



The Dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde

Author(s): Michael B. Zdan

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 35, No. 85 (Jun., 1957), pp. 505-522

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204855>

Accessed: 10/06/2014 23:18

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

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



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde

MICHAEL B. ZDAN

I

THE Golden Horde as a state organism and especially its control of Eastern Europe have not been satisfactorily assessed for a long time in historiography, the only exception here being the now somewhat antiquated monumental work of Hammer Purgstall, *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde*¹, which gives a comprehensive picture of the period. Recently however a number of works have been published which are devoted either wholly or in part to the Golden Horde. The first of these is B. Spuler's *Die Goldene Horde*,² which, in view of its comprehensiveness, is the 'last word' on the subject.

In spite of all the efforts of historians who have studied the history of the Golden Horde, there are still many obscure problems which require further research. Among these is the question of the dependence of the West Ukrainian lands or, more precisely, of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde. The reason why the question of these relations is still not yet definitely answered lies first in the unusually small number of sources of both a narrative and documentary character. It is therefore not surprising that historians dealing with these questions usually express very general opinions.

On the whole the majority of historians take the position that Halych-Volyn' Rus' entered the orbit of the Golden Horde with the same obligations as all the other Ukrainian and Russian lands. Thus, for instance, V. T. Pashuto asserts that up to 1257 Halych-Volyn' Rus' really enjoyed more independence from the Golden Horde than all the other lands of Rus'; but later 'the attack of Burunday (1257) on south-western Rus' initiated the period of Tartar-Mongol domination there, accompanied, of course, by the establishment of *baskak-ship* and the regular levy'.³

The most complete survey of the question of the dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde has been made by George Vernadsky.⁴ He, like Pashuto, asserts that the total subordination of Halych-Volyn' Rus' came during the campaign of Burunday. We quote the relevant passage here:

With this raid Burunday considered his task accomplished and with-

¹ Josef Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Goldenen Horde in Kiptschak*, Pest, 1840.

² Bertold Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde*, Leipzig, 1942.

³ V. T. Pashuto, *Ocherki po istorii galitsko-volynskoy Rusi*, Moscow, 1950, p. 298.

⁴ George Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*, New Haven, 1953.

drew his field army from Volynia, stationing it again in the middle Dnieper region. However, agents of the Mongol administration were appointed to supervise the work of collecting taxes and recruits through a network of military districts in Podolia, Galicia and Volynia similar to those in East Russia.

To explain this statement, Vernadsky, in footnote 61, writes:

There is no direct evidence in the sources that the military districts were established in Galicia and Volynia by Burunday; however, since we know that such districts existed later, they may have been established at the time of Burunday's raid.⁵

A document which in Vernadsky's opinion should prove that 'such districts existed later' is the *yarlyk* (1507) of the Crimean khan Mengli-Geray to the Polish king Sigismund I. We quote Vernadsky's other conclusions in this context:

In this document Mengli-Geray confirms the earlier *yarlyk* of his father Haji-Geray addressed to Grand Duke Vitovt of Lithuania (around 1428). Having been rescued by Vitovt from the persecution of the rival khans, Haji-Geray 'granted' to Vitovt all the former possessions of the khans of the Golden Horde in West Russia. Actually, most of them had been occupied by the Lithuanian grand dukes for several decades. In spite of this, they were still listed in the records of the Golden Horde as so many *t'my*, and now Mengli-Geray enumerated them all. The same list, with some variations, was repeated in King Sigismund's letter to the Crimean khan Sahib Geray (1540). From these documents we know of the existence of *t'my* named after the following cities and districts: 1. Kiev; 2. Vladimir in Volynia; 3. Lutsk; 4. Sokal; 5. Podolia; 6. Kamenets (in Podolia); 7. Braslav (in Podolia); 8. Chernigov; 9. Kursk; 10. 'The Egoday *t'ma*' (south of the Kursk region); 11. Liubutsk (on the Oka River); 12. Okhura; 13. Smolensk; 14. Polotsk; 15-16. Riazan (at least two *t'my*: Riazan and Pronsk). To this list for the first century of Mongol rule, Galicia (lost to Poland in 1349) should be added, with probably three *t'my*; 17. Galich; 18. Lvov; 19. Sanok.⁶

A map with the named *t'my* is appended to this list, and among them are also those 'probable' *t'my* which, according to Vernadsky's assertion, must be added to the list of the revenue and administrative districts (*t'my*) of 'Russia, i.e. Galich, Lvov and Sanok'.

As additional proof that Halych-Volyn' Rus' must have been under the direct control of the Golden Horde and in this connection divided into *t'my*, with Mongol officials or *baskaks* to collect taxes, Vernadsky cites the remains of those groups of the population which the Mongols, during their control of Halych and Volyn', had organised. To these he has devoted a special treatise 'The Royal Serfs' (*servi regales*)

⁵ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 217-18.

of "Ruthenian law" and their Origin',⁷ and he mentions them in his *The Mongols and Russia*.⁸

It is a question here of the so-called *ordynsi*, *sotni lyudy* (hundred-men) and *kalannyky*. The existence of these three social groups, whose obligations in general were not very different, is mentioned in the *Acta Grodzkie i Żiemskie* of Galicia from the time of its submission to the rule of Poland to the beginning of the 16th century. Of these, the *sotni lyudy* lived in five royal villages near Syanik, the *ordynsi* and *kalannyky* in five royal villages near Halych and in ten villages near L'vov (Ukr. L'viv). They were all connected with the royal domains, and in connection with this they had the corresponding obligations to the king or his representatives. The obligations of the *ordynsi* were in brief: (1) to furnish transportation for the royal needs, (2) to maintain contacts for this in L'vov, (3) to transport the royal post for a distance of ten miles, (4) to furnish horses in time of war for the personal needs of the king, and (5) to pasture the royal cattle.

