an announcement of outlawry following the banishment penalty, which meant the person was outlawed in the whole territory of the Commonwealth; see banicja (banishment).
putny (Ruth., pl. putni) – a ‘road’ one = a category of boyar (= servant) obliged to perform fixed services on behalf of the Grand Duke and his representatives, mainly respective starosts. In the case of putny boyar apart from the military service (abolished in 1529, when this category of boyars became equalized to villein peasants), it was mainly carrying of royal/ducal, starostial letters and messages.

R

roki sądowe (Pol.) = periodical sessions of the courts (both castle and territorial ones) held in fixed period of the year
rota (Pol.) = a military unit, both in the cavalry and infantry, consisting of 50-250 soldiers.
rota drabska (Pol.) = an infantry unit of usually 50 men, see rota piesza.
rota piesza (Pol.) = an infantry unit of e.g. 50 drabs
rota strzelecza (Pol.) = a unit of riflemen
rotmistrz (Pol.) = a captain, both of infantry and cavalry troops.
rotmistrz królewski (Pol.) = a royal captain
rotmistrz pancerny (Pol.) = a captain of the light horse
ród (Pol.) = a clan, kin, house. A family group descending form a common ancestor or persuaded to have a common one, and having the same coat of arms.
ruch egzekucyjny (Pol.) – ‘executive movement’ = the Polish gentry and nobility action in the late 1550’s and 1560’s which aim was to curtail magnate power by the enforcement of the existing laws.
Ruś Czerwona (Pol.) = Red Rus’, the province in the Crown bordering on the Crown Podolia.
Rzeczpospolita (Pol.) = Commonwealth or Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów (Pol.) – commonwealth ‘of two nations’ = the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the name in use after the Union of Lublin of 1569.

S
sandżakbej (Pol.; in the sources also as „sędziak”) = Sandhak bey, the Ottoman official, governor of the district.
sąd grodzki (Pol.) = the castle court
sąd podkomorski (Pol.) = the sub-chamberlain’s court
sąd ziemski (Pol.) = the territorial (or district) court for the nobility. Usually it operated in a given voivodeship and worked within a framework of periodical sessions, separate for each of its powiats. It had judicial powers over the gentry and nobility of that particular voivodeship.
Sejm (Pol.) = Parliament/Diet; the lower house of the Polish Parliament and Parliament (Diet) as referred to in general. The Polish Sejm consisted of the lower house (izba poselska) and of the upper house (senat).
sejmik (Pol.) = a dietie; the regional assembly of nobility of a given voivodeship, usually preceding the Sejm. It was held in a fixed chief town of powiat of the given voivodeship, e.g. in the Bratslav Voivodeship deities were held at Vinnytsia, in the Jesuit Church.
sędzia (Pol.) = judge (Lat. iudex)
sędzia grodzki (Pol.) = the castle court judge (Lat. iudex castrensis)
sędzia ziemski. (Pol.) = the territorial court judge (Lat. iudex terrestris)
siarniostwo (Pol.) = the family commonly administering its all estates, what might be explained by its nomadic roots.
Sić (Pol.) = the Cossack authorities abode; an island on the Dnipro River.
sielszczyzna (Ruth.) = a settlement, e.g. stare sieliszcze = the old settlement.
sień (Pol.) = a vestibule or antechamber
siolo (Ruth.) = a village
skarbnik (Pol.) = treasurer (Lat. thesaurarius)
służba tiahla (Ruth.) = the corvée or soccage in terms of obligations resulting from it.
słoboda (Pol. transliteration) = (Ruth. sl’oboda, Pol. wolnizna) – ‘freedom’. Type of settlement in which new settlers were granted for a given period with a series of exemptions and “freedoms” (franchises). Usually these exemptions periods lasted between 10-15 years, but in the Ukraine, especially in Eastern Podolia they might have last up to 35 years.
slużba ciągła (Pol.) = the corvée or soccage in terms of obligations resulting from it.

stacja (Pol.) = the maintenance and house offered to the troops by the local gentry in their properties in accordance with the general military regulations, or the same taken by the passing troops forcibly.

starina (Ruth.) = the "oldness"; a term referred usually to old customs and laws.

starosta (Pol.) = starost/captain (Lat. capitaneus)
starosta grodowy or grodżki (Pol.) = the castle starost (Lat. capitaneus castrensis or cum iurisdictione), thus the one having not only administrative responsibility (tenutarisz), but also being a head of the castle court.

starostwo (Pol.) = a starosty (Lat. capitaneatus)
starostwo grodowe (Pol.) = the starosty, in which operated the castle court subordinated to the starost (Lat. cum iurisdictione)

starostwo niegrodowe (Pol.) = a starosty administered of king's appointment by a person (tenutarisz - tenuta = a tenancy), which apart from the administrative duties had no public and jurisdictional powers (Lat. sine iurisdictione)

starszy (Pol.) = 'older' = a senior officer or commander in the Cossack Zaporozhian forces.

