

KYIV-MOHYLA HUMANITIES JOURNAL

Forgeries and Their Social Circulation in the Context of
Historical Culture: The Usable Past as a Resource for Social
Advance in Early Modern Lemberg/Lviv

Author: Alexandr Osipian

Source: Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal 1 (2014): 95–134

Published by: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

<http://kmhj.ukma.edu.ua>

Forgeries and Their Social Circulation in the Context of Historical Culture: The Usable Past as a Resource for Social Advance in Early Modern Lemberg/Lviv¹

Alexandr Osipian

Kramatorsk Institute of Economics and Humanities,
Department of History and Cultural Studies

Abstract

The main purpose of this paper is to put the charter – for a long time seen as simply forgery – into a wider context of historical culture of the epoch. It also aims to investigate motive, means, and opportunity, as used by the social actors – the forgers. The examination of the forgeries not only uncovers the historical imagination of their producers but also helps our better understanding of the historical culture of the epoch and its social circulation in a given society. The study of “Prince Fedor’s charter of 1062” examines how urban elites accepted the noblemen’s political and historical culture and used it for their own purposes. The author of the paper examines how the social aspirations and dominant cultural framework in the host society influenced the wealthy Armenian Diaspora to promote some possible options of the usable past and to abandon other ones. Finally, it shows how the elements of all these options were combined into a new narrative in the nineteenth century, in accordance with the historical culture of Romantic nationalism.

Key Words:

forgers, historical imagination, usable past, social advance, urban patricians, Armenian merchants, ennoblement.

1 This article was written thanks to my fellowships at the International Cultural Centre (Cracow, Poland), and Deutsches Historisches Institut Warschau (Warsaw, Poland). I am grateful to the New Europe College (Bucharest, Romania) for the financial support of my research trip to Rome. I am grateful to Prof. Oxana Pakhlovska, Prof. Giovanna Siedina, and Dr. Felicia Roșu who helped to arrange my visit to Rome and, therefore, my archival work at the Archivio storico Congregazione per l’evangelizzazione dei popoli (“De Propaganda Fide”), in Biblioteca Pontificio Istituto Orientale and in Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Roma.

The images of the past are a product, yet at the same time they figure as an influential factor in the discourses of the identity of social groups. According to Bo Strath, “History does not exist ‘out there,’ waiting to be discovered, but is permanently invented in order to give meaning to the present – and to the future – through the past.”² Thus, the examination of the forgeries not only uncovers the historical imagination of their producers but also helps to understand better the historical culture of the epoch and its social circulation in the given society.

By 1500, senses of the past among elite groups had clearly become a major if not predominant element in various political cultures of Europe.³ There can be little doubt that the 16th and 17th centuries witnessed an enormous efflorescence in historical interest among European social elites. Professor Bernd Schneidmüller’s note of the changes in urban historical consciousness in late medieval Germany could be easily applied to late 16th–17th century Lemberg: “It is important to note that urban historiography was subject to a general process by which urban society increasingly splits into strata. When the patriciate emerged as an authority endowed with a God-given right to rule, urban chroniclers, when describing the origins of their city as a social body, no longer focused exclusively on the emancipation of the city dwellers from their lords ... [Now] ... city chroniclers [...] were far more interested in explaining the royal acts of favor that had fostered the development of their cities. They integrated the community of burghers into the history of realm.”⁴

2 Bo Strath, introduction to “Myth, Memory and History in the Construction of Community,” in *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community: Historical Patterns in Europe and Beyond*, ed. Bo Strath (Bruxelles, Bern, Berlin, Frankfurt/M, New York, Wien: P.I.E.-Peter Lang, 2000), 26.

3 Orest Ranum, introduction to *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. Orest Ranum (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 5.

4 Bernd Schneidmüller, “Constructing the Past by Means of the Present: Historiographical Foundations of Medieval Institutions, Dynasties, Peoples, and Communities,” in *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 189.

In 1641, representatives of Lemberg's Armenian community submitted to the royal chancery a charter, issued in 1062 by the great Prince of Rus Fedor (Theodore), son of Dmitry. According to the charter, the Prince invited Armenian warriors to help him at war and allowed them to settle anywhere in his domains. The Armenian community used the Latin translation of this charter in a lawsuit against the city magistrate of Lemberg in 1654 and was granted some privileges by King Jan Kazimierz. But, as we know, in 1062, there was no Ruthenian prince with such a name. The original charter, written in Old-Slavonic or Ruthenian, was lost in the early 19th century. In the late 19th century, with the development of a positivist critical approach some scholars doubted the authenticity of the charter.⁵ The last time the charter caught scholarly attention was in the 1960s. In 1962, young Ukrainian historian Iaroslav Dashkevych made a statement that the charter is an evident forgery because of the lack of many features obligatory for late medieval charters.⁶ His statement was attacked by the Armenian historian Vardges Mikaelian, who insisted on the authenticity of the charter.⁷ This discussion had no further development. In some of his later papers Dashkevych simply repeated his positivist criticism of the charter.⁸ Being positivists, both scholars absolutely

5 Tadeusz Gromnicki, *Ormjanie w Polsce. Ich historja, prawa i przywileje* (Warszawa, 1889), 9–10. For more general survey, see: V.F. Inkin, "Chy ie istorychna osnova v falsyfikatakh hramot kniazia Lva Danylovycha?" ["Is there Historical Ground in the Falsified Charters of Prince Lev, son of Daniel?"] *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu* 24 (1988): 55–63.

6 Iaroslav Dashkevych, "Hramota Fedora Dmytrovycha 1062 roku (Narys z ukraïnskoï dyplo-matyky)," ["Charter Issued by Fedor Dmytrovych in 1062 (A Study in Ukrainian Diploma-cy),"] *Naukovo-informatsynyi biuleten arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSS* 4 (1962): 9–20.

7 Vardges Mikaelian, "K voprosu o gramote Fedora Dmitrievicha," ["On the Issue of Fedor Dmitrievich's Charter,"] *Arkheograficheskii iezhegodnik za 1964 god.* 1965: 11–19.

8 Iaroslav Dashkevych, "Drevniaia Rus i Armenia v obshchestvenno-politicheskikh sviaziah XI–XIII vekov. (Istochniki issledovania temy)," ["Social and Political Contacts of Ancient Rus and Armenia in the 11th–13th Centuries: Problems of New Reading of Source Mate-rial,"] *Drevneishie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR. Materialy i issledovania*, 1984: 177–95; Iaroslav Dashkevych, "Davnii Lviv u virmenskykh ta virmeno-kypchatskykh dzherelakh," ["Old Lviv in Armenian and Armeno-Kipchak Sources,"] *Ukraina v mynulomu* 1 (1992): 7–13; Yaroslav Dachkevych, "Who are the Armeno-Kipchaks (On the Ethnic Substrate of the Armenian Colonies in the Ukraine)," *Revue des études arméniennes* 16 (1982): 357–416.

ignored the socio-cultural context in which Theodore's charter was used. Moreover, they did not even try to pose questions about a general perception of the past in the early modern period, the historical imagination of the townspeople in Lviv, and – what is more important – the uses of the distant past by the Armenian community before 1641.

When it is discovered that a forgery is indeed a forgery, the temptation may be simply to call it that and stop, instead of attempting to study the relationship of the particular forgery to historical culture.

As an umbrella term to capture what is being described in the present paper, I have chosen the term “historical culture.” According to Daniel Woolf,

A historical culture consists of habits of thought, languages, media of communication, patterns of social convention that embrace elite and popular, narrative and non-narrative modes of discourse. It is expressed both in texts and in commonplace forms of behaviour – for instance, the resolution of conflicts through reference to a widely accepted historical standard such as ‘antiquity.’⁹

This paper can contribute to the study of the following two aspects of early modern historical culture: the social construction of the distant past as evidence to resolve legal disputes and its uses by urban elites for their social advance. The investigation of this microscale case could also contribute to a better understanding of developments in the township's historical imagination in early modern Europe.

The difficulty is that these sorts of questions are not the only ones that can or should be asked in connection with Polish historical thought during the early modern period. What we now need to know is what turned the townspeople in Lemberg – and Armenian merchants residing there in particular – who were not remarkably interested in their national and local urban history in the 1560s, and only marginally more so in the 1600s, a generation later, into people thoroughly preoccupied with history in the 1630s–1670s (so absorbed by it that they not only used

9 Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 9–10.

their recently constructed distant past along with other arguments in their lawsuits, but also as a significant point in their self-representation reflected in Catholic missionaries' reports). In order to do this, we need to move beyond a study of the narrow cohort of well-known historians of that period and to look a bit closer at the background for explanations, namely to study the perception of the distant past by burghers and its uses for practical needs as evidence to resolve legal disputes. Thus, in order to explain why in 1641 the Armenian community in Lemberg put into circulation the forged or reinvented "charter of the Prince Theodore," we have to ask a set of questions: *when, why* and *how* the Armenian urban elite began its appeal to the distant past to make an argument.

According to Anthony Grafton, there are circumstances that need clarification when any forgery is to be investigated: *motive, means, and opportunity*. The paper examines these three things.¹⁰

The chronological framework begins with the 1570s – when the Polish Diet restricted access to nobility status for foreigners and "plebeians," and construction of the usable past was launched in the trials between wealthy Armenian merchants and the city magistrate. And it ends in the 1670s, when both competing groups of Lemberg's elite completed their historical identity construction and ennoblement.

Social Advance and its Restriction in Early Modern Poland

In the late 15th and early 16th centuries, the Polish nobility (*szlachta*) gained many privileges and restricted the power of the king. On 26 April 1496, King Jan I Olbracht granted the Privilege of Piotrków, increasing the nobility's feudal power over serfs. It bound the peasant to the land, as only one son (not the eldest) was permitted to leave the village; townfolk (*mieszczaństwo*) were prohibited from owning land; and positions in the Church hierarchy could be given only to nobles. On 23 October 1501, the nobles were given the right to disobey the king or his representatives –

10 Anthony Grafton, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (London: Collins & Brown, 1990), 37.

in Latin, “non praestanda oboedientia” – and to form confederations, an armed rebellion against the king or state officers if the nobles thought that the law or their legitimate privileges were being infringed. On 3 May 1505, King Alexander I (1501–1506) granted the Act of “Nihil novi nisi commune consensu” (“I accept nothing new except by common consent”). This forbade the king to pass any new law without the consent of the representatives of the nobility, in the *Sejm* and *Senat* assembled, and thus greatly strengthened the nobility’s political position. Basically, this act transferred legislative power from the king to the Polish Diet – *Sejm*. In 1505, one such act forbade noblemen to engage in trade or commerce, with the penalty of loss of noble status. The end of the Jagellon dynasty in 1572 and introduction of the elective monarchy enabled the nobility to establish a monopoly of political power in Poland. Thus, by the 1570s the *szlachta* had become a separate, closed, hereditary estate jealously guarding its rights, privileges and all means by which it could be accessed.