Vernadsky explains the origin of these three social groups in this way: after the domination of Rus' by the Mongols, the princes of Rus' recognised the sovereignty of the khan. In some regions of south-western Rus' (in the original, always 'Russia'), as for example in the Kiev region, the population was directly subordinated to the Mongol government, while in other parts of Rus' Mongol officials (*darugas-baskaks*) were appointed who, as representatives of the khan, were to supervise the activities of the princes, to recruit soldiers, and to collect taxes from the local population. The first census of the population was made in 1245, the next in 1257-8, and another in the 1270s. As a result of the census Rus' was divided into revenue-districts or provinces, each of which contained 10,000 tax-payers, and such a province was called a *t'ma*. The *t'my* were divided into thousands, the thousands into hundreds, and the hundreds into tens. In this way the 'hundred-men' (*sotni lyudy*) arose, and these are mentioned in Galician sources. At the beginning this system included the entire village population of western and eastern Rus'. Later, when the Mongols recalled their own officials and allowed the local princes to collect the taxes for them, this system gradually disappeared, and only a small number of the units organised by the Mongols continued active and performed specific obligations for the princes of Rus' and Lithuania and later for the Polish kings.⁹

The views of Vernadsky on the dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' can be summarised in three points, viz. (1) Halych-Volyn' Rus' fell into the same dependence on the Mongols as Kiev Rus' and the

⁷ G. Vernadsky, 'The Royal Serfs (*Servi Regales*) of the "Ruthenian Law" and their Origin' (*Speculum*, Cambridge, Mass., 1951, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 255-64).

⁸ G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*, pp. 222, 225-7.

⁹ G. Vernadsky, *Speculum*, p. 262.

Moscow principalities; (2) Halych-Volyn' Rus' was divided into Mongol administrative tax-districts or *t'my*; (3) the princely sovereignty of Halych-Volyn' Rus' was limited by the *baskaks*, who carried out the levy of taxes and collected the military contingent from the people for the military needs of the Horde.

The arguments set forth by Vernadsky, as we have already explained, rest on: (1) the already-cited interpretations of the *yarlyk* (1507) of the Crimean khan Mengli-Geray to the Polish king Sigismund I, and (2) an analysis of the structure of the remains of the three social groups of Galicia from the second half of the 15th century, i.e. the *sotni lyudy*, *ordyntsi*, and *kalannyky*.

Let us now consider how far Vernadsky's arguments satisfy the demands of modern historical criticism. First, there is the question of the reliability of the *yarlyk* of Mengli-Geray and of Sigismund's letter. The list of the districts which the khan of the Crimea yielded to Sigismund and which Sigismund mentions in his letter rests on copies (*transsumpti*), the basis of which is without doubt the *yarlyk* of Tokhtamysh to Jogaila (Jagiełło) in 1393 and to Vytautas (Witold) in 1397.¹⁰ The period of time between these three *yarlyks* (1393, 1397, 1507) could, beyond all doubt, produce great changes in the last of these, viz. in the corruption both of the nomenclature and of the text. About this B. Spuler says:

There are various documents on the basis of which the khans of the Horde made grants of land to the Lithuanian princes, so that it might be thought that the (Tartar-Lithuanian) frontier could be exactly drawn. But on this point there are two sets of considerations. The first concerns the formal surrenders which testify only to the demands of the Lithuanians and not to the actual extent of their control. This concerns the *yarlyk* of Tokhtamysh to Vitovt (1397). Secondly, we do not know the majority of the *yarlyks* of the early periods in their original form, but only in the shape in which they appear at their confirmation (e.g. 1507), when they were used as the basis for other documents (the so-called *transsumpti*). In such cases the actual data, in accordance with changed conditions, were replaced by another content.¹¹

The warnings as to these writings have existed for a long time. Thus, for instance, under the *yarlyk* of Mengli-Geray the editor made the following note: 'The writing is uncorrectable and with many omissions in the text.'¹² Under the letter of King Sigismund to Sahib-Geray, we read this remark: 'The names of some cities in the old copy have been corrupted and others have been omitted.'¹³

¹⁰ A. Prochaska, 'Układ Tochtamysza z Witoldem' (*Przegląd Historyczny*, vol. XV, p. 260); M. Hrushevs'ky, *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy*, New York, 1955, vol. IV, pp. 86-7; M. Zdan, 'Stosunki litewsko-tatarskie za czasów Witolda W. ks. Litwy'. Offprint from *Ateneum Wilenskie*, Vil'na, 1931, vol. VII, no. 3-4, p. 11.

¹¹ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

¹² *Akty zapadnoy Rossii*, vol. I, no. 200, p. 363.

¹³ *Ibid.*, vol. I, no. 6, pp. 4-5.

Yet even a very superficial examination of the authentic parts of these writings, viz. the *yarlyk* of 1507 and the letter of 1540, shows great differences. Here is one example. The *yarlyk* says: 'the Sokal *t'ma* with all its income and taxes and with its lands and waters'. Whereas the letter has: 'Sokal with its *t'my* and with waters and with lands'. If in one document a given area is credited with one *t'ma*, a unit of an administrative character with a definite number of inhabitants and with (hypothetical) boundaries, and in the other, almost contemporary document this locality contains an unspecified number of *t'my*, we obviously cannot speak of the reliability of the source.

There are also observations of a second kind. Among the *t'my* which were supposed to exist in Halych-Volyn' Rus' in the middle of the 13th century (the time of the attack of Burunday) Vernadsky localises the Sokal *t'ma* on a special map. At the same time the first mention of Sokal dates from 1411, when Prince Ziemowit, residing there, issued privileges to the city of Busko.¹⁴ How could Burunday have created a Sokal *t'ma* when this town did not exist in his time?

