

VIEWS OF M. O. KOYALOVICH ON THE POLISH-LITHUANIAN UNIONS

Alexey M. Stolyarov¹

Urgency of the studied problem is associated with the need of reconsideration of the development of the Russian historiography of the XIX century. The purpose of article is in characterizing views of M.O. Koyalovich, the Russian historian of the middle of the XIX century, about the unions between the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland (Krevsk and Lublin Unions). The main approaches in the research are problem and thematic and comparative approaches which have allowed to define the place of M.O. Koyalovich views in the development of the Russian historiography of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania history. The main results of the study are in continuity of the ideas of M.O. Koyalovich with the previous development stage of the Russian historiography of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania history. Innovative ideas of M.O. Koyalovich on History of the Polish-Lithuanian unions are revealed. In this article we show the uniqueness of the number of M.O. Koyalovich ideas. Value of the M.O. Koyalovich views on the further development of the Russian historiography of Grand Duchy of Lithuania history is also analyzed. Materials of the article can be useful for teaching of History of the Russian historical thought in the XIX century.

Keywords: history, M.O. Koyalovich, N.G. Ustryalov, Jagiello, Sigismund II August, the Krevsk Union, the Lublin Union, The Grand Duchy of Lithuania, The Kingdom of Poland.

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary tasks of the modern historical science in study of the Russian historiography is “the return of names” and turn to “peripheral issues”. “Return of names” implies drawing the attention of researchers on the works and ideas of those Russian historians, remained little known to a wide circle of readers for a long time. Turn to “peripheral issues” means the concentration of the interests of the modern scholars on the aspects of the works of historians of the XIX-XX centuries, which were previously considered as the secondary important in determining of the historical path of Russia. This path has always been associated with the victories of the Moscow princes, and therefore with the Moscow Principality. Hence, historians searched for the causes and factors of Moscow’s rise, and then studied the development of historical views on this process. At the same time the “other Russia” - the Grand Duchy of Lithuania undeservedly pushed into the background. The “Moscow-centric” consciousness of many Russian historians did not notice the truth, that most of the ancient Russian lands of Kievan Rus were united under the authority of the Lithuanian princes. Recognition of the primacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the process of unification of the Russian lands was understood by professional historians with difficulty and up to the present

¹ Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University, Kazan, Russia. *E-mail: yagello1386@mail.ru*

time has surprised the Russian public. Meanwhile, in the XIX century, the explanation of successes of Lithuanian princes in the matter of the Russian lands “collecting” was the professional duty of every major historian who was trying to write the history of medieval Rus. Historiographic interest in these searches arose only at the end of the XX century, because the “principal cornerstone” of the Russian middle ages in the Soviet historical science was the Moscow Principality. There was a genuine “return of names” of Russian researchers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania M.K. Lubavsky (1910), V.B. Antonovich (1878), M.F. Vladimirsky-Budanov (1868), N.G. Ustryalov (1849). However, on the periphery of research interests there are still views on the history of this principality, presented in the writings of Mikhail Osipovich Koyalovich (1864).

The chronological framework of the historical period, analyzed in this study, is limited by the end of the XIV century and the middle of the XVI century - the time of the Krevsk (1385) and Lublin (1569) Unions forming. The time frames, in which the views of M.O. Koyalovich are examined, cover the 1860s.

METHODS

Research tasks. During the research it was necessary to solve the following tasks:

- 1) determine the continuity of the views of M.O. Koyalovich (1864) on the Polish-Lithuanian Union with ideas that became widespread in Russian historical thought of the first half of the XIX century;
- 2) identify innovative ideas proposed by M.O. Koyalovich on the question of the Polish-Lithuanian unions and to show their uniqueness in Russian historiography;
- 3) show the importance of the proposed by M.O. Koyalovich (1864) approaches to the Polish-Lithuanian unions for the further development of Russian historiography of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania history. The theoretical and methodological basis of the research was the conceptual provisions of scientific research in the field of studying the history of development of historical thought. Using the methodology and method of existing researches contribute to the development of Russian historical scientific thought.

The system-structural approach provided an opportunity to comprehensively characterize the sources of this study, in our case, the works of M.O. Koyalovich (1864), in their relationship with each other and with the historical researches of modern Russian historians. The system-structural approach also made it possible to combine within the framework of one study, data from historical, historiographic, methodological and historical studies.