According to Fernand Braudel, “The headiest days of the sixteenth century, for example, from as early as 1470 until say 1580, were [...] an age of accelerated social promotion throughout Europe... A bourgeoisie emerging from the background of trade was climbing by its own efforts to the highest place in contemporary society. During the last years of the century by contrast, with the reversal of the secular trend, or at any rate a prolonged intercyclical depression, the societies of continental Europe put up the barriers once more.”¹¹ He suggested that the process of social mobility “was twofold – in the course of this long century, a section of the nobility disappeared and was immediately replaced, but once the gaps had been made good the door swung to behind the newcomers.”¹²

Braudel also pointed out that instead of obvious time lags and diversities between one country and another “social developments had a tendency to be synchronized throughout Europe.”¹³ In the Polish kingdom, the growing aspirations of the urban elite for ennoblement and “the noble

11 Fernand Braudel, *The Wheels of Commerce*, trans. S. Reynolds (London, 2002), 478.

12 Ibid.

13 Braudel, *The Wheels of Commerce*, 477.

way of life” became evident in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁴ It was caused mostly by the nobility’s policies towards the cities. The 16th and 17th centuries witnessed the growing discrimination of townspeople by the nobility, which ruled the country through their dominance in the *Sejm*.

Noble status was very attractive to city patricians not only as a sign of prestige, but also because it freed them from many taxes. As a rule, the city patricians were ennobled through offering credits to the king, rarely through service in the courts of magnates (senators), ecclesiastical service, or marriage with a noblewoman. The nobleman Walerian Nekanda Trepka (1585–1640), in his treaty “*Liber chamorum*”¹⁵ written in 1626, counted 2,500 false noblemen in early 17th-century Poland, half of them “burgher’s sons.”

There were three ways to be ennobled in the early modern Polish kingdom.¹⁶

Adoption (*adopcja*) was the basis of ennoblement, a legal act issued by the monarch to a person from a lower class, often a foreigner. This pure form of ennoblement, took place in a situation when a person of the lower class was adopted into a clan and into its coat of arms (*herb*) by its armigerous representative(s). The first recorded ennoblement took place in 1419 when Szymon Szczecina, burgher of Brzesc Kujawski, was ennobled for his deeds carried out during the war against the Teutonic Knights. The *Szlachta* was rightly cautious, however, when it believed that not all ennobled persons were worthy of this honour. Its apprehension was even more justified by the rapid increase in the number of the ennoblements owed to merits rendered doubtful by the *szlachta*. It should

14 Marta Bogucka, “Miejsce mieszczanina w społeczeństwie szlacheckim. Atrakcyjność wzorców życia szlacheckiego w Polsce XVII wieku,” in *Spółeczeństwo staropolskie*, ed. A. Wyczański (Warszawa, 1976), 185–219.

15 Walerian Nekanda Trepka, *Liber generationis plebeanorum: Liber chamorum* (Wrocław, 1995).

16 Edmund Juško, *Nobilitacje i indygenaty jako droga awansu społecznego w Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej w XVII wieku* (Tarnów: Biblos, 2006); Andrzej Kulikowski, *Heraldyka szlachecka* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Chateau, 1990).

not be surprising then, that the *szlachta* wanted to defend itself against usurpers by many acts passed by the *Sejm*.

In the Kingdom of Poland, ennoblement (*nobilitacja*) was also granted by the monarch. From 1578, this was done by the King and the *Sejm*, since in 1578 the *Sejm* passed, what has been called *Plebeiorum Nobilitato*, a law depriving the sovereign of his power to create new grants of ennoblement. The only exception to this rule was ennoblement on the battlefield for outstanding bravery. All other cases from then onwards had to be first consulted with the *Sejm* and to receive approval from the Upper House (Senate). From 1641 ennoblement was done by the *Sejm* only. In the beginning, *nobilitacja* (Royal grants of ennoblement) followed the adoption rules – it entitled many ennobled persons to bear already existing arms used by different noble clans and share in all privileges of the nobles. However, since 1633 when the *Sejm* passed a law which put a definite end to the adoption and granting of old coats of arms, each new nobleman had to have new arms created specifically for him. Finally, from 1678 ennoblement could be granted only to a Catholic.

Indygenat or naturalization was the third official way of becoming a member of the Polish nobility. This one concerned only foreigners of noble origins (Latin *indigenatus*). The procedure involved here was also quite difficult. Before 1573, that is the times of elective kings, applicants taking pains for such grants had only to take an oath of faith and prove their noble descent. From 1573 onward, the terms presented by the *Sejm* on which such grants were made became more and more demanding. Firstly, a candidate had to demonstrate his merits toward the country; secondly, he was obliged to prove his noble status from his country of origin before the Crown or the Lithuanian Chancellery; thirdly, in the *Sejm*, in the presence of the Upper and the Lower House, the candidate had to take a personal oath of faith to the King and *Rzeczpospolita* (the Commonwealth). Next, he had to purchase an estate before a subsequent gathering of the *Sejm*.

The arrogant attitude toward townspeople and the peasantry was affirmed and elaborated within the so-called culture of Sarmatism or

the Sarmatian ideology.¹⁷ Noblemen were proclaimed the exclusive descendants of the Sarmatians, who dominated Eastern Europe in ancient times.¹⁸ Townspeople and the peasantry became descendants of the subjugated natives. Noblemen regarded military service as the only way to obtain noble status. Thus, a warrior became a synonym for a nobleman (*szlachcic*).

It is hardly surprising that both wealthy Armenian and Catholic patri-cians in Lemberg began to emphasize the noble origins of their ancestors. Under the influence of Sarmatism, in the writings of the local Catholic humanists the early German settlers in Lemberg were transformed into German mercenaries (*stipendiarii Germani*) in the service of King Casimir III, who conquered Galicia and allegedly settled his German warriors in Lemberg in the 1340s.¹⁹

Armenian Merchants in Search of the Usable Past

In the 13th–14th centuries, many Armenian merchants who were actively involved in transcontinental trade migrated to the northern shore of the Black Sea. They used land routes through the Tatar steppelands and the Ruthenian principality of Galicia and Volhynia. In the second half of the 13th and first half of the 14th centuries some Armenian merchants settled in the territory of the principality wherein the city

17 Stanisław Cynarski, "The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland," *Acta Poloniae Historica* 19 (1968): 5–17.

18 See historical works of M. Miechowski (1517), M. Bielski (1554), M. Kromer (1555), A. Guagnini (1579), M. Strykowski (1582), and S. Sarnicki (1587).

19 Sebastian Petrici, *Polityki Aristotelesowey, to iest rządu Rzeczypospolitey z dokładem ksiąg osmiuro* (Kraków, 1605), 187; Ioannes Alnpekius, "Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae," in *Jan Alnpek i jego "Opis miasta Lwowa" z początku XVII w.*, ed. S. Rachwał (Lwów, 1930), 11; J.-B. Zimorowicz, "Leopolis triplex," in *Opera quibus res gestae urbis Leopolis illustrantur*, ed. K.J. Heck (Lwów, 1899), 37, 61–63. For more details see my paper: Alexandr Osipian, "Vynaidennia prestyzhnykh predkiv u konteksti svitohliadu miskoho patrytsiatu u Lvovi 17 st.: 'pershi nimtsi' ta 'dvoznachni virmeny' u 'Patriynomu Lvovi' J.-B. Zimorowicza," ["The Invention of the Prestigious Forefathers in the Context of Worldview of the Urban Patricians in the Seventeenth Century Lemberg: 'Primary Germans' and 'Ambiguous Armenians' in Józef-Bartłomiej Zimorowicz's 'Leopolis triplex,'"] *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal* 5 (2013): 192–229.

of Lviv²⁰ which was recently founded and named after Prince Lev (Leon) (1264–1301), son of Danylo. From the very beginning, Lviv was a multiethnic city inhabited by Ruthenians, Armenians, Jews, Tatars, and Saracens. The German merchants and artisans, mostly from Poland and Silesia, were invited by the Ruthenian Prince Danylo (1238–1264), in the mid-13th century. All these urban “nations” were protected by the prince and his successors. After the Polish conquest of Galicia in 1349, local German townspeople (*cives catholici*) became the dominant community as the Catholics were supported by the Polish kings. On the other hand, the rights of other urban “nations” were guaranteed and confirmed by the Polish King Casimir (Kazimierz III) in 1356, when the city was granted the German Law (*ius theutonicum*) – so-called *Magdeburger Recht*. Thus, Lviv became Lemberg (also known as Lemburga or Leopolis).

Non-Catholics (*schismatici*) were not accepted into the city community. They were not treated as *cives*, i.e. the citizens of Lemberg. All members of the city magistrate were Catholics.²¹ In the central intramural part of the city, there were special streets for Armenians, Ruthenians, and Jews. Economic opportunities of the heretics and Jews were also restricted. They were not admitted into the artisan guilds. Trade of many goods was prohibited or restricted for the Armenian as well as Ruthenian and Jewish merchants to the benefit of the Catholic ones.²² Oriental trade was the only economic niche the Catholic city authorities allowed the Armenians.²³ On the other hand, Armenian merchants were used

20 The original name of the city was *Lvov* or *Lviv*. Then it was renamed by German settlers in the mid-fourteenth century as *Lemburg*. In the neo-Latin writings, the city was named *Leopolis*. In Polish it is known as *Lwów*. From 1772 to 1918 the city – as well Galicia/Galizien province – was part of Habsburg Empire where it was known as *Lemberg*. Under this name, the city was known in modern times in the main European languages.

21 Eleonora Nadel-Golobic, “Armenians and Jews in Medieval Lvov: The Role in Oriental Trade, 1400–1600,” *Cahires du Monde russe et soviétique* 20 (1979): 352–53.

22 Łucja Charewiczowa, *Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schyzmatyckich i żydów we Lwowie XV–XVI w.* (Lwów, 1925).

23 For more details on Armenian trade with Orient, see: A. Dziubiński, *Na szlakach Orientu. Handel między Polską a Imperium Osmańskim w XVI–XVIII wieku* (Wrocław, 1998); Nadel-Golobic, “Armenians,” 363–65.

as interpreters in the Royal chancery. Some of them were diplomats or spies, listed in the royal service.²⁴ They also provided credits to the king in cases of emergency. For all these reasons, Polish kings protected the Armenian community.

The city magistrate, controlled by the Catholic patricians made successive efforts to restrict the judicial autonomy of the Armenian community. In accordance with the royal decree of 1469, the office of the Armenian judge (*advocatus, wójt*) was abolished.²⁵ The further decrees of 1476²⁶ and 1510²⁷ established new order when the court of Armenian elders was headed by the city judge. Cases of manslaughter, bloody and bruised wounds, of larceny and Armenian real estate (so-called “four articles”), belonged to the jurisdiction of the city jury, which would try these cases according to Magdeburg Law. Other court cases, both civil and criminal, were under the jurisdiction of a mixed court and were judged by Armenian Law.²⁸

In the second half of the 16th century, there was an evident growth of tension between the Catholic patricians, who gradually transformed magistrate offices into their hereditary domain, and the Armenian community, caused mainly by economic reasons. Using their capital accumulated previously in oriental trade, Armenian merchants began to push their Catholic competitors out of the Lemberg market. Efforts made by the wealthy Armenians to buy houses in the central market square – the most prestigious part of the city – were also seen by the Catholic patricians as a symbolic act – to challenge the dominant position of Catholics in the city. Thus, there was also a social conflict between these two elite groups.