In making both these observations, which strike us on even a cursory approach to the question, we should like to call attention to another point. Vernadsky, in enumerating the *t'my* of Rus' in the middle of the 13th century on the basis of the *yarlyk* of 1507 and the letter of 1540, writes: 'To this list, for the first century of Mongol rule, Galicia (lost to Poland in 1349) should be added, with probably three *t'my*: 17. Galich, 18. Lvov, 19. Sanok.'¹⁵ In our opinion this argument for basing a statement on the subdivision of Halych (Galicia) and Volyn' (Volynia) into *t'my* passes even the limits of historical intuition.

In the matter of the existence of the three special social groups in Halych-Volyn' Rus' in the second half of the 15th century (*ordynsi*, *sotni lyudy*, and *kalannyky*) we have again to decide two points, viz. the structure and the origin of these groups. In regard to the first we must admit that Vernadsky's account gives a series of objective details. The question of their origin is different. In citing the views of Hejnosz, Grekov,¹⁶ and others, Vernadsky considers these groups, in opposition to many historians, as a product of the dominance of the Golden Horde and of its organisational and administrative activities on the territory of Halych-Volyn' Rus'. This assertion should be proved by an historical digression of the author, who, as we have previously said, suggests without the slightest reason that the division of

¹⁴ Mykola Holubets', *Ź istoriyi mista Sokala*, L'vov, 1929, p. 32. Hrushevs'ky supposes that Sokolets' in the Bratslav area is in question, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, p. 86.

¹⁵ G. Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia*, p. 217.

¹⁶ W. Hejnosz, *Jus Ruthenicale*, L'vov, 1928; B. D. Grekov, *Krest' yane na Rusi s drevneyshikh vremyon do XVII veka*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1946.

Halych-Volyn' Rus' into *t'my* headed by *baskaks* is an indisputable fact.

A comprehensive analysis of the origin of the *ordyntis*, *sotni lyudy*, and *kalannyky* is outside the limits of the problem we have set ourselves here. We should like to say only that Vernadsky's statement to the effect that these social groups were the result of the division of Halych-Volyn' Rus' into *t'my* with all its implications lacks proof. In the north-western neighbour of the Ukraine, Lithuania, which was never subject to the Mongols, there were social groups with similar obligations to the princes as those of the *ordyntsi* in Galicia. We have in mind here the Mongol population (colonists) of the settlements of Sorok Tatar, Vaka, etc., near Vil'na. It was the obligation of these colonists to maintain bridges and to take care of the hostels which the prince was to visit, and in case of need to build new bridges as well as to furnish an adequate contingent of soldiers at the prince's call.¹⁷

Thus much in criticism of Vernadsky's statements. Now let us consider what sources exist for the statement that Halych-Volyn' Rus' was never divided into *t'my* and that, in connection with this, it never knew the institution of *baskaks*. We begin with the arguments *a silentio*.

First, no source mentions that the Mongols in Halych-Volyn' Rus' made a census of the population in order to divide the region into *t'my*. This is all the more striking, because at the same time we have several notices of such a census of the population in the Kiev area, Podillya (Podolia), and above all, in the Moscow principalities, and these divisions are described in detail.¹⁸

Secondly, we have no information in the historical sources about the life and activities of the *baskaks* in Halych-Volyn' Rus', while at the same time we meet many references to these same *baskaks* in the Kiev area, Podillya, and the Moscow principalities, and often we find the activities of the *baskaks* discussed in detail.¹⁹

Thirdly, none of the historical sources mentions the *chyslyaky* 'numbered persons', i.e. those who were subject to the census of the population in Halych-Volyn' Rus', although at the same time we find these *chyslyaky* in the other Ukrainian and Muscovite lands. Vernadsky's statement that the *chyslyaky* are identical with the *kalannyky* and the *sotni lyudy* of Halych-Volyn' Rus'²⁰ has absolutely no foundation in these sources.

Although the arguments *a silentio* do not decide the question of the absence of an administrative fiscal division of Halych-Volyn' Rus'

¹⁷ St. Kryczyński, 'Tatarzy litewscy' (*Rocznik Tatarski*, Warsaw, 1938, vol. III, p. 94). On this subject: M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. V, pp. 145-6.

¹⁸ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-1, 172, 215; B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-4.

¹⁹ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 193, 220, 228, 358; B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-45.

²⁰ G. Vernadsky, *Speculum*, p. 260.

into *t'my*, yet they have great importance. Another authentic source is decisive. We have in mind the will of the prince of Volyn', Volodymyr Vasylykovich, to his own wife, executed in 1287. This will, included in the chronicle, seems to be the oldest document of its kind from the Ukrainian lands, and its authenticity is not subject to the slightest doubt.²¹ We cite the text of the will according to T. Kostuba.²²

Volodymyr ordered his secretary Khodortsiv to write the following letter:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, by the prayers of the Most Holy Mother of God and the Ever-Virgin Mary and all the angels, I, Prince Volodymyr, son of Vasylyko, grandson of Roman, write this letter. I have given my princess, after my death, my city of Kobryn with the people and the revenues they gave me, so let them give (these) to my wife. And I have given her my village of Horodlo with its revenues, and as the people gave to me so (they are) to give to my princess after my death. If the prince burdens the city (there is no need to take these), for the city levies and Tartar tax (*tatarshchyna*) belong to the prince. And Sadove and Somyno I have also given to my princess and the Monastery of the Holy Apostles, which I founded. And I bought the village of Berezovychi from Yuriy Davydovich Khodorko and gave him for it 50 hryvni of sables, 5 ells of scarlet cloth (and) alms of wood. This village I have given to the Apostles. And my princess, after my death, if she wishes to become a nun, let her go; if she does not wish to, let her do as she pleases. I shall not arise to see what any one does after my death.

There is no doubt that the *tatarshchyna* is a tax levied by the Mongols (Tartars).²³ It is not important for us to determine whether it was a yearly fixed tax or a tax which was collected for the Mongols on certain extraordinary occasions. For us the important thing to remember is that the population gave it directly to the prince and not, as in the other parts of the Ukraine and the Muscovite principalities, through the *baskaks*.