The problem-chronological approach allowed to divide the analyzed area into a number of specific problems and to characterize them separately, but in interrelation with other problems.

The application of the comparative-historical method made it possible to compare the views of various historians.

RESULTS

By the middle of the XIX century thanks to the works of N.G. Ustryalov (Ustryalov, 1849) in Russian historiography formed a stable idea of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a history of the state, which was “Russian” from the very beginning, where from the end of the XIX century, began a national religious struggle between the Polish Catholic and Lithuanian-Russian Orthodox sides. Historians believed that the Catholic grand dukal power was more inclined to the side of Poland, which ultimately predetermined the victory in the principality in the middle of the XVI century of the “Polish orders” - polonization. This doomed it to the sad final outcome of its existence - the absorption by Poland as a result of the Lublin Union of 1569.

In the 1860s, a new surge of interest to Lithuania and Lithuanian-Russian history occurred in Russian historiography. The catalyst for this interest was the Polish Uprising in the early 1860s. During it, the Polish insurgents advanced the former slogan of restoring Poland’s independence within the borders of 1772. The political dispute was once again reinforced by scientific research. Lectures on the “History of Western Russia” read by Mikhail Osipovich Koyalovich (1828-1891), a professor of St. Petersburg Theological Academy, were published in St. Petersburg in 1864. This work described in details the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Mikhail Osipovich Koyalovich was born in the place of Kuznitsa, Grodno province, in the family of the uniatic priest. Mikhail Koyalovich received primary education in the Supraslsky Religious School, which he graduated in 1845. Then until 1851 he studied at the Lithuanian Theological Seminary. In 1851 he entered the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, which he graduated in 1855. Since November 1855, Mikhail Koyalovich began teaching at the Riga and St. Petersburg theological seminaries, and from May 1856 he became a lecturer of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. In 1856-1862 M.O. Koyalovich worked at the Department of Comparative Theology and the Russian Raskol. From 1862 to 1868 he taught at the Department of Russian Civil and Church History. In 1873, M.O. Koyalovich became a doctor of theology, with a thesis entitled “The History of the Reunion of Western Russian Uniates of Old Times (before 1800)” (Historians of Russia, Biographies, 2001).

Considering the fact that M.O. Koyalovich was an active supporter of Orthodox missionary work in the western provinces of the Russian Empire, his “Lectures on the History of Western Russia” should be expected to strengthen the national-religious factor in explaining the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Partly this happened. M.O. Koyalovich agreed with N.G. Ustryalov in the question of the reasons for the entry of the ancient Russian lands into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Among the reasons for this rapprochement, the historian (Koyalovich, 1864), following N.G. Ustryalov(1849), placed the dynastic kinship of the Lithuanian princes in the first place with representatives of the genus Rurikovich.

But at the same time, the historian expressed innovative ideas in the matter of the Krevsk Union of 1385. M.O. Koyalovich (1864) was the first among Russian historians who singled out objective reasons for rapprochement of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with Poland at the end of the XIV century. He saw them in geopolitical conditions. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania bordered in all directions with much stronger, as the historian believed, neighbors: Moscow Russia, Poland, the Teutonic Order, the Golden Horde. In his opinion, by the end of the XIV century, it was found impossible for the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to exist independently, and it necessarily had to join one of these political entities. But M.O. Koyalovich (Koyalovich, 1864) did not stop more detailed at this point on the proof of his thesis. He did not fully analyze the foreign policy situation in which turned out to be the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the end of the XIV century, so his statement seemed baseless. Later, the historian (Koyalovich, 1885) showed the importance of Krevsk Union for the foreign policy of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in stopping the aggression of the Teutonic Order in the south-eastern Baltic. Based on this, the researcher believed that Krevsk Union is not a complete union of the two states as considered N.G. Ustryalov (Ustryalov, 1849), and a foreign policy union directed against the Crusaders. Grand Duchy of Lithuania from Krevsk to the Union of Lublin appeared to M.O. Koyalovich as “nothing more than a political alliance between the two states, united by common foreign interests and a sovereign” (Koyalovich, 1864).

It was a new approach to Krevsk Union. He solved existed collision in “Ustryalov” interpretation. As the unification of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland in 1385 was considered by N.G. Ustryalov as full and complete, then the purpose of forming by Poles and Lithuanian princes of the Union of Horodlo in 1413 and even more the Union of Lublin in 1569 was unclear. The very fact of their forming could indicate that the agreement, signed in the castle of Krevo in 1385, did not mean the full consolidation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland that emerged from the words of M.O. Koyalovich (1864).