Statut Litewski (Pol.; pl. Statuty Litewskie) = the Lithuanian Statute (in its three versions of 1529, 1566 and 1588 = I Lithuanian Statute of 1529, II LS of 1566, and III LS of 1588). A main legislative code of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, after the union of 1569 of Lithuanian and Ruthenian voivodeships of the Commonwealth, e.g. of the Bratslav Voivodeship.

stolnik (Pol.) = esquire-carver (Lat. dapifer)
strażnik polny (Pol.) = the Guardian of the Field (Lat.)
sumariusz (Pol.) = a digest or collection of documents, usually regarding ownership issues and collected for the judicial purposes.
surrogator (Pol.) = a substitute appointed to act on behalf of the starost during his absence in the starosty, e.g. Alexander Piaseczynski on behalf of Alexander Bałaban in the Bratslav Starosty in 1620/21.

swiaszczennik (Ruth.) = an Orthodox priest

szlachta (Pol.) = the nobility and gentry together regarded as the one state (including as well the magnate group), enjoying the same political rights despite huge property differences.

szlachta gniazdowa (Pol.) = 'nested gentry' = the gentry belonging to the same house (ród) being for a long period in possession of its oldest endowments in the given area = gniazdo (= the nest), and organizing its economic life around them. Due to this long lasting connection this gentry developed as well a common clan identity of symbolic meaning.

szlachta okoliczna (Pol.) = the so-called neighbourhood gentry (= lesser gentry) of the Zhytomir area in the Kyiv Voivodeship.

szlachta zagrodowa (Pol.) = a petty gentry.
szyngownica (Pol.) = a catapulting device

tenuta (Pol.) = a leased royal property, a starosty.
t'ma or tuman (Tur.) = the Mongol/Tartar district, as e.g. in Podolia in the 13th century; created for the taxation purposes, it was to originate from tume or
tumen what meant a military unit of 10,000. Thus, t’ma it was an area being used by a given tuman (military unit).
towarzyst (Pol.) - ‘comrade’ = a horseman in the cavalry detachment, e.g. of the so-called ambivalent defence cavalry troops.
Trybunál Koronny w Lublinie (Pol.) = the Crown Tribunal at Lublin; the highest court of appeal for all voivodeships of the Commonwealth founded in 1578.

U
uchod (Pol.) = the mouths of a river
ugoda „przez przyjaciół” (Pol.) = a friendly/ arbitrary agreement; an out-of-court settlement usually regarding such matters as estate ownership rights, its boundaries or subjects abscondage.
uroczyszcze (Pol., pl. uroczyszcza) = a wilderness or meadow, usually a large plot of uncultivated land in the midst of densely afforested area.

V
volost’ (Ruth.; Pol. wołość) = a castle district which often evaluated into a powiat. See above the powiat.
Wołyn (Ruth.; Pol. Wołyń) = Volynia

W
Western Podolia = the Crown Podolia
Winnica (Pol.) = Vinnytsia
Włodzimierz (Pol.) = Volodymir, the castle and town in Volynia, after 1564 the Powiat centre.
wołość (Pol.) = a complex of villages making a larger property unit.
włóka (Pol.) - ‘drag’ = a local measure of the area (generally 1 drag = 16,8 ha).
wojewoda (Pol.) = voivode (Lat. palatinus)
województwo (Pol.) = voivodeship or palatinate (Lat. palatinatus)
wojski (Pol.) = military curator (Lat. tribunus)
wojski mniejszy (Pol.) = the minor military curator (Lat. tribunus minor)
wojski większy (Pol.) = the greater military curator (Lat. tribunus maior)
Wółyń (Pol.; Ruth. Volyn) = Volynia
woźny (Pol.) = the court beadle, an official of low rank. His responsibility was first of all delivering of summonses and of other judicial acts to the parties involved in the procedure and to conduct or witness formal judicial acts taking place out of court, like e.g. establishments of property ownership or autopsies of copses and of wounded victims of violent acts.
woźny general (Pol.) = the [court] beadle-general, in this case for the Voivodeships of Kyiv, Bratslav, and Volynia
wójt (Pol.) = a bailiff
wysługi (Pol.; Ruth. vysluhi) = the landed properties restricted to temporal ownership, usually endowed by the Grand Duke as a reward for services and with the condition of performing service, mainly a military one.
wzdanie (Pol.) = a legal term of different meaning: 1) an official transfer of property rights (both in case of landed property and movable assets) ordered by the court; 2) charging with a case; 3) an official sentence. Of which the first meaning is to be referred to in the text.
Zadnieprze (Pol.) – ‘Beyond Dnipro’ = referred to the territory on the left bank of the Dnipro River.

zapis wlewkowy (Pol.) = a legal term meaning an official cession of legal rights to a property in the form of a written act, usually introduced to the court registers book.