²¹ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 105-6; V. T. Pashuto, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-4; B. D. Grekov, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 205, 269.

²² *Halyts'ko-volyns'kyi litopys*, translated by Teofil Kostruba, L'vov, 1936, vol. I, p. 97. (Abbrev. *H.V.L.*)

²³ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 102. Mongolian tribes—Naiman, Kerait, Merkit, Oirat, and Tatar—were chronologically the oldest components of Chingis Khan's empire. But already in the first organisational stage of it the Turkic Uigurs were incorporated and fairly quickly assimilated. At the close of Chingis Khan's reign the Turkic tribes formed the vast majority of the population of this gigantic empire. This relationship changed still more to the disadvantage of the Mongols in the time of the creation of the Golden Horde. The sources of contemporary Rus' and of Western Europe prefer the name 'Tartars' for this ethnic mixture. Present-day historians call them differently too: Hrushevs'ky calls them 'Tatars', Vernadsky 'Mongols', Pashuto 'Tatar-Mongols'. We follow the majority of Orientalists (e.g. Pelliot, Haenisch, and Kotwicz) who use the term 'Mongols'. Cf. A. Bruce Boswell, 'The Kipchak Turks' (*S.E.E.R.*, London, 1927-8, vol. VI, 16, p. 81).

Summing up our conclusions from a critical review of Vernadsky's assertions and our own arguments, we can with full certainty reiterate that (1) Halych-Volyn' Rus' was never divided by the Mongols into administrative fiscal districts, or *t'my*; (2) there were never any *baskaks* or representatives of the Golden Horde in Halych-Volyn' Rus'; and, as a corollary to this, (3) the political legal status of Halych-Volyn' Rus' during the domination of the Golden Horde was entirely different from what it was in other parts of the Ukraine and in the Muscovite principalities.

II

What was the position of Halych-Volyn' Rus' in the orbit of the Golden Horde's influence? To answer this question we must first analyse the important events in the history of Halych-Volyn' Rus' which are connected with the Golden Horde, as only in this way can we expect satisfactory results from our reasoning. Such an approach is all the more imperative because in the relations of the two sides a perpendicular cleavage does not exist, but merely a zigzag with considerable deviations from the perpendicular, in accordance with the political pressure of the Golden Horde at any given moment and with the changing resilience of Halych-Volyn' Rus' itself.

The decision of Danylo Romanovych's deputy Dmytro to defend Kiev in the winter of 1240 put all Halych-Volyn' Rus' on a war footing against the Mongols. As the outcome of the struggle, the Mongols captured the 'golden gate', Kiev,²⁴ then an important political and commercial centre, highly regarded not only in the West but among Arabs, Turks, and Mongols.²⁵ After this disaster to Rus', the Mongols pursued their invasion westwards, towards Hungary, and other cities of Halych-Volyn' Rus' fell into their hands, viz. Volodymyr (in Volynia) and Halych, and, as the chronicler puts it, 'many other cities without number' were taken and destroyed. The same chronicler remarks that Danylo's deputy Dmytro, who was released by the Mongols because of his bravery during the siege of Kiev, perceiving that 'the land of Rus' was perishing at the hands of the unbelievers', advised Batu to advance towards his final goal as quickly as possible.²⁶ The fact that some communities of Ponyzzya (in the borderlands of Volyn' and Kiev areas) surrendered to the Mongols and were left by these 'to sow wheat and barley for them',²⁷ does not imply in any case that the hostile attitude of the Mongols towards this country had changed. In order to prove this it might

²⁴ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 19.

²⁵ *Die geheime Geschichte der Mongolen*, translated by Erich Haenisch, Leipzig, 1948, pp. 139, 179; A. Bruce Boswell, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

²⁶ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 19.

²⁷ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 23.

suffice to mention the information furnished by the chronicler, whose narrative about the Mongol retreat to the Volga contains the statement that Batu sent both the headmen Manman and Balay with a detachment of soldiers to fight Danylo, and that both of them, not having found their quarry, 'fought at Volodava and near the lakes' and 'they dealt badly with the Christians'.²⁸ Moreover Danylo Romanovych, after his return to his country, sent a punitive expedition to Ponyzzya, because, as the chronicler relates, its inhabitants 'put all their hope into the Tartars'.²⁹

The following years up to 1245 show no events which might illuminate the relationship of the newly organised Golden Horde to Halych-Volyn' Rus'. Probably both parties devoted their time to ordering their internal affairs, which demanded considerable attention not only in the newly established state of the Golden Horde but in devastated Halych-Volyn' Rus'. We have sufficient material to infer that Danylo's primary aim, as far as the Golden Horde was concerned, was to prepare his country militarily for any future conflict with the Horde and to win, by diplomatic means, allies in Western Europe. Danylo's plans are best illustrated by the fact that he completely ignores the very existence of the Golden Horde and does so in spite of the fact that many contemporary princes of Rus' went to the capital of the khan from as early as 1242 in order to obtain *yarlyks* for their lands.³⁰ Thus Danylo faces with full awareness all the possible reprisals which lay in store for him from the Mongols in accordance with their supreme law (*yassa*).³¹

But Batu did not forget Danylo. The chronicle relates how Mohuchiy sent his legate to Danylo, during the latter's stay in Dorohovsk with Vasyl'ko, saying: 'Give up Halych!' This greatly troubled Danylo, so he took counsel with his brother, and resolved to journey to Batu. 'I shall not give up a half of my country,' he said, 'but rather I shall go to Batu myself.' This laconic notice of the chronicler supplies us with important, if not too clear information. Vernadsky assumes that the administration of Halych was taken over by a Mongol general.³² Hrushevs'ky proposes the interpretation that 'one of the princes of Rus' had petitioned for and was given the right to Halych by Batu, and now Mohuchiy was demanding that Danylo should abdicate in favour of another'.³³

Be this as it may, Danylo resolved to travel in person to the capital

²⁸ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 25.