A new interpretation contradicted the idea that since 1385 the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania changed the direction of its development towards rapprochement with Poland in the state system, towards “polonisation”. This thesis contradicts another speculation of the historian. Thus, the ideas of N.M. Karamzin (1818) and N.G. Ustryalov (1849) of aggressive Poland’s position in relation to Orthodoxy M.O. Koyalovich opposed the thesis that the initiator of Catholicism distributing in Lithuania became not Catholics but namely the Lithuanian side. But Jagiello went to this step in order to deprive Crusaders of ideological justification of expansion against the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Koyalovich, 1864). Thus,

interests of the church were in the constructions of the historian not only as a self-sufficient factor, but also as a tool of foreign policy, which skillfully used by the grand-ducal power.

The adoption of Catholicism in Lithuania was considered in the views of M.O. Koyalovich against the Crusaders, and not against the Russian lands. The historian for the first time in Russian historiography noted that the spread in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of Catholicism after 1385 affected only ethnically Lithuanian lands, and Orthodox positions on the Russian lands in the first years after Krevsk union remained inviolable. Samogitia and Russian Orthodox principalities did not experience pressure from the Roman Curia and the Polish Episcopate immediately after the Krevsk Union (Koyalovich, 1864). But simultaneously with this M.O. Koyalovich proposed the original understanding of the effects of the baptism of Lithuania for its relations with the Russian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

This understanding is already partially fit into the framework of existing historical conceptions. In place of the “struggle” of the Catholic Lithuania and the Russian Orthodox areas in the views of N.G. Ustryalov (1849) by M.O. Koyalovich “separation” between Lithuania and the Russian lands came with the Krevsk Union. It is to be understood as a misunderstanding, alienation, but still not a direct conflict. However, the origins of this “separation” M.O. Koyalovich, as well as N.G. Ustryalov, saw in different religious affiliation, somewhat softening the severity of the confrontation that began with the Krevsk Union.

In another place of his work the historian drew attention to the conflict between Jagiello and Vytautas in their struggle for the Grand Buffet in the late 1370's - early 1380's. According to him, in the Krevsk Union of 1385 Jagiello found an external ally represented by the Polish magnates with a view to the final victory over Vytautas and consolidation of his power in Lithuania (Koyalovich, 1864). This idea of the historian traced the same tendency as that on the adoption of Catholicism in Lithuania - external power is drawn from one of the opposing sides to solve domestic problems.

As for the idea of N.G. Ustryalov (1849) on the Polish influence in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, then we can say that in general M.O. Koyalovich accepted it. But as carriers of Polish orders were to act the Poles themselves, then the historian believed that talks about this impact should be only after the Union of Lublin in 1569, when their intensive penetration into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania began. Arguments of N.G. Ustryalov that Poles imposed to the duchy their own political model for a short stay in Lithuania after Krevsk Union in 1386 - 1392, from the scientific point of view seemed to M.O. Koyalovich (1864) inconclusive. In these circumstances, as the key moment in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania polonization he chose Lublin, and not the Krevsk Union.

Despite the fact that the unification of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania with Poland in 1385 was only a foreign policy union, to Russian people, from the point

of view of M.O. Koyalovich, it was immanent inherent the rejection of such forms of cooperation with Poland. This coincided with the position of N.G. Ustryalov. The basis of this hostility for the historian was only the difference of faiths. Thus, he again strengthened the role of the religious factor in the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

From the alleged rejection by the Russian princes of Catholic Poland M.O. Koyalovich (1864) deduced the campaign of Prince Andrey Polotsky against Jagiello in 1385 - 1387. The historian characterized Andrey Polotsky in this way: "A Russian and Orthodox man who marched in defense of the Russian and Orthodox elements." In the episode with Andrey Polotsky, the historian had an excellent opportunity to regard his campaign against Jagiello in a completely different way, namely, to present it as a campaign of the apanage prince against the great Lithuanian prince in the struggle for the throne. Speaking a little earlier about the Krevsk Union and the struggle of Jagiello against Vytautas in 1386 - 1392, M.O. Koyalovich (1864) valued claims of Vytautas in this way. Moreover, describing the political situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania during the period of the Krevsk Union, the historian declared the existence of a group of apanage princes who wanted to be independent after the departure of Grand Duke Jagiello to Poland, and among these princes the historian named both Andrey Polotsky and Svidrigailo. Andrey Polotsky - the Lithuanian prince Wingolt, the eldest son of Olgerd, who first in 1342 was sent by his father first to Pskov, where he adopted Orthodoxy with a new name of Andrey, and then was transferred to Polotsk, where he remained prince until the events of 1385 - 1386. Jagiello was the son of Olgerd from his second wife, and, accordingly, a half-brother of Andrey Polotsky. Given these facts known to the historian, the conflict between them could be considered by M.O. Koyalovich only as a political struggle for power within the dynasty of Gediminovich without reference to the confessional belonging of the princes. But the historian did not go to such a step, as this was impeded by his setting on the religious basis of the inter-princely struggle.