Zaporozje (Pol.) – ‘beyond the rapids’ = Zaporozhe, the territory on the Left Bank of Dnipro, the Cossack domain; the name comes from poroh (Ruth.) = a rapid.

zaręka (Pol.) = a sum of the deposit, required most often in the property transactions.

zasadżca (Pol.) = a promoter or chief organizer; colonist, settlement(s) organizer. Usually it as a “technician” hired by the lord on the basis of a written contract in order to locate a settlement, in exchange of which he often became its first hereditary bailiff.

ziemianka (Pol.) = a landlady

ziemianin (Pol.) = a landlord

ziemianin hospodarski bracławski (Pol.) = the royal/ducal landlord of Bratslav.

starszy ziemianin (Pol.; Ruth. starshyi) = senior landowner; the source material of the 16th century from the Bratslav territory referred this way to the “nested gentry”, thus usually lords, in contrast to “lesser landlord” (Pol. podlejszy ziemianin; Ruth. podleishyi) means lesser gentry. In Volhynia the same differentiation has been indicated by starszy (Ruth. starshyi = senior) and mniejszy (Ruth. menshyi = minor), while in the Kyiv area respectively by ważniejszy (Ruth. prelozhneishyi) means and równiejszy (Ruth. rovneishyi) means equal.

Zloty or Wołoski Szlak (Pol.) = the so-called Golden or Wallachian Tartar Trail.

Zwino^od (Pol.; Rus. Zvynyhorod) = Zvinogrod, a castle and town in Eastern Podolia, later on the powiat.

Żytomierz (Pol.) = Zhytomir
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APPENDIX 1a:

The SŁUPICA alias SŁUPICZ Family of Individual Arms
(From the 14th to the 17th Century)

I. PAWEŁ [I/1]

II. IVAN [II/1]
TYCHON [II/2]

III. STEĆKO [III/1]
ŻDAN [III/2] = ? [IV/3]
BOHUSZ [III/3] ∞ Unknown

IV. BOHDAN Iwanowicz [IV/1] ∞ Zofia Olechnówna Mikulińska, who 2.v. with Jermolaj Meleszko
ADAM [IV/2]

HREHORY BOHUSZEWICZ called ŻDAN [IV/3] ∞ Unknown
ŻDANNA BOHUSZEWICZÓWNA [IV/4] ∞ Roman Iwanowicz Krasnosieński
V.

SEMEN BOHDANOWICZ [V/1] ∞ Owdotia alais Eudoksja Juchnówna Krasnośieńska

MARUSZA BOHDANÓWNA [V/2] ∞ Ivan Łysohorski

HREHORY HREHOROWICZ alias ŽDANOWICZ [V/3]

MIKOŁAJ alias MIŚKO HREHOROWICZ [V/4]

DIMITR HREHOROWICZ [V/5] ∞ Unknown

JURIJ HRYHOROWICZ alias ŽDANOWICZ [V/6] ∞ Marusza Mikołajewna Diakowska, who 2. v. with Ivan DZIUSZA alias DŽUSA

VI.

HALSZKA alias HELENA SEMENÓWNA [VI/1] ∞ Vasil [Dmitrowicz?] Rohoziński, 2.v. Anna Krasnośieńska of Krzyków, who 1.v. with Jakub Ławrynnowicz Piaseczyński

MATIASZ alias MIKOŁAJ SEMENOWICZ [VI/2]

TYCHON SEMENOWICZ [VI/3] ∝ (?) Marusza alias Marianna Michajłówna Krasnośieńska


FEDORA DMITRIEWNA [VI/5] ∞ Alexander Kruszelnicki
APPENDIX 1b:

The SŁUPICA alias SŁUPICZ Family of Individual Arms
(From the 14th to the 17th Century)

I.

PAWEL
[I/1] (1391-94)
(d. after 1394)

II.

IVAN [II/1] (ca. 1411-30)
TYCHON [II/2] (1431-46)

III.

STECKO [III/1] (1509)
ZDAN [III/2] = ? [IV/3] (1533)
(d. 23 March 1541 in Bratslav drowned in the Boh River)
∞ UNKNOWN

Children: HREHORY Bohuszewicz called Zdan; ŻDANNA Bohuszewiczówna.
IV.