³⁰ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 64.

³¹ John of Plano Carpini, 'History of the Mongols' (*The Mongol Mission*, edited by Christopher Dawson, New York, 1955, p. 44).

³² G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 144. Vernadsky's assertion is totally contrary to Mongol practice in the conquered lands. Cf. B. Grekov and A. Yakubovskiy, *Zolotaya Orda i yeyo padeniye*, Leningrad, 1937, p. 178.

³³ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 64.

²⁹ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 23.

of the Golden Horde in order to request the khan to grant him a *yarlyk* for his own lands. Danylo was moved to this, because, as the chronicler points out, 'he was behind in securing his land with fortifications (*horods*)',³⁴ and because the internal situation of Halych-Volyn' Rus' was quite unfavourable to a vigorous defence.

Danylo's visit to Saray in the mid-autumn of 1245 is described very fully in the chronicler's narrative,³⁵ and we have additional information about it in the reports of the papal legate Plano Carpini.³⁶ It put an end to the independence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' and thus is to be regarded as the beginning of its dependence on the Golden Horde.³⁷ It is evident that during Danylo's stay of nearly a month in Saray all the details of this state of dependence were definitely agreed on. The author of the chronicle, who was well disposed towards Danylo and had a close acquaintance with all state affairs, perhaps because he accompanied Danylo on this journey,³⁸ tells of the humiliating manner in which his prince had to recognise the khan as his liege and he remarks that Danylo was treated as a 'cholop' (serf) by the khan, to whom he was required to pay tribute.³⁹ It is regrettable that we do not know the amount of this tribute. In our opinion it would be totally amiss to apply to Halych-Volyn' Rus' the forms of dependence which were demanded from other lands conquered by the Mongols, as we know that conditions in the Mongol satellite countries differed sometimes to a very considerable extent.⁴⁰ We cite here Pashuto's opinion. 'It seems to us', he says, 'that at this period (i.e. till 1257) the relations of Halych-Volyn' Rus' to the Horde differed considerably from the forms of dependence of north-eastern Rus'. The geographical situation of Halych-Volyn' Rus' imposed certain measures of caution on the Mongol statesmen. They saw in this south-western state an advance post of those countries which had remained outside Mongol control.'⁴¹ P. Hrytsak declares that Saray and the metropolis of the grand khan in Mongolia were sometimes at loggerheads, from which Danylo, the founder of Ukrainian eastern policy, was not slow to profit.⁴² This statement about the state of things in Halych-Volyn' Rus' requires substantiation. Besides, whatever obligations Danylo imposed upon himself, he never gave a thought to their fulfilment.⁴³ This is quite clearly confirmed by his policy and activities after his return from the Horde.

³⁴ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 31.

³⁶ Plano Carpini, *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 70.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-7.

⁴⁰ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 321; Plano Carpini, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

⁴¹ V. T. Pashuto, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

⁴² Zab. (Bohdan Zahaykevych), 'Druha Velyka Rus' (*Ameryka*, Philadelphia, no. 56, 23 March 1955).

⁴³ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

³⁵ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 33.

³⁷ V. T. Pashuto, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

³⁹ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 33.

Danylo's stay in the capital of the Golden Horde as well as his agreement with the khan considerably strengthened his position inside his country and raised his authority in the eyes of the rulers of Western Europe. A practical result of this state of affairs was Danylo's alliance with the Hungarian king Béla⁴⁴ and his diplomatic conversations with the Papal See. About these a substantial literature exists, but history has still not established when they began. Papal bulls from this time,⁴⁵ although through lack of other sources they may be rather one-sided, show active contemporary intercourse which led finally to an act of great political importance, viz. Danylo Romanovych's coronation (1253). Simultaneously with the conclusion of external alliances, Danylo gave his full attention to increasing the war potential of his country by building many fortresses,⁴⁶ and reorganising his army in Mongol fashion.⁴⁷ Here the policy of the new king appears to be in full accord with the advice of the papal legate, that keen observer of Mongol ways, John of Plano Carpini.⁴⁸ All these preparations allowed Danylo to proceed against the Mongols.⁴⁹ Thus the years 1253-7 were filled with continuous warlike actions against Kuremza, who was then military leader of those regiments of the Golden Horde which were stationed farthest west. A general survey of the battles fought show us very clearly Danylo's able leadership when at grips with the Mongol strategists. But a more important fact emerges: Danylo's procedure marks a total break of the formal dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde, which had existed from his journey to the khan in 1245. We do not think that Danylo's resolution was caused by Batu's death in 1255, as the war between the Golden Horde and Halych-Volyn' Rus' started in 1253. But it is not impossible that Batu's hostile attitude to the Grand Khan Guyuk (1246-8) and to the latter's regent Oghul-Gamysh (1248-52) influenced Danylo's decision to some extent.⁵⁰

The Golden Horde's reaction to Danylo's anti-Mongol moves was not long delayed. The energetic Batu's brother, Berke, a skilled military leader and full of fighting enthusiasm, ordered Burunday, the successor of Kuremza, to suppress the warlike activities of Halych-Volyn' Rus' (1259).⁵¹ The latter, though commanding, as the chroni-

⁴⁴ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 68.

⁴⁵ *Documenta Pontificum Romanorum Historiam Ucrainae Illustrantia*, ed. by P. A. G. Welykyj OSBM, Rome, 1953, vol. I, pp. 30-2, 34. (Abbrev. *DPRHUI*.)

⁴⁶ Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 66; V. T. Pashuto, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

⁴⁷ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 33; V. T. Pashuto, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

⁴⁸ John of Plano Carpini, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

⁴⁹ Hrushevs'ky's opinion is that the conflict between Danylo and Kuremza started as early as 1250. He gives a good synopsis of all the events connected with the wars (cf. *op. cit.*, vol. III, pp. 83-5).