24 B. Baranowski, “Ormianie w służbie dyplomatycznej Rzeczypospolitej,” *Mysł karaimska. Rocznik naukowo-społeczny. Seria Nowa* 1, XXIII (1945–1946): 119–37; K. Wróbel-Lipowa, “Działalność dyplomatyczna Ormian polskich w XVI–XVII w.,” *Studia z dziejów kontaktów polsko-ormiańskich*, ed. M. Zakrzewska-Dubasowa (Lublin, 1983): 107–17.

25 Royal charters granted to the national communities in the city of Lviv in 14th–18th centuries, see: *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad mista Lvova (XIV–XVIII st.) [Royal Charters Granted to the National Communities in the City of Lviv in the 14th–18th Centuries]*, ed. Myron Kapral (Lviv: Piramida, 2000), 146.

26 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 147–48.

27 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 169–72.

28 F. Bischoff, *Das alte Recht der Armenier in Lemberg* (Wien, 1862), 39–42.

One group was the “bourgeoisie of office (talent),” i.e. the narrow circle of well-educated city notables as hereditary officeholders who also had aspirations for ennoblement. Another group consisted of the “bourgeoisie of commerce,” i.e. prosperous Armenian merchants who wanted to obtain equal civil and economic rights with the Catholics. In 1563, the Armenian community filed a legal case against the city magistrate. The Armenians appealed to King Sigismund II August (1548–1572) that the city magistrate made unlawful restrictions of their judicial and economic rights. The king issued an edict which for the most part maintained the status quo.²⁹

In 1578, there was a trial in the presence of the recently elected King Stefan Bathory (1576–1586), who was previously Prince of Transylvania. The Armenians stated that they are citizens of Lemberg; their ancestors were not restricted in their rights, and they demonstrated to the king their old charters that they had received from his predecessors. The representatives of the magistrate stated that: “Armenians are not equal [to them] because of the difference in languages and religions” that is, they are not citizens (*cives*) of Lemberg, but strangers and infidels. To obtain equal rights with Catholic burghers in Lemberg, local Armenians stated that their ancestors were invited by the Galician Prince Danylo and demonstrated the old and short charter.³⁰ The King granted to the local Armenians equal economic rights with the Catholics.³¹

There were numerous trials between the magistrate and the Armenian community in the 15th and 16th centuries, but the Armenians never used the charter of Prince Danylo. In every trial, they demonstrated to the king the royal decrees issued by his predecessors to the Armenian

29 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 277–83.

30 Actually, it was the Catholic Archbishop of Lemberg Jan-Dymitr Solikowski (1583–1603) who mentioned in his project of reconciliation between the city magistrate and Armenians wrote down on 8 December 1597, that Armenians demonstrated “the old and short charter” of the Prince Danylo to the King Stefan Bathory in 1578. Quoted by Myron Kapral, *Natsionalni hromady Lvova XVI–XVIII st.: Sotsialno-pravovi vzaemyny* [*The National Communities of Lviv in the 16th–18th Centuries: Social and Juridical Relations*] (Lviv: Piramida, 2003), 368–69.

31 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 298–300.

community. Daniel's charter was of no significance, because after the Polish conquest of Galicia in 1349, and re-foundation of Lviv as Lemberg in 1356, charters issued by Ruthenian princes lost their judicial power. The land grants issued by the Ruthenian princes to the local nobility were translated into Latin and confirmed by the Polish kings in the second half of the 14th century. By then the Ruthenian originals were out of use.

In 1578, the Armenians used Danylo's charter for the first time to prove that Armenians are not newcomers to Lemberg – their ancestors had settled there at the moment of the city foundation by Lev, son of Danylo. Thus, the remote past – the epoch before the Polish conquest – was neglected before it became a crucial argument in this and further trials.

The first documented interest in the history of Armenian settlement in Lemberg goes back to the days of Cardinal Giovanni Francisco Commendoni, papal nuncio in Poland (1563–1565), who visited the city in 1564. During this visit, he collected information about heretics and schismatics in Galician Rus. In his biography, published later by his secretary Antonio Maria Gratiani, there is a summary of his investigation about the origins of the Armenian Diaspora in Ruthenia (Rus): “The Armenian nation living in that city [of Lviv] has its Archbishop. Under the press of Turkish tyranny they left their old places and crossed the Black Sea and from the estuary of the Danube came through Walachia to Rus where they settled with the permission of the king. And the Armenians are useful for Rus because of their trade with the Turks, and the Persians, and with other inhabitants of the Black Sea [region]. And a lot of foreign [merchandise] they import into Poland.”³² Commendoni's interest in Armenians and their history is also reflected in a letter written to him on 10 December 1564 by the local humanist Stanisław Orzechowski, a nobleman of the Przemyszl county of the *Ruthenia* district (*palatinatum*). In his letter, Orzechowski addressed some issues they discussed previously at their meeting. While describing the multi-confessional population of Rus, he

32 Antonii Mariae Gratiani, *De vita Jannis Francisci Commendoni cardinalis libri quatuor* (Parisii: Apud Sebastianum Mabre-Cramoisy, 1669), 166–67.

also noted that “There are also Armenians in Rus and I know nothing about their arrival in Rus from their motherland.”³³ Thus, contemporary inhabitants of Lemberg knew nothing about invitation of the Armenians by Danylo or Lev.

Danylo’s son Lev was much more popular in Lemberg, since he was seen as the founder of the city in local legends. These legends were recorded by Martin Gruneweg, a German born in Danzig, who was in the service of the Armenian merchant Aswadur in 1582–1588.³⁴ Charters issued by Lev were fabricated many times in 16th century Galicia.

Why did the Armenians not use Danylo’s charter in 1563 and did use it in 1578? What changed between 1563 and 1578?

Consciousness of Rupture and Change

According to Daniel Woolf, the general sense of change and temporal difference in the 16th century was inspired by a profound sense of political instability along with the Reformation and actual observable change in the material and cultural environment.³⁵ My point is that the Polish Kingdom experienced the same situation of rupture and change in the second half of the 16th century, witnessing rising food prices, which in turn led to the reorientation of the Polish economy, deforestation, changing tastes, etc. The most evident rupture between past and present happened in the 1570s with the extinction of the Jagiellonian dynasty, the introduction of the elective monarchy, and the first elections in 1573 and 1575. Introduction of the Gregorian calendar in 1583 in the multi-confessional Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth provoked numerous religious disputes and as a result – reflections on temporality.

Every new king – after the extinction of the Jagiellonian dynasty in 1572 was elected by the assembly of the nobility – confirmed to the

33 Stanisław Orzechowski-Roxolan, “Lyst do Yana-Francisco Commendoni: 10 hrudnia 1564,” [“Letter to Giovanni Francisco Commendoni, 10 December 1564,”] in *Ukrainska literatura XIV–XVI st.*, ed. Vasył Mykytas (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988), 156.

34 Martin Gruneweg, “Opys Lvova,” [“Description of Lviv,”] *Zhovten* 10 (1980): 110–11.

35 Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, 21.

Armenian community of Lemberg all the decrees issued by his predecessors, thereby re-establishing relations between a suzerain and a group of his subjects – as it happened in 1387, 1461, 1509, 1519, 1548, 1574, 1576, and 1588.³⁶ The extinction of the Jagiellonian dynasty (1386–1572) and four years of interregnum and calamities in 1572–1576 were perceived by contemporaries as an evident breaking line which separated the present from the recent past.³⁷ This break also gave an opportunity to revise some “charters” derived from this epoch. Thus, an ancient past beyond effective historical continuity could be used as a valuable argument.

In 1569, the unification of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was proclaimed in the Diet in Lublin. Both states maintained their autonomy in the new dual state. On the other hand, the lands of South Ruthenia (Rus) (modern Ukraine) were handed from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Kingdom of Poland. These South-Ruthenian lands, with the numerous Orthodox nobility, joined Galician Rus (*Ruthenia Rubra*), conquered by Poland in the 1340s. Prior to 1569, the Ruthenian past in the Polish kingdom was of no value, but then the situation changed. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania was based on the cultural heritage of Kyivan Rus, and the overwhelming majority of the Duchy’s nobility and aristocracy were Orthodox Ruthenians. Since the act of unification resulted from the compromise achieved by the nobility of both countries, the rights and privileges of the south-Ruthenian nobility were confirmed in the Kingdom with a dominant Catholic faith. Thus, the act of unification of 1569 rehabilitated the Ruthenian past in the Kingdom of Poland.³⁸

36 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 124, 136–37, 167–68, 251–52, 266–67, 295–96, 302.

37 Many contemporary Polish authors trace Polish history from the death of the King Sigismund II August in 1572 as the starting point of their narratives. See, for instance: Ś. Orzelski, *Bezkrólewia Ksiąg Ośmioro 1572–1576* (Kraków, 1617); Reinhold Heidenstein, *Rerum Polonicarum ab excessu Sigismundi Augusti libri XII* (Francoforti, 1672); I.D. Solicovius, *Commentarius brevis rerum Polonicarum a morte Sigismundi Augusti* (Dantisci, 1647).

38 The rehabilitation of the Ruthenian past from the Polish upper-classes point of view also reflected in its growing interest to the history of Ruthenian lands. Two works were published in a few years: Alexander Guagninus, *Sarmatiae Europaeae descriptio* (Cracoviae, 1578); Maciej Strykowski, *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi* (Cracoviae, 1582).

In the Diet of Lublin there were also confirmed charters issued by Prince Lev, son of Danylo. Many of these charters were fabricated long after the prince's death. However, they were not forged *ex nihilo*. In many instances, original charters were lost due to wars, fires, and other societal and natural disasters. The fabricators themselves, mostly local noblemen, saw the fabrication as a renovation and restoration of the lost charters, in accordance with memory and tradition. They also introduced new contemporary realities into the renovated charters in accordance with their claims (mostly for the inherited lands granted to their forefathers by Ruthenian princes of Galicia).³⁹ During the trial of 1578, Armenians of Lemberg could use the same model. My point is that “the old and short charter” of Prince Danylo, which they demonstrated to King Stefan Bathory in 1578 and to Catholic Archbishop of Lemberg Jan-Dymitr Solikowski in 1597, could be identified as a letter of protection, given by the Prince to Armenian merchants. Such letters granted free passage – *salvum conductum* – for the merchants and guaranteed their protection in the domains of a certain lord or state. In our disposal there are letters granted to the foreign merchants by Ruthenian and Lithuanian princes, Khans of the Golden Horde, and the Republics of Genoa and Venice in their overseas domains in the late 13th and early 14th centuries.⁴⁰ By adding new details, Armenians could transform this letter of free passage into a charter of invitation of their ancestors by Danylo and the foundation of their settlement

39 Inkin, “Chy ie istorychna osnova?” 61–62.

40 The Charters Issued by the Cities of Great Novgorod and Pskov *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, ed. S.N. Valk (Moscow, 1949), 57; *Hramoty XIV stolittya [The Charters Issued in the Fourteenth Century]*, ed. M.M. Peshchak (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974), 23–24; Oleh Kupchynsky, ed., *Akty ta dokumenty Halytsko-Volynskoho kniazivstva XIII – pershoi polovyny XIV stolittya. Doslidzhennia. Teksty [Acts and Documents of the Galician-Volhynian Principality of the 13th–14th Centuries: Investigations and Texts]* (Lviv, 2004), 152–58, 158–61, 194–200; S.P. Karpov, *Italianskie morskije respubliki i Iuzhnoe Prichernomorie v XIII–XV vekakh: problemy torgovli [Italian Maritime Republics and the South Black Sea Region in the 13th–15th Centuries: Problems of Trade]* (Moscow, 1990), 323; Donald Ostrowski, *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influence on the Steppe Frontier, 1304–1589* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 118; Thomas T. Allsen, “Mongolian Princes and Their Merchant Partners, 1200–1260,” *Asia Major* 2 (1989): 84.