BOHDAN IWANOWICZ [IV/1] (1551)
(d. soon after the capture of Bratslav by the Crimean Tartars in September 1551 or 1552?)
∞ ZOFIA Olechnówna MIKULIŃSKA of individual arms, 2.v. (after 1552) Jermolaj MELESZKO of the Korczak arms
(d. 1570)

Children: SEMEN Bohdanowicz; MARUSZA Bohdanówna.

ADAM [IV/2]
(d. before May 1556)

HREHORY BOHUSZEWICZ called ŽDAN [IV/3] (1556-96)
(d. before 8 December 1596)
∞ UNKNOWN

Children: HREHORY Hrehorowicz called Ždanowicz, JURIJ alias JERZY Hrehorowicz called Ždanowicz, MIKOŁAJ
alias MIŚKO Hryhorowicz, DIMITR Hryhorowicz.

ŽDANNA BOHUSZEWICZÓWNA [IV/4] (ca. 1556)
(d. after 1556)
∞ (before 30 May 1556) Roman Iwanowicz KRAȘNOSIEŁSKI of the Prus I arms

Children: IVAN Romanowicz, BOHDANA Romanowiczówna

V.

SEMEN BOHDANOWICZ [V/1]
(born ca. 1546 – d. before 8 December 1596)
∞ OWDOTIA alias EUDOKSJA Juchnówna KRASNOSIELSKA of the Prus I arms (d. ca. 1617)

Children: HALSZKA alias HELENA Semenówna; MATIASZ alias MIKOŁAJ Semenowicz; TYCHON Semenowicz.

MARUSZA BOHDANÓWNA [V/2]
(d. before 1615?)
∞ IVAN ŁYSOHORSKI of individual arms

Children: FEDOR Iwanowicz; JERMOŁAJ alias HERMOLAUS Iwanowicz.

HREHORY HREHOROWICZ alias ŻDANOWICZ [V/3]
(d. before 17 June 1599)
Childless

MIKOŁAJ alias MIŚKO HREHOROWICZ [V/4]
∞ UNKNOWN

Children: MARUSZA alias MARUSIA Mikołajewna.

DIMITR HREHOROWICZ [V/5]
∞ UNKNOWN

Children: FEDORA Dmitriewna.

JURIJ HRYHOROWICZ alias ŻDANOWICZ [V/6]
(d. after 1607?)

∞ MARUSZA Mikołajewna DIAKOWSKA of the individual arms, 2.v. (before 23 April 1610) Ivan DZIUSZA (DŻUSA) of the Kierdeja arms
VI.

HALSZKA alias HELENA SEMENÓWNA [VI/1]
(born before 1595 – d. after 1638, before February 1639)
∞ (ca. 1613) Vasil [Dimitowicz?] ROHOZIŃSKI of the Leliwa arms
(d. between 10 March and 15 June 1647)
2.v. ∞ (before 28 February 1639) Anna KRASNOSIELSKA of Krzyków, who l.v. Jakub Ławrynowicz PIASECZYŃSKI

Children: MATWIEJ alias MACIEJ alias MATIASZ (childless, b. before 1622 - d. after 1664); ADRIAN (b. before 1622 - d. on 2 June 1652 in the battle of Batoh) ∞ (before 29 March 1647) Eufrozyna Piasecka (in some sources as childless, but daughters: Prudencjanna alias Pudencjanna married to Marcin Krzétowski and Zuzanna married to Jan Glinka Wolski); MIKOŁAJ (childless, b. before 1622 - d. on 2 June 1652 in the battle of Batoh); ALEXANDER (childless, d. on 2 June 1652 in the Battle of Batoh); Szymon (childless, d. on 2 June 1652 in the Battle of Batoh); WAWRZYNIEC (childless, d. on 2 June 1652 in the Battle of Batoh); KONSTANTY alias CONSTANTINE (childless, d. on 2 June 1652 in the Battle of Batoh).

MATIASZ alias MIKOŁAJ SEMENOWICZ [VI/2]
(d. ca. 1606 in Hungary in the course of military campaign)
Childless

TYCHON SEMENOWICZ [VI/3]
(born before 1596 – d. killed in Kuna during the foray on 22-23 January 1615)
∞ (?) Marusza alias Marianna Michajłówna KRASNOSIELSKA of the Prus I arms
Childless

MARUSZA alias MARUSIA alias MARIANNA MIKOŁAJEWNA [VI/4]
Children: Unidentified from the second marriage to Birkowski.