⁵⁰ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 29; *id.*, 'Geschichte der islamischen Länder' (*Handbuch der Orientalistik*, Leiden-Cologne, 1953, vol. IV, p. 19).

⁵¹ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8.

cler says, a large army,⁵² did not dare to proceed openly against Danylo; he demanded only that Danylo and his brother Vasył'ko should join him in his campaign against the Lithuanians. Danylo refused to take part in this adventure himself and sent Vasył'ko instead. The next year Burunday, marching against Poland, once more demanded that Danylo should assist him; Danylo refused again, but sent his son Lev and Vasył'ko. This time Burunday demanded that Vasył'ko should demolish all the town battlements, which Vasył'ko, being too weak to resist, was forced to do. Thus all fortifications were pulled down, and all the towns had no other choice but to surrender, with the exception of Cholm, which had received secret instructions from Vasył'ko. Danylo himself was compelled to take refuge abroad.⁵³

Burunday's march against Poland and the demolition of the fortifications of Halych-Volyn' Rus' are considered by some historians to be the turning-point in the relationship of this state to the Mongol empire. Vernadsky especially goes so far as to consider this event to be connected with the administrative partition of Halych-Volyn' Rus' into fiscal-military units (*t'my*), headed by *baskaks*, which would mean an unlimited submission of Danylo's state to Mongol authority. According to Vernadsky's statement Danylo returned to his native country 'with a heavy heart, now as an obedient vassal of the khan'.⁵⁴ At the beginning of our article we took pains to show that the assertion to the effect that Halych-Volyn' Rus' was divided into *t'my* was wrong. Let us first consider whether the relationship between Halych-Volyn' Rus' and the Golden Horde had been changed at all by Burunday's march into Poland. Danylo's double refusal to participate in Mongol warfare is doubtless significant. Even more so is the fact that Danylo's capital, Cholm, refused to surrender on Vasył'ko's advice. How could we then, even forgetting the arguments we have cited before, possibly assume that under such circumstances a division into *t'my* could have been made? How could administrative officers or *baskaks* have been appointed to a country whose towns, even when besieged and facing a strong enemy, could dare to refuse to surrender? There would have been no sense in Danylo's escape from the enemy if he had afterwards had to return as an 'obedient vassal of the khan'. In matters of foreign policy Danylo decided everything himself. Vasył'ko (1245),⁵⁵ refused to talk with Plano Carpini, the papal legate, in the absence of Danylo, who was then in Saray. How could we even think that Vasył'ko would have dared to assume any obligations to the Mongols of his own accord without consulting his brother? It is our firm conviction that Burunday's

⁵² *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 60.

⁵⁴ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8.

⁵³ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, pp. 61-2.

⁵⁵ John of Plano Carpini, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

march did not cause any changes in the relations between Halych-Volyn' Rus' and the Golden Horde. Danylo preserved his own and his country's independence down to his death (1264).

After Burunday's march into Poland the Mongols ceased to trouble Halych-Volyn' Rus' for a long time.⁵⁶ This happened, because the attention of the Mongols was then absorbed by inner conflicts, which lasted through the 1260s and 1270s. The central figure in the events which stirred the Golden Horde was Nogay, a descendant of Chingis Khan himself, a superior and energetic military leader. For his military prowess he received the steppes on the Black Sea from the mouth of the Dnieper to the Lower Danube, a land whose boundaries he quickly enlarged to include the prosperous Crimea, which was soon to become his principal seat of power. Nogay's marriage with Euphrosyne, a daughter of emperor Michael VIII of Byzantium, considerably increased his authority at home and abroad. Some historians, like Vernadsky and Veselovsky, are of the opinion that Nogay declared himself an independent khan (1280).⁵⁷ Parallel to his intense diplomatic activities were his efforts to unite into one whole all the Turkic-speaking tribes who inhabited his territory. These and similar actions of Nogay's, for instance the extension of the *yassa* to cover all his subjects, resulted in the various Turkic elements becoming an ethnic unit and entering history under the name of the Nogays.⁵⁸ The geographical nearness of Halych-Volyn' Rus' caused Nogay to devote increased attention to that country and in due course he was able to put an end to its independence, won by Danylo Romanovych, and to incorporate it into the orbit of Mongol influence not only *de jure* but *de facto*. We do not know the immediate circumstances of the transformation of Halych-Volyn' Rus' into a Mongol dependency. Perhaps Nogay used for his conquest a lull in the wars against Persian Mongols. If that was so, then the submission of Halych-Volyn' Rus' to the Mongol empire could have taken place between the years 1269 and 1274.⁵⁹ The Halych-Volyn' Chronicle, mentioning Danylo's son Lev's request for aid against the Poles, which he submitted to the khan Menke Timur (1274), adds: 'because all the princes were then under the Tartars'.⁶⁰ The dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Mongols is confirmed by the apparently friendly message of Nogay to the Halych-Volyn' princes, about which there is a notice in the chronicle under the year 1277. In this message Nogay expresses himself in this way: 'You always complained of

⁵⁶ This fact is one more argument against the hypothesis that Burunday's march caused the subjugation of Halych-Volyn' Rus' to Mongol authority.

⁵⁷ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-5, 174; N. I. Veselovsky, *Khan iz temnikov Zolotoy Ordyy*. *Nogay i yego vremya*, Petrograd, 1922, p. 54.

⁵⁸ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 238, 363.

⁵⁹ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁶⁰ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 76.