Although concerning the Lublin Union of 1569, M.O. Koyalovich did not fully echo the views of N.G. Ustryalov. He rather carefully extended the idea of S.M. Solovyov (1851) to the understanding of the Lublin Union about external factors affecting the history of the state. Having made this step, M.O. Koyalovich successfully solved the contradictions characterized the ideas of N.G. Ustryalov. Thus, the Russian delegates of the southern lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania gave their voluntary consent to the inclusion of their territories in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as according to the historian, they felt the acute need for Polish aid from the ruinous raids of the Crimean Tatars (Koyalovich, 1864), and not because of obedience to the order of their prince Sigismund II Augustus, as N.G. Ustryalov thought (Ustryalov, 1849). M.O. Koyalovich very briefly mentioned another foreign policy factor that facilitated the conclusion of the Lublin Union - the Livonian War and the clash in its course of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

with the Russian state (Koyalovich, 1849).

With all this, on the main points, the historian took a position of N.G. Ustryalov (1849). He considered the sagacious Sigismund Augustus to be the main initiator of the union, who “gave the principality to the Poles”, and the population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania obediently followed the king and did not dare to ask him for condescension (Koyalovich, 1864). Here the views of M.O. Koyalovich directly echoed the ideas of N. G. Ustryalov on the existence of an inseparable connection between the ruler and his subjects and their support due to this moral inner connection of almost all the political steps of the grand dukes or kings.

However, the historian somewhat complicated the idea of the actions of Sigismund Augustus. M.O. Koyalovich (1864) wrote that this grand duke, having conceived at the beginning of his reign to unite the principality with Poland, decided to acquire supporters of the union in Lithuania. He elevated the Lithuanian (and not Russian) gentry to the position of the Polish nobility (Koyalovich, 1864) during his reign, which facilitated the involvement of the Lithuanian nobility in the “Polish order. “It is important to note that before this the nobility, from the point of view of the author, did not aspire to new rights and, only having received them from the Grand Duke, has turned into an “polonized gentry”. Here M.O. Koyalovich (1864) remained within the framework of the views of his predecessors. But his singling out in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, in addition to the personality of the ruler of the social and political power (the Lithuanian gentry), interested in union with Poland, thanks to the actions of this ruler, was nevertheless a step forward to the development of ideas about the Lublin Union.

The historian first raised the question on the consequences of the Lublin Union. And he considered not only the political aspect, but also social changes in the social system of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The historian considered these consequences for the principality only as negative. Among them, M.O. Koyalovich called deterioration of the peasantry position and its equation in status with Polish serfdom (Koyalovich, 1864).