FEDORA DMITRIEWNA [VI/5]
(d. after 1637)
∞ (between October 1610 and 23 April 1613) Alexander KRUSZELNICKI of the Sas arms
(d. 1634)

Children: ANDRZEJ <ANDRIEJ> ∞ (before 6 June 1636) Zofia (childless); AUGUSTYN (childless); STANISŁAW ∞ Marianna alias Anna PASŁAWSKA; JAN (childless), FRANCISZEK (childless); ALEXANDER (d. before 4 April 1665), WAWRZYNIEC <ŁAWRENTIJ> (childless); LUDWIK (born 1632, childless); HELENA; MARYA; MAGDALENA.

JEREMIJ alias JEREMIASZ JURIEWICZ [VI/6]
(d. 1618, killed in Nosowce during the foray)

Unmarried and Childless

Patronymics (examples):
- TYCHON Semenowicz = Tychon, son of Semen
- HALSZKA Semenówna = Halszka, daughter of Semen
APPENDIX 2

Hierarchy of Magistracies in the Bratslav Voivodeship
(Bratslav, Vinnytsia, Zvinogrod)

The Polish administrative structure and hierarchy of magistrates was formally introduced into the Bratslav territory as a result of the Union of Lublin of 1569, but the process had already started in 1566, when the Voivodeship of Bratslav was founded. Prior to 1569, beginning from the late 14th century in the whole of Podolia we may observe step-by-step implementation of particular magistracies and crystallization of local hierarchy modeled after the one that King Casimir the Great had introduced in Red Rus’ in 1351.

It was not until 1611 that the Diet passed a law making the established hierarchy of magistracies, which became applicable in the voivodeship of Bratslav as well. Accordingly, the castle starost took the fourth place in the voivodeship hierarchy, after voivode, castellan and sub-chamberlain. The general trend was towards a stricter adherence to the order of seniority and promotions within the castle (grod) hierarchy, while more liberal interpretations were allowed in the district (ziemska) hierarchy. In the Bratslav Voivodeship were originally two Powiats (districts) that of Bratslav and of Vinnytsia. The Vinnytsia territorial hierarchy emerged not earlier than the second half of the 16th century with a few magistracies only, to get full shape in the late 17th century.

The office of wojski separate for Bratslav and Vinnytsia was created by Sigismund August in 1567. In 1569 in Lublin the king promised to create the office of chorąży for Bratslav Voivodeship, but the first appointee is known from 1574. In 1578 the Diet agreed to apply to Kyiv, Podlachia, Bratslav and Volhynia voivodeships the offices of podczaszy, stolnik, podstoli, and of cześnik. Finally, in 1589 it allowed in the Bratslav and Volhynia Voivodeships the same with the Crown cursus honorum: podkomorzy, chorąży, sędzia, stolnik, podczaszy, łowczy, podsędek, cześnik, miecznik, skarbnik, and wojski.
In 1765 the wojski mniejszy (minor military curator’s) office was added to the list, which was honorable title. In the 18th century the list of Vinnytsia district (Powiat) offices was enlarged (standard-bearer, esquire-carver, cup-bearer, steward, junior cup-bearer, master of the hunt, senior military curator, junior military curator, treasurer).

When a separate Powiat of Zvinogrod was established in 1736 a decision was made to create new district (ziemskie) magistracies by forming an independent Zvinogrod hierarchy, with the following order: chorąży, stolnik, podczaszy, podstoli, cześnik, łowczy, wojski with a later division into senior and junior military curator, miecznik, and skarbnik.

A. Territorial (district, Pol. powiat, Lat. districtus) Hierarchy (Pol. ziemska):

voivode (Pol. wojewoda, Lat. palatinus) *
castellan (Pol. kasztelan, Lat. castellanus)
sub-chamberlain (Pol. podkomorzy, Lat. subcamerarius) **
starost cum jurisdictione or castri (Pol. starosta grodzki, Lat. capitaneus castrensis) ***
standard-bearer (Pol. chorąży, Lat. vexillifer),
judge of the terrestrial court for nobility (Pol. sędzia ziemski, Lat. iudex terrestrial)
esquire-carver (Pol. stolnik, Lat. dapifer)
cup-bearer (Pol. podczaszy, Lat. pocillator)
deputy judge of the terrestrial court for the nobility (Pol. podszedek ziemski, Lat. subiudex terrestrial)
deputy esquire-carver (Pol. podstoli, Lat. subdapifer)
deputy cup-bearer (Pol. cześnik, Lat. pincerna)
master of the hunt (Pol. łowczy, Lat. venator)
military curator (Pol. wojski, Lat. tribunus)
minor military curator (wojski mniejszy, Lat. tribunus minor)
notary of the terrestrial court for the nobility (Pol. *pisarz ziemski*, Lat. *notarius terrestris*)
sword-bearer (*miecznik*, Lat. *ensifer* or *gladifer*).
treasurer (Pol. *skarbnik*, Lat. *thesaurarius*)