Lithuania; see, now I myself give you my army and the general Mamshiy with it, so go with them against your enemies.⁶¹ When, to continue our argument, Lev contemplated extending the boundaries of his realm with the help of the same Nogay, after the death of Bolesław of Cracow, all other princes had, 'under Tartar pressure', to assist him in his campaign against Poland.⁶² The expression 'all the princes being Tartar underlings' is repeated once again in the above-mentioned chronicle under the year 1285, on the occasion of the Mongol invasion of Hungary,⁶³ and also in the account of the advance of the Mongol army against Poland in 1286 with Halych-Volyn' regiments as auxiliaries.⁶⁴

The dependence of the Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde in the last quarter of the 13th century is thus established without doubt. What then were the duties imposed upon the Halych-Volyn' princes? Above all these princes were bound to send their regiments as auxiliaries to the Mongols on demand. From the records of chroniclers we can assume that this obligation was limited to the wars with the immediate neighbours of Halych-Volyn' Rus' only, such as Hungary, Poland, and Lithuania. We have no record in contemporary chronicles of a Halych-Volyn' army having been recruited for wars against other lands. But we know of the presence of other Rus' regiments in Mongol battles in the Caucasian area,⁶⁵ which leads us to the assumption that other principalities of Rus' were in a state of far greater bondage. A second duty of the Halych-Volyn' princes to their Mongol masters was to pay tribute. This follows quite explicitly from Volodymyr Vasylykovich's testament, which was mentioned before.⁶⁶ It is a matter for regret that we are unable to ascertain from this solitary source the amount, the nature, or the manner of payment of the tribute.⁶⁷ In view of the close attention paid by the Mongols to the collection of taxes from conquered nations,⁶⁸ it would be difficult to imagine that they applied different measures towards Halych-Volyn' Rus'. It is quite certain however that, regardless of what the nature and level of the levies may have been, and of whether they were paid annually or only on some occasions, they were always collected from the population by the princes themselves. As we have already shown, there is no trace of any Mongol *baskaks* or tax-collectors in Halych-Volyn' Rus'. If we then overlook these two obligations, we may surmise that the sovereignty of the princes was never limited in other respects, either

⁶¹ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 79.

⁶² *H.V.L.*, vol. II, pp. 82-3.

⁶³ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 87. Cf. *Letopis' materialov otosyashchikhsya k istorii Zolotoy Ordy*, ed. by V. G. Tizengausen, St Petersburg, 1884, vol. I, pp. 106-7.

⁶⁴ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 90.

⁶⁵ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 59; G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-3.

⁶⁶ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 97.

⁶⁷ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 102.

⁶⁸ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

in internal or in external affairs. The fact that Volodymyr Vasylykovich made his last will in the presence of the 'tsars and their advisers',⁶⁹ i.e. the Mongol khans Telebuga and Aglu during their campaign against Poland, may be considered as a tactical manoeuvre to safeguard the execution of the testament.⁷⁰

With the year 1292 ends the Halych-Volyn' Chronicle, that monumental source of the history of the country. The historian who wishes to rehearse the events in Halych-Volyn' Rus' in the first half of the 14th century is badly handicapped by the very limited number of papal letters, and the scanty, trivial, and often contradictory data to be found in the chronicles of neighbouring lands. It is therefore not to be wondered at that the information available on this period in the history of Halych-Volyn' Rus' is superficial and as a rule very much open to question.

Our assumption with regard to the relations of Halych-Volyn' Rus' to the Mongols is that they did not change so long as the powerful Nogay was alive, in spite of his having been embroiled in conflicts with the Golden Horde. We say that Halych-Volyn' Rus' had had, up to Nogay's death, to pay tribute to the Mongols as well as to send auxiliaries in the event of war. This state of things changed radically after the death of Nogay (1299).⁷¹ Tokhta, now no longer bound in his actions by Nogay, resolved once more to centralise the empire and remove even the slightest trace of centrifugal force, represented, for instance, by Nogay's sons who wished to maintain their independence of the Horde. Such tendencies resulted in internecine strife. Tokhta's victory brought the re-establishment of unity inside the Horde, but simultaneously it considerably weakened the Mongol empire and diminished its prestige abroad.⁷² An Arab source reports that one of Nogay's grandsons fled with a small retinue of supporters to Podillya, and remained there,⁷³ a fact which clearly shows that Tokhta's arm did not reach as far as Podillya. If this area was safe enough for the enemies of the khan of the Golden Horde, we shall not be far from the truth in stating that Halych-Volyn' Rus' had by that time already severed her ties with the Mongol empire. Our assumption with regard to the liberation of Halych-Volyn' Rus' from the Golden Horde could be confirmed by the title acquired by Yuriy, the son of Lev Danylovych, for we know that he uses the title of 'rex Russiae et dux Lodomeriae'. Although historical sources are vague about the coronation of this ruler,⁷⁴ his use of the title according to the

⁶⁹ *H.V.L.*, vol. II, p. 93.

⁷¹ B. Spuler, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁷³ 'Letopis' Beybarsa' in *Sbornik materialov otnosyashchikhsya k istorii Zolotoy Ordy*, ed. by V. G. Tizengauzen, St Petersburg, 1884, vol. I, p. 92.

⁷⁴ Mykola Andrusiak, 'Kings of Kiev and Galicia' (*The Slavonic and East European Review*, London, 1955, vol. XXXIII, no. 81, p. 348).

⁷⁰ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 103.