(*locatio*) in his domains. In their complaint to King Sigismund III, submitted by Catholic townspeople of Lemberg between 1597 and 1600 in order to revise the royal decree of 1578, they stated that “Armenians connect their invitation to the aforementioned Danylo. At that time, the city of Lviv did not exist yet. In accordance with it, there is no doubt whatsoever that they were invited not to the city of Lviv, but to the lands of Rus...”⁴¹

The act of unification of Poland and Lithuania in a dual state in 1569 guaranteed to the senators, dignitaries, and nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – who in majority were of the Orthodox faith – equal rights with the Polish nobility, senators, and dignitaries, the majority of whom were of the Catholic faith.⁴² Though equal rights were guaranteed only to the noble estate, this act was used as a precedent by the Orthodox townspeople of Lemberg, gradually marginalized by the dominant Catholic community after the Polish conquest and introduction of Magdeburg Law in the city. The Ruthenian community appealed to King Sigismund II August who in turn issued a decree on 20 May 1572, by which he granted Orthodox Ruthenians of Lemberg the same rights as the Catholic townspeople were granted in 1356, in particular, to have their representatives on the city council. In the text of the decree, a reference was made by the king to the recent act of unification in 1569 as a precedent: “since the equation of the noblemen of the Kingdom of Poland and of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is complete, it is even more necessary to maintain the same equality between people of lesser and lower estates.” The decree of 1572 emphasized that the Ruthenians are now accepted in Lemberg with the same rights as the “Polish townspeople of the Roman faith” ordinarily used, which “were granted to the city of Lemberg for different occasions and in different ways by our glorious predecessors, dearest kings of Poland, and dukes of Rus, as well

41 Quoted in Dashkevych, “Drevniaia Rus i Armenia,” 195.

42 It is worthy adding that in 1573 – in a time of religious conflicts in western Europe and a few months after “St. Bartholomew massacre” in Paris – the assembly of Polish nobility proclaimed religious freedom for all Christian denominations in the Kingdom by the special act. Stanisław Grzybowski, “The Warsaw Confederation of 1573 and Other Acts of Religious Tolerance in Europe,” *Acta Poloniae Historica* 40 (1979): 75–96. This act was valid for almost a century, but only within the noble estate.

as by other lords and governors of our Kingdom and domains.”⁴³ For the first time in a royal decree issued to the city of Lemberg, privileges granted by the Ruthenian princes were mentioned. Moreover, these princes (*duci Russiae*) were put in a line after the Polish kings but before “other lords and governors.” Thus, the Ruthenian past before the Polish conquest of the 1340s evidently became valuable and could be used by Armenians who, undoubtedly, were aware of the Ruthenians’ success in 1572.

It is possible that another precedent was also important for the Armenians in 1578. In the trial, representatives of the magistrate demanded from the Armenians to show a charter of foundation (*locatio*) of their community in Lemberg. The Armenians initially stated that there is no such a charter at their disposal. Though later they “demonstrated the old and short charter of [the Prince] Danylo.” In accordance with late medieval and early modern juridical practices, every foreign “nation” invited or allowed to settle in a certain city within the Kingdom of Poland was granted a charter of foundation by the king. The Jews were the most evident example. In 1264, Boleslaw the Pious, the Prince of the Greater Poland principality, allowed Jews to settle in his domains and granted them a privilege. Several decades later, when Casimir III (1333–1370) restored the Kingdom of Poland from a conglomerate of independent principalities, Boleslaw’s privilege was seen as judicial grounds for the toleration of Jews within the whole Kingdom. On the ground of Boleslaw’s privilege, Casimir III granted a statute to the Jews of Lemberg in 1367. It was confirmed by the first Jagiellonian king Wladyslaw II Jagiello in 1387. The Jews of Lemberg demonstrated Boleslaw’s privilege in a trial in 1488.⁴⁴ References to Boleslaw’s privilege were made in a royal decree issued to the Jews of Lemberg in 1553.⁴⁵ Evidently, the Armenians also needed such a charter of foundation. The problem was that Armenians were never invited by the

43 “...a serenissimis praedecessoribus nostris desideratissimis regibus Poloniae, ducibusque Russiae ac aliis quibusvis principibus et proceribus regni et dominiorum nostrorum eidem civitati Leopoliensi quavis ratione et modo concessis.” *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 46.

44 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 390.

45 *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 426.

Polish kings or princes to settle in Poland – they settled in Lemberg before the Polish conquest when Galician Rus was ruled by Ruthenian princes. Ruthenian charters – written in Cyrillic characters – were of no value if they were not confirmed by Polish kings. Galician Rus and Lemberg were seen by the city patricians as joined to the Polish kingdom by the law of war (*jure belli*) – thereby the city was founded in 1356. Only rehabilitation of a pre-Polish, that is “Ruthenian past,” and precedent with Ruthenians in 1572, stimulated the Armenians in 1578 to demonstrate Danylo’s letter as their charter of foundation. The Armenians tried to derive their rights from the period situated deeper than the royal decree of 1356, seen in the dominant discourse of the Catholic patriciate as the foundation of the city. Nevertheless, it is evident that “the relative values of different time-depths” is not constant even in a given society, in particular, if this society is complex and comprised of different social strata and groups, as was the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Evaluation of “different time-depths” could be changed, for instance, in the course of the efforts made to establish social cohesion at the moment of a substantial enlargement of a society including new culturally different parts.

Changes in the dominant discourse of the upper-classes in the 1570s provoked certain changes in the cultural framework and created opportunities for townspeople to transform previously neglected segments of the past into valuable ones.

There is no doubt that in the 1570s, the “Ruthenian past” was included into “a minimal set of formal constraints,” because of the “cultural consensus”⁴⁶ – as well as a political one – achieved by representatives of the noble estates of Poland and Lithuania in the Diet of Lublin in 1569. Thus, the claims of the Armenians in 1578 could be based on the ratification of a credible *external authoritative figure* in the past – the letter of the Ruthenian Prince Danylo. Danylo’s letter was as particularly valuable for the Armenians, since it situated their invitation – real or

46 Both terms were introduced by American anthropologist Arjun Appadurai: Arjun Appadurai, “The Past as a Scarce Resource,” *Man* 16.2 (1981): 203.

imagined – deeper in the past than the re-foundation of Lemberg on the basis of Magdeburg Law in 1356.

The Diet of Lublin in 1569 and the rupture of the 1570s established a new cultural consensus as to the *authority, continuity, and depth* of the Ruthenian past in general, and thereby of Prince Danylo's charter in particular, within the Polish upper classes.

The Armenian “Invitation Model” Within the Framework of Polish Historical Culture

In 1597, the Catholics submitted a complaint to the court of King Sigismund III (1587–1632). They agreed that the statement of the Armenians about the invitation of their ancestors was a real fact, but accused Armenian warriors of participating in hostile incursions against Poland led by Prince Danylo or his son Lev together with the Tatars in the 1250s–1280s:

Lviv was founded around 1280 by Leon, the son of the Ruthenian Prince Daniel. This Daniel died around 1263 or 1264. It means that the Armenians were invited earlier, since Armenians connect their invitation with the aforementioned Daniel. At that time, the city of Lviv did not exist yet. In accordance with it, there is no doubt whatsoever that they were invited not to the city of Lviv, but to the lands of Rus in order to wage war together with Daniel, the Ruthenians and Tatars against the Kingdom [of Poland] as it is written in the chronicles of the Kingdom in the times of [Prince] Lesco Czarny. Equally, the Armenians, even if they later lived in accordance with the privileges [granted to them by] Leon – which we never admit [as legitimate] – all these privileges they lost in accordance with the law of war. Exactly when conquered with a sword, part of Rus with the city of Lviv was dominated by [King] Kazimierz in 1340. It means that the foundation of Lemberg should be connected with his [Kazimierz's] ordinance but not with those previous princes of Rus. It goes in accordance with the first privilege of Kazimierz granted in Sandomierz in 1356.⁴⁷

In such a way, the Armenians – good subjects in 1578 – were turned into the descendants of Poland's enemies. In April 1600, the royal court in Warsaw considered the complaint of the Lemberg magistrate. The new edition of the decree proclaimed equal rights for Armenians in general, but limited their opportunities in many particular cases.

47 Quoted in Iaroslav Dashkevych, “The Old Rus and Armenia,” 195.

In the second half of the 13th century Tatar troops, accompanied by Ruthenian allies, passed through the Galicia principality to devastate neighboring Poland. However, there is nothing about the participation of the Armenians in the Tatar and Ruthenian incursions against the Polish Kingdom in the Polish as well as Ruthenian chronicles. To construct this historical accusation against the ancestors of the Armenians, the patricians used certain sentences about Princes Daniel and Lev, and about the foundation of Lviv shortly mentioned in the history of Poland, written by Martin Kromer (1512–1589) – “De origine et rebvs gestis Polonorum libri XXX.” The patricians also used in a very frivolous manner some sentences from other texts⁴⁸ as well as the fact that the Armenians living in Lemberg use Tatar as the language of their everyday conversation.

Kromer mentioned Lviv for the first time in 1280 in connection with the war between Ruthenian Prince Lev and Polish Prince Leszko Czarny (*Lesco Niger*).⁴⁹ There is also a story about Prince Danylo (among other events dated with 1261), who defeated alien factions of other Ruthenian princes and made them his vassals, and established almost a monarchy in Southern Rus. In 1254, he was crowned by the papal legate, Cardinal Oppiso, with a crown sent by the pope on the conditions of unification with the Roman Catholic Church, and joint military actions against the Tatars. However, Danylo ignored his obligations and, together with the Tatars and pagan Lithuanians, devastated Christian countries.⁵⁰ Thus, in Polish historical tradition, Prince Danylo and his son Lev were seen as enemies.