* In the Bratslav Voivodeship as of 1610’s one may notice the office of deputy Voivode (Pol. *podwojewodzi*, Lat. *vicepalatinus*), which in the opinion of many scholars dealing with the issue of magistracies was reserved strictly to Prussia and Lithuanian voivodeships, where (with exception of Samogitia) there were no starosts. The deputy Voivode was there a substitute of starost and represented him in legal proceedings. Here, he was rather the voivode’s magistrate having different duties like supervision of standard weights and measures and of prices of goods, or jurisdiction over Jews and Christians living in the royal castles. See for example Stefan Dziusza.

** Sub-chamberlain has also his deputy to perform part of his duties, especially during his absence and in the sub-chamberlain’s court, which dealt with the cases pertaining to land ownership rights, estates boundaries etc. This was the deputy sub-chamberlain (Pol. *komornik ziemski*). See for example Hrehory Ždan Slupica.

*** There existed also starosties regarded as tenencies, without, therefore, administrative and judicial powers.

A.1. Territorial Court Magistracies:

judge of the terrestrial court for nobility (Pol. *sędzia ziemski*, Lat. *iudex terrestris*) or
deputy judge of the terrestrial court for the nobility (Pol. *podszędek ziemski*, Lat. *subiudex terrestris*)
notary of the terrestrial court for the nobility (Pol. *pisarz ziemski*, Lat. *notarius terrestris*) or
deputy notary of the terrestrial court for the nobility (Pol. *podpisek ziemski*, Lat. *subnotarius terrestris*)
court beadle (Pol. *woźny*)

There was only one starosty in the Bratslav territory with the right of jurisdiction (Pol. starostwo grodowe, Lat. cum iurisdictione). There was a castle court, along with its judicial and administrative staff, attached to the starosty in Bratslav, to deal with cases involving the nobility and gentry. In 1598 due to the external danger, usually from the Tartars and Cossacks, influencing heavily the regularity of its proceedings, the court was transferred to Vinnytsia.

The terminology and differentiation between the powers of a plenipotentiary starost and of a starost/captain (Pol. starosta, Lat. capitaneus) is a separate question. One has to point as well to the simultaneous usage of the term starosta and namiestnik. The latter has been used in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In fact namiestnik had the same meaning, i.e. the starost, being in the Lithuanian lands an equivalent of starost in the Polish Crown. The plenipotentiary starost office in Vinnytsia was usually held by the starost of Bratslav himself, who quite often placed there his appointee to act on his behalf. The starost in his absence might have also appointed a substitute (Pol. surrogator) to act on his behalf in the starosty. The term dzierzawca as an equivalent of starost usually occurred in the context of tenancy, meaning a starosty without administrative and judicial powers. However, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania it was similar to the starost enjoying full starostial authority.

B.1. Castle Court Magistracies:

starost cum iurisdictione or castri (Pol. starosta grodzki, Lat. capitaneus castrensis)
or in his absence deputy starost (Pol. podstarości, Lat. vice-capitaneus)
judge of the castle court for the nobility (Pol. sędzia grodzki, Lat. iudex castrensis) or
deputy judge of the castle court for the nobility (Pol. podsędek grodzki, Lat. subiudex castrensis)
notary of the castle court for the nobility (Pol. pisarz grodzki, Lat. notarius castrensis) or
deputy notary of the castle court for the nobility (Pol. podpisek grodzki, Lat. subnotarius castrensis)
court beadle (Pol. woźny)
Also a separate magistrate called investigator (Pol. instigator) was subordinated
to the castle justice. His responsibility was to prosecute the suspects, keep an
eye on them and bring them in front of the court for the proceedings.

Apart from the bibliography see also Góralski, Zbigniew. 1983. Urzędy i
godności w dawnej Polsce (Magistracies and Dignitaries of the Bygone
Poland). Warsaw: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza. Here also selected
bibliography on the subject.
APPENDIX 3:

1. The Influx and Afflux of the Subjects (Peasants) in the Kuna Estate
(The End of the 16th Century – the First Half of the 17th Century)*

Note:
1590 – “free settlement” at Kuna; 1605 – foundation of the town at Kuna with 35 years of exemption