⁷² G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

contemporary European interpretation of the conception 'rex' nevertheless authorises us to assume that Yuriy considered himself to be an independent sovereign. The hypothesis of the independence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' from the Mongols in those times is confirmed by the foundation of a separate metropolitan see there in 1303.⁷⁵ Hrushevs'ky suggests that behind that event there were strong political motives.⁷⁶

After the death of Yuriy L'vovych in 1308 the sceptre of his realm was transferred to both his sons Andriy and Lev II. From that period we have two documents which indicate without any doubt the relationship of these princes to the Golden Horde.⁷⁷ The first document relates to the agreement between them and the Teutonic Order.⁷⁸ According to this the princes are obliged to defend the Order from the Mongols. It is of no importance that there was little probability that the Mongols would attack the Teutonic Order, but it is an important fact that the princes would never have dared to sign such an agreement as Mongol vassals. Another document throwing some light on the subject is a letter from the Polish ruler Władysław Lokietek to Pope John XXII in 1323. In this letter Władysław Lokietek informs the Pope that both the princes, who were an 'impregnable shield against the Mongols', had passed away.⁷⁹ It is clear that if these princes had been Mongol dependants, Lokietek would never have couched his letter in this way.⁸⁰ Some historians even maintain that both the princes perished in a battle against the Mongols.⁸¹ Matsyak goes still further and assumes there was a Mongol attack on Halych-Volyn' Rus' between 1316 and 1320 under the leadership of Khan Uzbek, which was repulsed by the Romanovyches. Another attack, in still greater strength, is to be assumed as having taken place in 1323, and it is then that both princes were killed.⁸² Matsyak even goes so far as to give details of those encounters, for instance with regard to the strength of the army of Halych-Volyn' Rus', and the auxiliaries from the Teutonic Order, Poland, Hungary, and Lithuania; but the net utility of such assumptions can be gauged only after further collation with the relevant historical sources, which, unfortunately, this author does not cite.

⁷⁵ Teofil Kostruba, *Narysy z cerkovnoyi istoriyi Ukrainy X-XIII stolittya*, Toronto, 1955, p. 112.

⁷⁶ Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 27.

⁷⁷ Volodymyr Matsyak, *Halyc'ko-Volyns'ka Derzhava v novykh doslidakh*, Augsburg, 1948, p. 15.

⁷⁸ *Codex Diplomaticus Prussicus*, ed. Johannes Voigt, Königsberg, 1842, vol. II, p. 92.

⁷⁹ *Monumenta Poloniae Vaticana*, ed. Jan Ptasnik, Cracow, 1913, vol. I, p. 83.

⁸⁰ Henryk Paszkiewicz, *Polityka ruska Kazimierza Wielkiego*, Warsaw, 1925, p. 11.

⁸¹ Ivan Kholm'sky, *Istoriya Ukrainy*, New York-Munich, 1949, p. 84.

⁸² Volodymyr Matsyak, *Halyc'ko-Volyns'ka Derzhava 1290-1340 rr. v novykh doslidakh*, Augsburg, 1948, p. 18; Volodymyr Matsyak, 'Ukrayina 14 stolittya v zudarakh z islamom' (*Ukrayins'ka Dumka*, nos. 31/281-33/283, London, 31 July-7 and 14 August 1952).

After the death of the princes, the throne of Halych-Volyn' Rus' was occupied by their relative, Boleslav Yuriy Troydenovych, known under the name of Yuriy II. This prince being of Polish extraction and a Roman Catholic showed in his internal and external policies a strict Western orientation. He too, like his predecessors, entered into an alliance with the Teutonic Order and undertook to defend it in case of a Mongol attack.⁸³ This also proves our point of view with regard to the full independence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' from the Mongols. This independence is always emphasised by Yuriy II, who deliberately styled himself 'Prince and Lord of Rus' by the Grace of God'.⁸⁴ The only fact which could speak against our hypothesis would be the information given in *Rocznik Świętokrzyski* about a common incursion of the Mongol army and the forces of Halych-Volyn' Rus' into Poland. This event is given by the above-mentioned chronicle under the year 1337.⁸⁵ Historians did not question this relationship, until Paszkiewicz proved on the basis of a very close analysis of sources that this incursion took place as late as 1341,⁸⁶ i.e. after the death of Yuriy II. Vernadsky, in mentioning the election of Yuriy II as prince of Halych-Volyn' Rus', states that 'he was confirmed in his office by Khan Uzbek'.⁸⁷ This assertion Vernadsky bases probably on the chronicle of John of Winterthur,⁸⁸ which calls Yuriy II a vassal of Khan Uzbek. The improbability of the facts related by John of Winterthur has been shown already by Hrushevs'ky, who called attention to the completely confused information given in this chronicle about both the Romanovych princes, Andriy and Lev, and the fantastic account of the death of Yuriy II which it contains.⁸⁹

Yuriy died in the spring of 1340, poisoned by the boyars who were dissatisfied with his internal policy. Immediately after his death the Polish king Casimir attacked Halych-Volyn' Rus', occupied L'vov, and destroyed and sacked the town. This attack caused Dmytro Ded'ko, who had been elected head of Halych-Volyn' Rus', to turn to Khan Uzbek for aid.⁹⁰ With the latter's auxiliary army Ded'ko now marched against Poland,⁹¹ but not without first having surrendered Halych-Volyn' Rus' to the khan as his vassal. It is difficult to imagine any co-operation between Uzbek and Ded'ko without this precautionary step by Uzbek. But the co-operation constitutes the last phase in the history of the dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus'

⁸³ *Codex Diplomaticus Prussicus*, vol. II, p. 157.

⁸⁴ Ivan Kholms'ky, *ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. III, p. 78.

⁸⁶ H. Paszkiewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-7.

⁸⁷ G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

⁸⁸ Johannes Vitodurani Chronica, *Archiv für schweizerische Geschichte*, vol. XI, p. 165.

⁸⁹ M. Hrushevs'ky, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 528.

⁹⁰ *DPRHUI*, vol. I, p. 65.

⁹¹ H. Paszkiewicz, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-72. This author gives a detailed synopsis of sources on the events in question.

on the Golden Horde, and it was of short duration. The very same year Uzbek died, and after a short interval the power of the khan came into the hands of Gambek.⁹² In 1344 Gambek's army marched once more against Poland with auxiliaries from Halych Rus',⁹³ as Volyn' already belonged to Lithuania; but in 1349, after the occupation of Halych Rus' by an allied Polish-Hungarian military expedition, the former was finally conquered and incorporated in Poland. This act put an end to the relationship of vassalage between Halych Rus' and the Golden Horde.

⁹² Spuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-9.

⁹³ H. Paszkiewicz, *op. cit.*, p. 104.