48 For a detailed analysis of the imagined Armenian-Tatar military cooperation directed against Poland, see my article: Alexandr Osipian, “The Lasting Echo of the Battle of Grunwald: the Uses of the Past in the Trials between the Armenian Community of Lemberg and the Catholic Patricians in 1578–1631,” *Russian History* 38.2 (2011): 243–80. The actual Armenian-Tatar military cooperation in the Near East was investigated in my paper: Alexandr Osipian, “Armenian Involvement in the Latin-Mongol Crusade: Uses of the Magi and Prester John in Constable Smbat’s Letter and Hayton of Corycus’s ‘Flos historiarum terre orientis’, 1248–1307,” *Medieval Encounters* 20.1 (2014): 66–100.

49 M. Cromerus, *De origine et rebvs gestis Polonorum libri XXX* (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1589), 171.

50 Cromerus, *De origine*, 161.

Kromer's historical work was very popular in the second half of the 16th and early 17th centuries. His book was published in Latin in 1555, 1558, 1568, 1589, in German in 1562, and in Polish in 1611. Kromer was born into a burgher family of German immigrants in Biecz, in southern Poland,⁵¹ thereby his work represented a particularly authoritative source of historical knowledge for Polish townspeople. Kromer's history in the Latin edition as well as in the German edition was mentioned seven times in the Catholic burghers' posthumous book inventories composed after their death in late 16th – early 17th-century Lemberg.⁵² In 1552, he was ennobled and granted a coat of arms for his diplomatic services to Kings Sigismund I and Sigismund II.⁵³ In 1573 Kromer was promoted to Prince-Bishop of Warmia (Ermland).⁵⁴ Thus, in the eyes of contemporary and later generations of the urban elite Kromer embodied their aspirations for career and ennoblement. Kromer's life became a model for the urban patricians and his history of Poland for a century shaped their historical imagination. Kromer's career and royalist vision of Polish history also made his work authoritative at the royal court. Along with the coming of the printed book and the spread of interest in national history among the Polish nobility and urban patriciate, Kromer's work provided public discourse about a past with a well-elaborated historical framework.

Nevertheless, Catholics in Lemberg generally accepted that the early Armenians who settled in the city were warriors in the prince's service.⁵⁵ Jan Andrzej Próchnicki, Lemberg Catholic archbishop in 1614–1633 stated

51 L. Finkel, *Marcin Kromer. Historyk polski XVI wieku. Rozbiór krytyczny* (Kraków, 1883), 7.

52 J. Skoczek, *Lwowskie inwentarze biblioteczne w epoce renesansu* (Lwów, 1939), 45.

53 Finkel, *Marcin Kromer*, 34.

54 Finkel, *Marcin Kromer*, 36.

55 See my papers: Alexandr Osipian, "German Humanist Ioannes Alembek from Lemberg and his 'Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae' (1603–1605)," *Berichte und Forschungen. Jahrbuch des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa* 17 (2009): 39–59; Alexandr Osipian, "Zaproszennya virmen do Lvova kniaziami Danylom ta Lvomu 'Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae' Ioanna Alembeka: Osoblyvosti renessansnoho istoriopsannia," ["The Invitation of Armenians to Lemberg by the Princes Daniel and Lev Danilovich in 'Topographia Civitatis Leopolitanae' of Ioannes Alnpekus: Some Aspects of the Renaissance Historical Writing,"] *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal* 6 (2012): 145–68.

in the report addressed to the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide on 22 September 1622: "It is said that [Armenians] migrated from Armenia to these lands *three hundred years ago*, invited by the Ruthenian Prince Leon for military service. Then they degenerated into merchants and spies."⁵⁶

The Papal nuncio in Poland, Honoratio Visconti (1630–1636), in his report on 7 June 1631 described the origins of the Armenian Diaspora in Rus. This account has evident apologetic features. In fact, it defends Armenians from the accusations of the Lemberg magistrate. The only possible explanation of this paradox is that the report was written by Visconti from evidence presented by the Armenians.⁵⁷ The story, recorded in Visconti's account, reflects all the previous historical debates between the Armenians and the Catholic patricians. "Thus, Armenians have lived for *about 500 years* in provinces of Rus. Their arrival, initially discussed and agreed upon by these Dukes with the Nation, was finally concluded in the times of Prince Danylo and affirmed by his successor Lev, at that time ruler of Rus, who founded the city of Leopoldis."⁵⁸ The privileges of invited Armenian warriors were affirmed by the Polish king Kazimierz III (1333–1370). Then, exhausted by wars – probably during the numerous Polish-Teutonic military conflicts – the noble Armenian warriors became merchants and artisans: "And the majority of them [Armenians] exhausted by the numerous sufferings [of war] and also satisfied with the profits derived from trade, and in order to be freed from obligatory military service refused the privileges of nobility and remained in the status of burghers and merchants. Thus, on such conditions they remain now..."⁵⁹

One might logically expect that after they lost the trial in 1600, the Armenians would no longer use Daniel and Lev as their "inviting-fathers." Yet, this did not happen. Instead, until the early 1630s, the Armenians

56 "Dicuntur sane a trecentis annis ex Armeniis in has oras commigrasse, a Leone duce Ruthenorum militiae causa acciti. At nunc in mercatores et propalas degenerarunt." Vol. 1 of *Litterae Episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes (1600–1900)* (Romae, 1972), 87.

57 For more details see my paper: Alexandr Osipian, "The Lasting Echo of the Battle of Grunwald."

58 Vol. 24, part 1 of *Acta nuntiaturae Polonae*, ed. Adalbertus Biliński (Romae, 1992), 278.

59 Ibid.

continued to maintain the version of their ancestors' invitation to Rus and the city of the Lviv by Danylo and/or Lev. Only the new hot phase of conflict between the two rival groups in the 1630s stimulated the Armenians to revise their version of the usable past and introduce substantial changes to it.

Prince Theodore Instead of Princes Daniel and Lev:

Introducing a New "Founding-Father" in the Old "Invitation Model"

The second stage in the making or rather re-making of local Armenian memory was the period of fierce religious conflict which divided the Armenian community in the 1630s–1650s, partly overlapping with the larger military conflict of 1648–1658, which threatened the very existence of Polish statehood.

In 1630, Nigol Torosowicz, Armenian bishop of Lemberg, with the support of Catholic Archbishop Andrzej Próchnicki, and with the implicit consent of King Sigismund III (1587–1632), began forced unification of the local Armenians with the Roman church. The archbishop was actively supported by the Jesuits, the royal governor (*capitaneus*), and city authorities. The Catholic patricians intended to crush their Armenian competitors using the internal quarrels among them. The Armenians for the most part rejected religious unification. This religious conflict resulted in series of trials and sometimes in violent acts against the Armenians and their property.⁶⁰ Under such circumstances the Armenians constructed a new version of their own past more useful to protect their rights.

There was a process of gradual change in the Armenian narrative of invitation in the 1620s–1630s. This new perception of the past was influenced by two factors, education and reading. Many young Armenians received a Renaissance education in the Academy of Zamość, founded in 1595. The Polish translation of Kromer's history was published in 1611 and

60 For detailed description see: Edmond Schütz, "An Armeno-Kipchak Document of 1640 from Lvov and its Background in Armenia and in the Diaspora," in *Between the Danube and the Caucasus*, ed. György Kara (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987), 247–330; in particular, 285–313.

thus became accessible to the Armenian readers. This new well-educated generation of the Armenian elite in Lemberg realised that both Danylo and Lev – discredited within the framework of Kromer's history – could not be credible authoritative figures of the past. The religious conflict of the 1630s stimulated a search for a new “founding-father” of the Armenian Diaspora in Ruthenian lands.

The petition, submitted by the Armenian community of Lemberg to the Polish Diet on 20 October 1632, could be seen as the first evidence that the Armenian elite accepted the necessity to reinvent the story of its foundation. It was an extraordinary Diet in time of interregnum. Among the main aims of the Diet was the establishment of inter-religious peace in the Kingdom, endangered with the Russian invasion early in the same year. The conflict between the Armenian community and Bishop Torosowicz reached its apex, and the former sent its delegation to the Diet in order to ask the representatives of the noble estate for protection, since at the moment there was no king – the main guarantor of the community's rights. Recounting misdeeds of the corrupt bishop, the petition stated that the Armenians were always loyal to the Polish Crown: “...as the most humble and devoted subjects of Your Graces, we are for 400 years in this Glorious Kingdom have always been faithful to Their Graces the Kings and to the Commonwealth until this day, and we have never been suspected in any crimes.”⁶¹ Thus, the Armenians emphasized their loyalty to the Polish kings and to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from the very beginning of their settlement there – “400 years ago” – instead of the well-known fact that Lviv (Lemberg) and Galicia were conquered by Poland less than 300 years ago – in 1340. Taking into account that in 1632 the Armenian elite was well acquainted with its foundation myth, there is no doubt that the petition deliberately omitted the names

61 “...iako naniszty y wierni poddani Wmczom ktorzysmy od 400 lat w tey Zacney Koronie zawsze wierne poddanstwa Krolom Ichmcm y Rzptiey do tego czasu zahowali y niwczym nie bylismy podeirzani.” *Petycja Ormian lwowskich, publicznie odczytana w kole rycerskim 20.X.1632* (Biblioteka Muzeum Narodowego Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie 366), 161–63.

of the “disreputable” Princes Danylo and Lev. One can also suggest that the point “we have never been suspected in any crimes” could be seen as a reference to the deadly religious clashes in Vitebsk in 1623, when Greek-Catholic Bishop Josaphat Kuncewicz was killed by the local Orthodox townspeople, then, in accordance with a royal decree, 70 rebellious burghers were sentenced to death, and the city lost its judicial autonomy.

I would like to give another example to conclude my argument. Simeon of Poland (*Lekhatsi*), a traveller born in Zamość, a cleric, and later a teacher in the Armenian school in Lemberg, wrote in his *Travelogue* around 1623 that Armenians living in Rus are descendants of the refugees from the Armenian city Ani. This city was a famous centre of international trade until it was completely destroyed by the Mongols in 1239. According to contemporary Armenian chronicler Kirakos Ganjaketsi, wealthy and arrogant residents of Ani were punished by God for their sins.⁶²

Being a teacher in the Armenian school in Lemberg paid for by the Armenian community, Simeon gave many examples of charity done by wealthy Armenian merchants there. That is why he tried to resolve the evident contradiction between his own statement that the ancestors of local Armenians allegedly migrated from the sinful city, and the praiseworthy way of life of their pious descendants in Lemberg:

They say that the local Armenians settled here from Ani. According to historians, they [the inhabitants of Ani] split into two groups: one went to Kaffa and Akkerman and their descendants to this day live in Sulumanastir and speak Armenian; the other group went to Angora and from there to Poland. They should not be ashamed that they are from Ani; for, although the city and its inhabitants were cursed, He [God] blessed these who left it. Just as in ancient times [God] cursed Sodom and Gomorrah, but saved Lot and those close to him, in that same manner

62 “This city, Ani, was filled with a multitude of people and animals and surrounded by very strong walls. It had in it so many churches that among the oaths spoken one was: ‘By the thousand and one churches of Ani.’ It was a city rich in all goods, because of this, arrogance resulting from satiety struck it; and that arrogance led to destruction, as has been the case from the beginning until the present.” Kirakos Ganjaketsi, *History of the Armenians*, trans. Robert Bedrosian (New York, 1976), 220.