*Blue indicates the immediate vicinity of the Kuna estate, green the territory of Bratslav Voivodeship, yellow the Crown Podolia, red the Volhynia. The Sluoica family estates: KUNA (KUNA STARA and NOWA), NOSOWCE, ZIATKOWCE (a part).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plaintiff</th>
<th>Defendant</th>
<th>Place of Departure</th>
<th>Place of Arrival</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Fedor Szandyrowski</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko and the Słupicas, children of Semen</td>
<td>Trościanice (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz., 1896 21: 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598</td>
<td>Ivan Curkowski</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko and the Słupicas, children of Semen</td>
<td>Demidowce (the western part of Bratslav Voivodeship)</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz., 1896 21: 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>Stanisław Podczaski</td>
<td>the Słupicas, children of Semen</td>
<td>Jabłonówka (the Crown Podolia, the Powiat of Kamenets')</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz. 1896 21: 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>Andriej Pilawski</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko and Eudokia née Krasnosierska, widow of Semen Słupica and children</td>
<td>Nizne Piławce alias Pilawce (the Crown Podolia, the Powiat of Latyczów)</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/88, XXIX/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1603-15]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604/06</td>
<td>Wojciech Humiecki</td>
<td>Eudokia née Krasnosierska, widow of Semen Słupica</td>
<td>Tarnawa (the Crown Podolia)</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>DIALO: F. 773, op. 1, spr. 41, no. 343, f. 13-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>Łukasz Choroszko Szelechowski</td>
<td>the Słupicas, children of Semen</td>
<td>Daszkovec (Volhynia, the Powiat of Kremenets')</td>
<td>Kuna (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz., 1896 21: 513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko</td>
<td>Halszka Semenówna Słupiczanka, [soon wife of Vasil Rohoziński]</td>
<td>Omelynce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Nosowce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz., 1896 21: 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Jan Odrzywolski</td>
<td>Halszka Semenówna Rohozińska and Halska of Rohoźno, widow of Jermolaj Meleszko</td>
<td>Hajsyn (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Ziatkowce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Selians'kiy rukh, 1993: 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618</td>
<td>Fedora Dmitriewna and Alexander the Kruszelnickis</td>
<td>Princes Zbaraski</td>
<td>Nosowce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Borszadz (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>AYZR, VII/2: 403,404; ZDz., 1894 20: 108; ZDz. 1896 21: 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622</td>
<td>Fedora Dmitriewna Kruszelnicka</td>
<td>Ławrenty (Wawrzyniec) Kruszelnicki</td>
<td>Nosowce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Kozuchowce part of Kublcz (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>ZDz., 1896 21: 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1644</td>
<td>the Rohoziński brothers</td>
<td>Jerzy Kleszczewski</td>
<td>Kuna Stara and Kuna Nowa (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Mielukowce (the Powiat of Vinnytsia)</td>
<td>Selians'kiy rukh, 1993: 476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The Influx and Afflux of the Subjects (Peasants) in the Meleszkos' Estate
(The End of the 16th Century – the First Half of the 17th Century)*

* All places in the Powiat of Vinnytsia; the Meleszko family estates: ŁUKA, OMETYŃCE, ZIATKOWCE, ŻERDENÓWKA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plaintiff</th>
<th>Defendant</th>
<th>Place of Departure</th>
<th>Place of Arrival</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Vasil Hulewicz</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko and his mother Zofia née Mikulińska</td>
<td>Sutyski</td>
<td>Łuka</td>
<td>ZDż., 1896 21: 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>one Celużyński</td>
<td>Ivan Meleszko</td>
<td>Karpowce [Karpów?]</td>
<td>Żerdenówka</td>
<td>ZDż., 1896 21: 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Jan Odrzywolski</td>
<td>Halszka Semenówna Rohozińska and Halszka of Jermołaj Meleszko</td>
<td>Hajsyn</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Selians'ky rukh, 1993: 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1629</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Humań</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1630</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Kublicz</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Romanówka</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Muszurów</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ometyńce</td>
<td>Metynowa</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Baban</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Stara Hodorecka</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Nowa Hodorecka</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Mikołaj Iwanowicz Meleszko</td>
<td>Adam Kalinowski</td>
<td>Ziatkowce</td>
<td>Makarówka</td>
<td>CDIAUK: F. 256, op. 1, spr. 107, f. 4.v.-5v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4:

LIST OF MAPS AND MAPS

Fig. 1a: UKRAINE - a general map of three Voivodeships, of Kyiv, Podolia and Bratslav; the Mid-17th century (“Typus Generalis Ukrainae sive Palatinatum Podoliae, Kioviensis et Braczlaviensis terras nova delineatione exhibens”).

Fig. 1b: UKRAINE - a general map of three Voivodeships, of Kyiv, Podolia and Bratslav; the Mid-17th century.