These views were set out by the historian in lectures; he delivered to the listeners of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. Naturally, the lectures were saturated with elements of socio-political topicality. M.O. Koyalovich emphasized the transformation of the peasantry of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania into an analogue of the Polish serf peasantry in order to welcome the peasant reform carried out by autocracy in the early 1860s, which also affected the western provinces of the Russian Empire (Beauvais, 2011). The peasantry of this region in its mass was before the reform in serfdom from the Polish, mainly landowners. M.O. Koyalovich was a supporter of serfdom abolition. And the step of the state in this direction meant, in his view, devoting to the historical destiny of the “West-Russian” peasantry, fulfillment by autocracy of the historical mission for the liberation of it from the “Polish oppression”.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In my opinion, all those new ideas that were expressed by M.O. Koyalovich (1864) about the Polish - Lithuanian unions, still were not united by him into a single system of views and did not influence the interpretation of other fundamental elements of the concept of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The presence in his views of the strong influence of ideas of N.G. Ustryalov does not allow us to state that M.O. Koyalovich (1864) proposed a new concept of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, in his works, the ideas of N.G. Ustryalov were not voiced in the same form, as was previously believed in Soviet historiography, which simply ignored the analysis of M.O. Koyalovich (Essays on the History of Historical Science in the USSR, 1962). Ideas of N.G. Ustryalov underwent a certain processing of M.O. Koyalovich, taking into account the new historiographic experience of his colleagues and his own research. In this sense, the ideas of M.O. Koyalovich occupy a peculiar marginal position in the historiography of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania history, not being a completely new view, but also without completely coming into contact with the ideas of N.G. Ustryalov. The more detailed the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was revealed in the works of the historian, the more M.O. Koyalovich cited historical facts in his work and expressed original ideas, the weaker seemed the concept of the national and religious confrontation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the late XIV and the first half of the XVI centuries, the more contradictory moments accumulated in it. Subsequently, this should have prompted and encouraged a new generation of historians to revise this concept, which eventually happened in the late XIX-early XX century. It can be argued that M.O. Koyalovich (1864), himself, perhaps, not wanting this, and in solidarity with N.G. Ustryalov on many issues, broke the first gap in the "Ustryalov" vision of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Thus, the idea of M.O. Koyalovich (1864) appears before the researcher in the following framework. He retained the continuity with the existing historiographic tradition in ascertaining the harmful, in his opinion, Polish influence on the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. M.O. Koyalovich as well as N.G. Ustryalov wrote about the religious-national basis of the confrontation between the Russian and Lithuanian parts of the principality. In this case M.O. Koyalovich (1864) expressed innovative ideas for his time on the issues of Polish-Lithuanian unions. He first appreciated the Krevsk Union only as a foreign policy union, proposing as a basis for this union the joint struggle of Lithuania and Poland against the Teutonic Order. This approach is also close to modern Lithuanian historiography (Gudavièius, 2005). A number of M.O. Koyalovich (1864) theses looked logically incomplete, and even completely unsubstantiated, but this does not reduce the value of his observations. The historian solved the contradictions with his ideas that arose in the concept of N.G. Ustryalov(1849), showing at the same time the weak points of this concept.

The idea of M.O. Koyalovich (1864) on the initiative of the Lithuanian side in the matter of baptizing Lithuania on the Catholic rite and about the direction of this step as not against the Russian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but against the Teutonic Order with the aim of devaluing its ideological cover for campaigns to Lithuanian lands looked innovative. A brilliant guess of the historian was the idea that the forming of the Krevsk Union with Poland, Lithuanian prince Jagiello tried to strengthen his position in the confrontation with Vytautas. The same progressive step was the distribution by M.O. Koyalovich (1864) the ideas of S.M. Solovyov about the external factor as one of the factors of historical development on the history of the Lublin Union of 1569. However, M.O. Koyalovich, due to, most likely, personal confessional preferences, did not use the opportunity to completely break with the concept of N.G. Ustryalov (1849) completely. The concept of M.O. Koyalovich did not, on the whole, go beyond of the “Ustryalov” interpretation of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but partly its going beyond took place.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The material of the article is of interest to specialists who are engaged in teaching in the higher school of historiography of the history of Russia, as well as teaching of the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Antonovich, V.B. (1878). ‘Essay of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania History until the middle of the 15th century’. St. Petersburg.
- Beauvois, D. (2011). ‘Gordian knot of the Russian Empire. Power, gentry and people in the Right-Bank Ukraine (1793-1914)’. Moscow: NLR.
- Vladimirsky-Budanov, M.F. (1868). ‘German law in Poland and Lithuania’. St. Petersburg.
- Gudavièius, E. (2005). ‘History of Lithuania. From ancient times to 1569’. Moscow: BALTRUS.
- Karamzin, N.M. (1818). ‘History of the Russian state’. St. Petersburg.
- Koyalovich, M.O. (1885). ‘Battle of Grunwald’. St. Petersburg.
- Koyalovich, M.O. (1864). ‘Lectures on the history of Western Russia’. Moscow.
- Lubavsky, M.K. (1910). ‘Essay of the Lithuanian-Russian State History until the Lublin Union’. Moscow.
- Solovyov, S.M. (1851). ‘History of Russia from ancient times’. St. Petersburg.
- Ustryalov, N.G. (1849). ‘Russian history’. St. Petersburg.
- Chernobaev, A. (2001). ‘Historians of Russia. Biographies’. Moscow: ROSSPEN.