He destroyed Ani with its impious inhabitants, but took away the good ones from there, just as He let Noah live but destroyed the entire world.⁶³

This explanatory model is typical for the medieval clergy. Simeon of Poland could construct his narrative from two main sources – unknown Armenian chronicles at his disposal and stories told to him by local Armenian clergymen – his own parents migrated from Caffa in the Crimea to Zamość in 1584 and he himself spent most of his adult life before 1623 travelling abroad. There is nothing about Danylo, Lev, and the invitation of Armenian warriors to Rus in Simeon's story. Therefore, the “invitation model” with Danylo's charter was constructed by Armenian merchants, that is by laymen – a sign of a gradual emancipation of the past from the clergy's domain. Moreover, when in 1641 the Armenians changed their initial version of the community's foundation, they did not use Simeon's story, since it was out of use in order to obtain equal rights and to accelerate the social advance of wealthy merchants. Instead, they used once again the “invitation model” with a little change – Princes Danylo and Lev, discredited by M. Kromer, were omitted in favour of Prince Theodore.

Anthony Grafton pointed out *opportunity* as one of the circumstances that need clarification when any forgery is to be investigated. I suggest that in the case of Theodor's charter, the Armenians used as an *opportunity* the visit of Catholic missionary Paolo Piromalli (Pyromalli) to Lemberg. A Dominican and theology doctor, Piromalli (1591–1664) spent five years (1632–1637) as a Catholic missionary among Armenians in Safavid Persia and the Ottoman Empire where he studied Armenian and even compounded an Armenian-Latin dictionary.⁶⁴ Then Piromalli was sent

63 George A. Bournoutian, *The Travel Accounts of Simeon of Poland* (Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 2007), 286–87.

64 For more details on P. Piromalli's biography, see: C. Longo, *Silvestro Bendici. Un missionario calabrese del secolo XVII* (Roma: Istituto Storico Domenicano (Dissertationes Historicae, XXIV), 1998), 109–11; M. Macri, *Memorie storico-critiche intorno alla vita ed alle Opere di Monsig. Frate Paolo Piromalli domenicano, Arcivescovo di Naxivan, aggiuntavi la Siderografia* (Napoli: Tipografia della Societa filomatica, 1824); V. Raschella, *Mons. Paolo Piromalli: un domenicano di Siderno missionario nell'Armenia* (Catanzaro: Stab. Tip. Giovanni Abramo, 1935).

to Polish Armenians by the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, and in early July 1638 arrived in Lemberg.⁶⁵ There Piromalli took the side of the Armenian community in its conflict with Bishop Torosowicz. In his report to the Congregation, written on 5 August 1641, and recently found by myself in the Congregation's archive in Rome, Piromalli described the foundation of the Armenian community in Lemberg as follows:

Five hundred and eighty years passed since Armenians were admitted into the city of Leopoli by Theodore, a great Prince of Rus and a schismatic ruler. There was an agreement that they could live and self-govern, in accordance with the rites of their faith and their customs. These rites, ceremonies, customs, and way of life were repeatedly [and] fairly permitted not only by the aforementioned Theodore, but by all other successor princes of Rus and also kings of Poland, who were, quite naturally, Catholics. And these numerous privileges were confirmed by a firm oath. It can be seen from their authentic privileges which I pass on to the mister secretary of the Sacra Congregation.⁶⁶

And later in this report he mentioned Prince Theodore again: "And [the King] could not object, because from the very beginning, when Armenians were admitted for the first time to Leopoli, they refused to convert to Catholicism. And this happened because not only Prince Theodore, who was the first ruler to accept them, but also all [others] who [then] arrived [and settled] in Leopoli were schismatics, and almost no one was a Catholic."⁶⁷ It seems beyond dispute that Piromalli was told

65 G. Petrowicz, *L'unione degli Armeni di Polonia con la Santa Sede (1626–1686)* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1950), 100.

66 "Quingentorum et octuaginta annorum elapsus est cursus a(b) te(m)pore quo Armeni in Civitate Leopoli(en)sis per Theodoru(m) magnu(m) Russie ducem scismaticu(m) Principe(m) recepti. Fuerunt hac tamen conditione, ut iuxta eoru(m) ritu(m) Ceremonias, et Consuetudines vivere, et gubernare possent. Qui quidem ritus, Ceremonie, Consuetudines, et vivendi ratio non a(b) predicto tantu(m) Theodoro, sed a(b) ceteris omnibus Russie Principibus successoribus et Polonie Regibus, etiam Catholicis non solum permissa verum, et qua(m) plurimis Privilegiis iuramento roboratis confirmata fuere, ut ex illoru(m) Privilegiis Autentico transu(m)pto Domino Secretario huius Sacre Congregationis exhibitio." Archivio storico Congregazione per l'evangelizzazione dei popoli ("De Propaganda Fide"). Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazione Generale (SOCG), vol. 293 (Armeni. Caldei. Maroniti. Arabi), fol. 150.

67 "Et non subsistit in facto, quod ab initio, quo p(rim)o Leopoli recepti fuerunt Armeni permiserint se Catholicos facturos, quod habet ex eo, quia non solum Theodorus

this story by Armenian elders and even saw the charter itself (which he could not read because of his ignorance of Ruthenian). Because of Piro-malli's latent conflict with Torosowicz, Armenian elders hoped to use the former as a representative of their claims at the royal court in Warsaw – which he visited later the same year – and at the apostolic see in Rome he visited in 1639–1640.

The Armenians connected their hopes for the resolution of the religious conflict with recently elected king Władysław IV (1632–1648), who was more tolerant than his father Sigismund III. A delegation of Armenian elders (*seniores*) submitted the confession of faith (*confessio fidei*) to king Władysław IV in 1641, in which they declared allegiance both to St. Peter and St. Gregory, and accepted the decisions of the first seven councils. The Polish kings considered these confessions to be so significant in the process leading to the catholicisation of the Armenians that subsequently they confirmed all their former privileges. As a result, Władysław IV renewed the rights they submitted to him in 1641.⁶⁸ Along with the royal decrees, by which Polish kings granted rights to their Armenian subjects in the 15th and 16th centuries, there was also a short charter issued by the Ruthenian prince. But this prince was neither Danyło nor Lev. It was a letter from Prince Fedor (Theodore), son of Dmitry. His title and domains were not closer indicated. The date was also absent. “From Prince Theodore, son of Dmitry, to the Armenians of Kosochac(ean): Come under my hand and I shall grant you freedom for three years.”⁶⁹

Thus, in 1641 the Armenians officially put into circulation the so-called “Charter issued in 1062 by the Ruthenian Prince Fedor, the son of Dmitry”. But as we know in 1062 there were no Ruthenian princes with such names.

Princes, quis primo illos recepit venem etiam omnes Leopoli sunt degentes scismatici erant, nullusq(ue) inibi ad erat Catholicis.” Vol. 293 of *Archivio storico*, fol. 151v.

68 Schütz, “An Armeno-Kipchak Document,” 309–10.

69 This document, written in Ruthenian, was lost in the mid-nineteenth century. The original content of the Feodor's letter is known to us thanks to Prof. F.-X. Zachariasiewicz (1770–1845): “Oto Kniazia Teodora Dmytrowicza Kosochackim Armenom: Prejdili na moju ruku dam wam wolnost na try lita.” F.-X. Zachariasiewicz, *Wiadomość o Ormianach w Polsce* (Lwów, 1842), 10.

Actually, the Armenians used the letter issued – perhaps in 1382⁷⁰ – by the Volhynian Prince (in 1377–1393) Fedor, the son of Lubart (the Lithuanian Prince Lubart was baptized as Dmitry) to invite the Armenian merchants into his principality. It was a typical protection charter (*salvum conductum*) granted to foreign merchants by the local ruler for safe and secure entrance and trade in his dominions. Why did the Armenians of Lemberg never use Fedor’s letter before 1641? In the early 17th century, old Armenian communities in Volodymyr and Lutsk – both in Volhynia province – as well as in Kyiv were at the final stage of their decline. A few Armenians still living in these cities were not able to pay their priests and to maintain churches. In the 1620s, the prosperous Armenian community of Lemberg took the Armenian churches and priests in these cities under protection.⁷¹ One could suggest that the Armenians of Lemberg took the archives from these churches, and among other papers they found the previously unknown to them letter of Volhynian Prince Fedor.

In the translation of the original letter from Ruthenian into Latin – realised in the royal chancellery on 18 October 1641 – the Armenians had included in the Latin copy information they needed to use in the trial with the Catholic patricians. According to the extended and updated charter, the prince invited Armenian warriors to help him at war and allowed them to settle anywhere in his domains: “The charter issued by Fedor, (son of) Dmitry, Prince of Rus, translated from Ruthenian into Latin, granted to the Armenians in the year 1062 AD,” whose content is as such⁷²: “Theodore *great Prince of Rus*, son of Demetr, to the Armenians of

70 Prof. F.-X. Zachariasiewicz stated that he does not remember last words of the Fedor’s letter. It could be easily explained if we take into account that in medieval Ruthenian manuscripts figures were transmitted with characters of Cyrillic alphabet. In medieval Orthodox chronology was used *era of creation*, which differ from *AD era* for 5508 years. As such, these characters have no meaning if were perceived by modern reader as a word. Misreading of these characters could also transform 6890 (1382) into 6570 (1062).

71 Bournoutian, *The Travel Accounts of Simeon of Poland*, 287–88; Vol. 2 of *Akty otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannyye i izdannyye arkhograficheskoi komissiei* [*Acts, Concerned with the History of Southern and Western Russia, Collected and Published by Archeographic Commission*] (St. Petersburg, 1865), 73–74.

72 I use *italics* to accentuate new words inserted into Latin translation in 1641.

Kosohac(ean). Who wish to come here, *they should come to help me*, and I am going to grant them freedom for three years. *And when you should be with me, you might freely go wherever it pleases you.*⁷³ Since in the Ruthenian original the title of prince was not indicated, in Latin translation he was easily transformed into “the great Prince of Rus.” Along with the other documents submitted by the Armenians in 1641, the extended Latin copy of Fedor’s charter was written down in the records of *Matricularium Regni Poloniae*. Then the Armenians received from the royal chancellery the Latin copy, which they used as officially confirmed credible document in future trials.⁷⁴

In 1654, the Armenians won the trial and received equal rights with the Catholics according to the solution of King Jan Casimir/Kazimierz (1648–1668). There is a mention in the royal decree that the Armenians demonstrated to the King “A charter issued by Prince Dmitry⁷⁵ in 1062, when for the first time the Armenian nation was accepted and invited as the army of a notable quantity for the military assistance and public interest to the lands of Rus. And this charter of the mentioned prince of Rus, granted the Armenians permission to live and settle everywhere in

73 “...privilegium Theodori Demetrii Ducis *Russiae* ex Ruthenico idiomate in latinum transpositum in a. Dni millesimo sexagesimo secundo Armenis datum, cujus ea sunt verba: Ecce *Magni Ducis Theodori Demetrii filii Kosohacensibus Armenis*, qui huc volunt venire, *veniant in auxilium meum*, et ego vobis dabo libertatem ad tres annos *et cum fueritis apud me, ubi quis voluerit, illuc ibit libere.*” Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (AGAD). Metryka Koronna. T.187, 139–39 v. Quoted from: F. Bischoff, *Urkunden zur Geschichte der Armenier in Lemberg* (Wien, 1864), 4; Sadok Barącz, *Rys dziejów ormiańskich* (Tarnopol, 1869), 60–61.