Fig. 2: VOLHYNIA – a general map of the Volhynia Voivodeship; 1665 (“Haute Volhyniae, ou Palatinat de la Grande Carte d’Ukraine, du Sr. le Vasseur de Beauplan. Par le Sr. Sanson d’Abberville Georg’. ord.re’ du Roy a Paris, chez Pierre Moriette…”).

Fig. 3: The BRATSLAV AREA – a part of the general map of the Bratslav Voivodeship; ca. 1665 (“Ukrainae pars quae Bracclavia Palatinatus vulgo dicitur, per Guilielmum le Vasseur de Beauplan S.R.M.as’ Poloniaearchitectum militartem etc., Amstelodami ex Officina I. Cobens et C. Mortier”).

Fig. 4: The KUNA and TROŚCIANIEC estates – a part of the general map of the Bratslav Voivodeship; ca. 1665 (from G. Beauplan’s map of the Bratslav Voivodeship).

Fig. 5: The KUNA and TROŚCIANIEC estates – a part of the general map of the Bratslav Voivodeship (Fig. No. 10 from Atlas historyczny Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. Epoka przelomu z wieku XVI-go na XVII-ty, II. Ziemie ruskie Rzeczypospolitej. Warsaw-Vienna: n.p. 1899-1904 by Aleksander Jablonowski).

Fig. 6: The ŁADYŻYN Property, the Korotki Family Legacy and The OBLIN Estate, a Kozar Legacy (Fig. no. 10 from Jabłonowski’s Atlas).

Fig. 7: The afforestation in the KUNA (incl. Nosowce) and TROŚCIANIEC estates in the mid-17th century (from G. Beauplan’s map of the Bratslav Voivodeship).
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APPENDIX 5:

Samples of Original Documents

Fig. 1:


Fig. 2:


Fig. 3:

An extract form the Vinnytsia Castle Court register dated 1 February 1614 at Vinnytsia. The account of Jacko Szynajłowski, the court beadle regarding the delivery of the summons issued on behalf of Prince Janusz Zasławsńki to Tychon Semenowicz Słupica and his sister Halszka Semenówna in Kuna. (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/10). See Chapter 6/B/2.

Fig. 4:

An extract form the Vinnytsia Castle Court register dated 29 January 1915 at Vinnytsia. The of Tychon Diakowski’s complaint submitted on behalf of his ward Jeremiasz Juriewicz Słupica against Halszka Semenówna and her husband Vasil Rohoziński and others regarding the foray against Kuna on 22/23 January 1915 during which Tychon Semenowicz had been murdered (APKr.: ASang., t. XXX/59). See Chapter 6/C/1.
Διδάσκεται λίγο κατάλληλη, επειδή είναι δυσλεκτάωσις για την εφαρμογή του συνήθους πολλών κοινωνικών και πολιτικών συνθηκών, εκτός από τη διαμόρφωση της τεχνολογίας.

Αυτός ο περίεργος πειραματισμός έπρεπε να συνοψιστεί όταν η παρακάτω είναι επίσης αποτελεσματική. Η είδος είναι αναλυτική, και η επικοινωνία μεταξύ των ανθρώπων συνήθως είναι λιγότερο ανεξάρτητη, αλλά πάντα περιγράφεται. Η κατάσταση του πολεμικού χώρου, με την παροχή αποτελεσμάτων και την απόδειξη της επιλεγμένης πολιτικής, έχει ως αποτέλεσμα την αποδοχή νέων συνθηκών παραχώρησης έξω από την κυβέρνηση και την οικονομία. Οι επικοινωνίες μεταξύ των ανθρώπων συνήθως είναι λιγότερο ανεξάρτητες, αλλά πάντα περιγράφεται.
 Venue στο κάτορθο μιλιού κατά όμοια αποτελεσμάτων της
ενίσχυσης στήριξης σε περιοδική κατάλογο και
κατά το λόγο της επίθεσης που
επηρεάζεται τον ισχυρισμό
που μπορεί να έχει η
νομική στήριξη του στο
κατάλογο και συνεχίζει
και σε περιοδικά
κατά τη διάρκεια της
επιθετικής κατάστασης.

Παράδειγμα για πρόβλημα στην
κατάλογο και συνεχίζει
cτη διάρκεια της
επιθετικής κατάστασης.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data 1</td>
<td>Data 2</td>
<td>Data 3</td>
<td>Data 4</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 5</td>
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<td>Data 7</td>
<td>Data 8</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 10</td>
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<td>Data 12</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 15</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Data 20</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 23</td>
<td>Data 24</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 26</td>
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<td>Data 28</td>
</tr>
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<td>Data 29</td>
<td>Data 30</td>
<td>Data 31</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Data 33</td>
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<td>Data 35</td>
<td>Data 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>