74 Armenians handed over a confession of faith to the new Polish king Jan Casimir (1648–1668) in 1652. However, before accepting it, the king set a condition that it should also be countersigned by Armenian Catholics Philippos. There was no obstacle to this, and confession was confirmed by Philippos in his pastoral letter addressed to the community of Lviv on 12 February 1653. After the agreement made with Catholics Philippos in 1653, Armenian elders concluded a thorough and detailed agreement with bishop Torosowicz on November 11, 1654. Schütz, “An Armeno-Kipchak Document,” 308–09.

75 This is most certainly a scribal error. First name (*Fedor*) and patronymic (*Dmytrowicz*) traditional for the Ruthenian Orthodox tradition, when translated into Latin as “Theodori Demetrii,” was sometimes perceived by Catholic readers as double name “Theodor-Dmitry.” It could explain why in some cases *Fedor/Theodore* was substituted by *Dmitry*.

this province.”⁷⁶ Thus, Armenians who were invited to help the prince (in 1641), were transformed (in 1654) into “an army of a notable quantity” (*in quantitate notabilis exercitus*) invited “for military assistance and public interest” (*in subsidium belli et ex necessitate publica*). In 1062, Rus was independent and almost absolutely absent in Kromer’s history. Therefore, the very moment of the invitation was moved beyond the framework of Kromer’s narrative.

Conclusion

According to Anthony Grafton, in any complex civilization, a body of authoritative texts takes shape; this offers rules for living and charters for vital social, religious, and political practices.⁷⁷ The political as well as historical culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was dominated by the concept of *freedom/liberties*. *Freedom* was based on *liberties/privileges* granted by the king to noble ancestors for defence of the *Fatherland*. The study of “Fedor’s charter of 1062” examines the process of how urban elites accepted nobility’s political and historical culture and used it for its own purposes.

As we saw above, in 1641 the version elaborated or written down by Simon of Poland (*Lekhatsi*) circa 1620 was not used to substitute the version of the invitation by Danylo and/or Lev. Why? My point is that by this time the elite of the Armenian Diaspora was acculturated enough into Polish political and historical culture to use it as a model for making its own version of the usable past.

As Anthony Grafton pointed out, in the Middle Ages most practitioners of forgery and criticism were clerics and lawyers. Forgers usually wanted to equip a person or an institution with a basis for possession of

76 “Imprimis autem privilegium Demetrii ducis anno millesimo sexagesimo secundo, quo primum tempore natio Armenica *in subsidium belli et ex necessitate publica* in provinciam Russiae *in quantitate notabilis exercitus* adscita et vocata fuerit, privilegiumque ipsis speciale ab eodem duce Russiae ubivis locorum habitandi et incolendi concessum fuerit producerent.” *Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad*, 334.

77 Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, 124.

lands or privileges.⁷⁸ This paper explains how in early modern Europe the clergy and aristocracy lost their monopoly on the past.

The aspirations for ennoblement and, thus, a search of prestigious ancestors, could be found in other branches of the early modern Armenian trading Diaspora. For instance, the wealthiest Armenian merchant family in Safavid Persia – the Scerimans (Shahrimanians) – migrated to Italy in the 1690s.⁷⁹ None of the known sources shed any light on the family's history before the massive deportation of Armenians from the city of Julfa to Safavid's capital Isfahan in 1604, but Armenian sources from the post-deportation period claim a noble status for the family and indicate that they belonged to an ancient clan of nobles (*nakharark*) with possible roots in the historic Armenian city of Ani. The family's branches settled in Italy in the eighteenth century and, applying for induction into the Venetian patriciate, went so far as to claim ("invent"?) for themselves European or French origins as well as noble status in ancient Armenia. Monsignor Basilio Sceriman in his "Libro di memorie," of which only an abridged version has come down to us, claims that the family descended from French Crusaders who had settled in Armenia after the Crusades.⁸⁰

There were at least four options to invent a prestigious past for the Armenian elite in the Polish kingdom: (a) migrants from Ani, the city destroyed by God and enemies; (b) refugees "from the tyranny of the Turks"; (c) warriors invited by the Princes Danylo, Lev, or (d) Fedor (Theodore). The first two options, explaining the origins of the Armenian

78 Grafton, *Forgers and Critics*, 24.

79 Sebouh David Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: the Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa, Isfahan, 1605–1747* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), 150–51.

80 "Libro di memorie di Monsignor Basilio Sceriman," Avogaria di Comun 348, Processi di Nobiltà – Sceriman, ASV, n.p. Quoted from: Aslanian. *From the Indian Ocean*, 153. Basilio Sceriman was educated at the Vatican from a very young age and went on to become a monsignor and governor of several Italian cities under Rome's influence, including Perugia. He is reported to have written in the 1740s a lengthy account of the family's history known as the "Libro di memorie," a drastically abridged version of which has come down to us in the form of preserved in the family's legal petition during its unsuccessful bid to be enrolled into the Venetian patriciate. Aslanian, *From the Indian Ocean*, 156.

Diaspora in East-Central Europe, circulated within the clergy, and were not developed by wealthy Armenian merchants, since the “sinful refugee” ancestors could not be used as an argument for ennoblement. On the other hand, later these versions received much more attention within the framework of modern nationalism and national historical writing, with its concepts of medieval Armenian statehood as a lost golden age, and of the Armenian Diaspora as part of a narrative of permanent persecution and suffering of the Armenian nation.

Finally, Sadok Barącz (1814–1892), a Dominican monk in mid-19th-century Austrian Galicia, and an amateur historian of Armenian ethnic background, combined both versions, in accordance with the historical culture of Romantic nationalism. Barącz accepted the invitation of Armenian warriors for military assistance by the great Prince Iziaslav, who ruled in Kyiv in 1054–1078, and whose Christian name was Dmitry. Since, according to medieval Russian chronicles, the nomadic tribes of the Cumans (*Polovtsians*) entered steppeland of modern day Southern Ukraine in 1060 and attacked Iziaslav and his brothers in 1068, Barącz claimed that Armenian warriors were invited to defend the lands of Rus from the Cumans’ raids. He pointed out that this Armenian host departed to Rus from the former Armenian capital – the city of Ani. Thus, Barącz connected an early modern version about a prestigious invitation of the noble warriors with the modern Armenian national narrative, where the glorious city of Ani was at the centre of the whole narrative, simultaneously saying nothing about the pre-modern perception of migration from there as celestial banishment of the sinful residents of Ani. In his narrative, Barącz gave the exact number of these imagined warriors – 20,000 – in accordance with nineteenth century realities, when centralized states used armies exceeding 100,000 and 200,000 soldiers. Thus, the alleged eleventh-century Armenian military detachment had to be numerous enough to be comparable with the 19th-century armies.

This modernized and rationalized version of Armenian migration to East-Central Europe was readily accepted by the wealthy Armenian landlords in Galicia/Galizien and Bucovina/Bukowina, many of whom were

recently ennobled by the Habsburgs, and, thus, in search of glorious and prestigious ancestors. Trying to find connections between early modern historical myth and historical facts, and to rationalize the myth, Barącz made it more vital to survive critics of positivist historians. Since Barącz's combined version ideally fits with the invincible historical imagination of Romantic nationalism, it is still very popular in amateur studies and among descendants of medieval Armenians now living in Poland as well as within the new wave of the Armenian Diaspora in Ukraine.

Bibliography

- Acta nuntiaturae Polonae*, edited by Adalbertus Biliński. Romae, 24.1, 1992.
- Акты относиашчесья к исторіи Іужной і Западной Россіи, собранные і изданные археографическоі комиссіей* [*Acts, Concerned with the History of Southern and Western Russia, Collected and Published by Archeographic Commission*]. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg, 1865.
- Allsen, Thomas T. "Mongolian Princes and Their Merchant Partners, 1200–1260." *Asia Major* 2 (1989): 83–126.
- Alnpekus, Ioannes. "Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae." In *Jan Alnpek i jego "Opis miasta Lwowa" z początku XVII w.*, edited by S. Rachwał. Lwów, 1930.
- Appadurai, Arjun. "The Past as a Scarce Resource." *Man* 16.2 (1981): 201–19.
- Archivio storico Congregazione per l'evangelizzazione dei popoli ("De Propaganda Fide"). Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazione Generale (SOCG). Vol. 293. (Armeni. Caldei. Maroniti. Arabi).
- Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (AGAD). Metryka Koronna. T. 187.
- Aslanian, Sebouh David. *From the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean: The Global Trade Networks of Armenian Merchants from New Julfa, Isfahan, 1605–1747*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- Baranowski, B. "Ormianie w służbie dyplomatycznej Rzeczypospolitej." *Mysł karaimska. Rocznik naukowo-społeczny. Seria Nowa* 1, XXIII (1945–1946): 119–37.
- Barącz, Sadok. *Rys dziejów ormiańskich*. Tarnopol, 1869.
- Bischoff, F. *Das alte Recht der Armenier in Lemberg*. Wien, 1862.
- Bogucka, Marta. "Miejsce mieszczanina w społeczeństwie szlacheckim. Atrakcyjność wzorców życia szlacheckiego w Polsce XVII wieku." In *Społeczeństwo staropolskie*, wyd. A. Wyczański, 185–219. Warszawa, 1976.

- Bournoutian, George A. *The Travel Accounts of Simeon of Poland*. Mesa, CA: Mazda Publishers, 2007.
- Braudel, Fernand. *The Wheels of Commerce*. Translated by S. Reynolds. London, 2002.
- Charewiczowa, Łucja. *Ograniczenia gospodarcze nacyj schyzmatyckich i żydów we Lwowie XV–XVI w.* Lwów, 1925.
- Cromerus, Martinus. *De origine et rebvs gestis Polonorum libri XXX*. Coloniae Agripinae, 1589.
- Cynarski, Stanisław. "The Shape of Sarmatian Ideology in Poland." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 19 (1968): 5–17.
- Dashkevych, Iaroslav. "Hramota Fedora Dmytrovycha 1062 roku (Narys z ukrainskoi dyplomatyky)." ["Charter Issued by Fedor Dmytrovych in 1062 (A Study in Ukrainian Diplomacy)."] *Naukovo-informatsiynyi biuletyn arkhivnoho upravlinnia URSR*. 4 (1962): 9–20.
- Dachkevych, Yaroslav. "Who are the Armeno-Kipchaks (On the Ethnic Substrate of the Armenian Colonies in the Ukraine)." *Revue des études arméniennes* 16 (1982): 357–416.
- Dashkevych, Iaroslav. "Drevniaia Rus i Armenia v obshchestvenno-politicheskikh svyaziakh XI–XIII vekov. (Istochniki issledovaniya temy)." ["Old Rus and Armenia in their Sociopolitical Ties in the 11th–13th Centuries (Source Materials for the Examination of the Issue)."] *Drevneyshie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR. Materialy i issledovaniya* (1982). Moscow, 1984: 177–95.
- Dashkevych, Iaroslav. "Davnii Lviv u virmenskykh ta virmeno-kypchatskykh dzherelakh." ["Old Lviv in Armenian and Armeno-Kipchak Sources."] *Ukraina v mynulomu* 1 (1992): 7–13.
- Dziubiński, Andrzej. *Na szlakach Orientu. Handel między Polską a Imperium Osmańskim w XVI–XVIII wieku*. Wrocław, 1998.
- Finkel, Ludwik. *Marcin Kromer. Historyk polski XVI wieku. Rozbiór krytyczny*. Kraków, 1883.
- Grafton, Anthony. *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship*. London: Collins & Brown, 1990.
- Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* [*The Charters Issued by the Cities of Great Novgorod and Pskov*], edited by S.N. Valk. Moscow, 1949.
- Gratiani, Antonii Mariae. *De vita Jannis Francisci Commendonis cardinalis libri quatuor*. Parisii: Apud Sebastianum Mabre-Cramoisy, 1669.
- Gromnicki, Tadeusz. *Ormjanie w Polsce. Ich historia, prawa i przywileje*. Warszawa, 1889.
- Gruneweg, Martin. "Opys Lvova." ["Description of Lviv."] *Zhovten* 10 (1980): 109–14.

- Grzybowski, Stanisław. "The Warsaw Confederation of 1573 and Other Acts of Religious Tolerance in Europe." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 40 (1979): 75–96.
- Guagninus, Alexander. *Sarmatiae Europaeae description*. Cracoviae, 1578.
- Heidenstein, Reinhold. *Rerum Polonicarum ab excessu Sigismundi Augusti libri XII*. Francoforti, 1672.
- Hramoty XIV stolittya* [*The Charters Issued in the Fourteenth Century*], edited by M.M. Peshchak. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974.
- Inkin, V.F. "Chy ie istorychna osnova v falsyfikatakh hramot kniazia Lva Danylovycha?" ["Is there Historical Ground in the Falsified Charters of Prince Lev, Son of Daniel?"] *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu* 24 (1988): 55–63.
- Juško, Edmund. *Nobilitacje i indygenaty jako droga awansu społecznego w Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej w XVII wieku*. Tarnów: Biblos, 2006.
- Kapral, Myron. *Natsionalni hromady Lvova XVI–XVIII st.: Sotsialno-pravovi vzaemyny*. [*The National Communities of Lviv in the 16th–18th Centuries: Social and Juridical Relations*]. Lviv: Piramida, 2003.
- Karpov, S.P. *Italianskie morskije respubliki i Iuzhnoe Prichernomorie v XIII–XV vekakh: problemy torgovli* [*Italian Maritime Republics and the South Black Sea Region in the 13th–15th Centuries: Problems of Trade*]. Moscow, 1990.
- Kulikowski, Andrzej. *Heraldyka szlachecka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Chateau, 1990.
- Kupchynsky, Oleh. *Akty ta dokumenty Halytsko-Volynskoho kniazivstva XIII – pershoi polovyny XIV stolittya. Doslidzhennia. Teksty* [*Acts and Documents of the Galician-Volhynian Principality of the 13th–14th Centuries: Investigations and Texts*]. Lviv, 2004.
- Litterae Episcoporum historiam Ucrainae illustrantes (1600–1900)*. Vol. 1. Romae, 1972.
- Longo, C. *Silvestro Bendici. Un missionario calabrese del secolo XVII*. Roma: Istituto Storico Domenicano (Dissertationes Historicae, XXIV), 1998.
- Macri, M. *Memorie storico-critiche intorno alla vita ed alle Opere di Monsig. Frate Paolo Piromalli domenicano, Arcivescovo di Naxivan, aggiuntavi la Sidernografia*. Napoli: Tipografia della Societa filomatica, 1824.
- Mikaelian, Vardges. "K voprosu o gramote Fedora Dmitrievicha." ["On the Issue of Fedor Dmitrievich's Charter."] *Arkheograficheskii iezhegodnik za 1964 god* (1965): 11–19.
- Nadel-Golobic, Eleonora. "Armenians and Jews in Medieval Lvov: The Role in Oriental Trade, 1400–1600." *Cahires du Monde russe et soviétique* 20 (1979): 345–88.
- Nekanda Trepka, Walerian. *Liber generationis plebeanorum: Liber chamorum*. Wrocław 2nd ed., 1995.

- Orzechowski-Roxolan, Stanisław. "Lyst do Yana-Francisco Commendoni: 10 hrudnia 1564." ["Letter to Giovanni Francisco Commendoni, 10 December 1564."] In *Ukrainska literatura XIV–XVI st.*, edited by Vasyl Mykytas. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988.
- Orzelski, Ś. *Bezkrólewia Książ Ośmioro 1572–1576*. Kraków, 1617.
- Osipian, Alexandr. "German Humanist Ioannes Alembek from Lemberg and his 'Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae' (1603–1605)." In *Berichte und Forschungen. Jahrbuch des Bundesinstituts für Kultur und Geschichte der Deutschen im östlichen Europa* 17 (2009): 39–59.
- Osipian, Alexandr. "The Lasting Echo of the Battle of Grunwald: The Uses of the Past in the Trials between the Armenian Community of Lemberg and the Catholic Patricians in 1578–1631." *Russian History* 38.2 (2011): 243–80.
- Osipian, Alexandr. "Zaproshehnyia virmen do Lvova kniaziami Danylom ta Lvom u 'Topographia civitatis Leopolitanae' Ioanna Alembeka: Osoblyvosti renessansnoho istoriopysannia." ["The Invitation of Armenians to Lemberg by the Princes Daniel and Lev Danilovich in 'Topographia Civitatis Leopolitanae' of Ioannes Alnpekius: Some Aspects of the Renaissance Historical Writing."] *Ukrainskii istorychnyi zhurnal* 6 (2012): 145–68.
- Osipian, Alexandr. "Vynaidennia prestyzhnykh predkiv u konteksti svitohliadu mis-koho patrytsiatu u Lvovi 17 st.: 'Pershi nimtsi' ta 'dvoznachni virmeny' u 'Potriynomu Lvovi' J.-B. Zimorowicza." ["The Invention of Prestigious Forefathers in the Context of the Worldview of Urban Patricians in 17th Century Lemberg: 'Primary Germans' and 'Ambiguous Armenians' in Józef-Bartłomiej Zimorowicz's 'Leopolis triplex.'"] *Ukrainskii istorychnyi zhurnal* 5 (2013): 192–229.
- Ostrowski, Donald. *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influence on the Steppe Frontier, 1304–1589*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Petrici, Sebastian. *Polityki Aristotelesowey, to iest rządu Rzeczypospolitey z докладem książk osmioro*. Kraków, 1605.
- Petrowicz, G. *L'unione degli Armeni di Polonia con la Santa Sede (1626–1686)*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1950.
- Petycja Ormian lwowskich, publicznie odczytana w kole rycerskim 20.X.1632*. Biblioteka Muzeum Narodowego Książąt Czartoryskich w Krakowie. 366, 161–63.
- Pryvilei natsionalnyh hromad mista Lvova (XIV–XVIII st.) [Royal Charters Granted to the National Communities in the City of Lviv in the 14th–18th Centuries]*, edited by Myron Kapral. Lviv: Piramida, 2000.
- Ranum, Orest. "Introduction," *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early-Modern Europe*, edited by Orest Ranum. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

- Raschella, V. Mons. *Paolo Piromalli: un domenicano di Siderno missionario nell'Armenia*. Catanzaro: Stab. Tip. Giovanni Abramo, 1935.
- Schneidmüller, Bernd. "Constructing the Past by Means of the Present: Historiographical Foundations of Medieval Institutions, Dynasties, Peoples, and Communities." In *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*, edited by Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, and Patrick J. Geary, 167–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Schütz, Edmond. "An Armeno-Kipchak Document of 1640 from Lvov and its Background in Armenia and in the Diaspora." In *Between the Danube and the Caucasus*, edited by György Kara, 247–330. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1987.
- Solicovius, I. D. *Commentarius brevis rerum Polonicarum a morte Sigismundi Augusti*. Dantisci, 1647.
- Strath, Bo. "Introduction. Myth, Memory and History in the Construction of Community." In *Myth and Memory in the Construction of Community: Historical Patterns in Europe and Beyond*, edited by Bo Strath. Bruxelles, Bern, Berlin, Frankfurt/M, New York, Wien: P.I. E. - Peter Lang, 2000.
- Strykowski, Maciej. *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*. Cracoviae, 1582.
- Wdowiszewski, Z. "Regesty przywilejów indygenatu w Polsce (1519–1793)." In *Materiały do biografii, genealogii i heraldyki polskiej*. Vol. 5. Buenos Aires, 1971.
- Wolf, Daniel. *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Wróbel-Lipowa, K. "Działalność dyplomatyczna Ormian polskich w XVI–XVII w." In *Studia z dziejów kontaktów polsko-ormiańskich*, pod red. M. Zakrzewskiej-Dubasowej, 107–17. Lublin, 1983.
- Wyrobisz, Andrzej. "Attitude of the Polish Nobility towards Towns in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century." *Acta Poloniae Historica* 48 (1983): 77–94.
- Zachariasiewicz, F.-X. *Wiadomość o Ormianach w Polsce*. Lwów, 1842.
- Zimorowicz, J.-B. *Leopolis triplex*. In *Opera quibus res gestae urbis Leopoldis illustrantur*, edited by K.J. Heck. Lwów, 1899.



Alexandr Osipian is an Associate Professor of History at the Department of History and Cultural Studies at Kramatorsk Institute of Economics and Humanities, Ukraine. His research focuses on the history of the Armenian trading Diasporas in the late medieval and early modern Polish Kingdom and Moldavian Principality, and their trade in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Attention is focused on the relations between Armenian merchants and local authorities, namely, on the merchants' strategies of integration into the host societies. In particular, Prof. Osipian focuses his interest on the questions of how the Armenian merchants and Catholic patricians in Lemberg/Lviv constructed the usable past for their social advance. Prof. Osipian's articles are published in peer-reviewed journals such as *Medieval Encounters* and *Russian History*, and in edited books such as *Memory before Modernity. Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), *Social and Political Elites in Eastern and Central Europe (15th–18th Centuries)* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013), and *Eredità Latina. Polonia, Lituania, Rutenia* (Florence, 2013).