

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2020.8.1.10>**PAN-SŁUGA: NIEKTÓRE ASPEKTY INTERAKCJI OSOBOWOŚCIOWEJ****Yuliia Bezsmertna***aspirantka Katedry Historii Ukrainy**Poltawskiego Narodowego Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego im. V.G. Korolenki (Poltawa, Ukraina)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4182-5490

e-mail: jbezsmertna@gmail.com

Adnotacja. W artykule wyjaśniono niektóre aspekty interakcji osobowościowej panów i ich sług w miastach Hetmańszczyzny w drugiej połowie XVIII wieku. Analiza opiera się na dokumentacji księgowej, aktach prawnych i prywatnych, materiałach sądowych, pamiętnikach, utworach literackich. Źródła te są już dobrze znane badaczom i są uniwersalne dla okresu wczesnomodernistycznego, jednak potrzebują odpowiednio postawionych pytań i konkretnych metod pracy. Jest to również ważne, ponieważ słudzy nie zostawili pisemnych wzmianek o sobie. Wszystko, co mamy, należy do pióra głównie kancelistów, czy też przedstawicieli ówczesnej wykształconej elity. Istnienie na skrzyżowaniu świata prywatnego i publicznego oraz specyfika wykonywanych prac prowadziły do pominięcia przedstawicieli tego zawodu w spisach, oficjalnych dokumentach i osobistych dziennikach, a akta spraw sądowych dotyczyły raczej sytuacji konfliktowych niż codziennej praktyki. Dlatego relacje osobowościowe między panami i sługami wymagają ostrożności w interpretacji.

Słowa kluczowe: Hetmańszczyzna, społeczeństwo wczesnomodernistyczne, Spis Rumiancewski, gospodarstwo domowe, pan, sługa.

MASTER-SERVANT: SOME ASPECTS OF PERSONAL INTERACTION**Yuliia Bezsmertna***Postgraduate Student at the Department of History of Ukraine**Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University (Poltava, Ukraine)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4182-5490

e-mail: jbezsmertna@gmail.com

Abstract. The article clarifies some aspects of personal interaction between masters and their servants in the cities of the Hetmanshchyna in the second half of the XVIII century. The analysis is based on accounting documentation, legislative and private law acts, court case materials, diaries, literary works. These sources are already well known to researchers and are universal for the early modern era. However, they require the right questions and specific working methods. This is also important because the servants did not leave written mentions of themselves. Everything we have belongs to the pen of mostly clerks or representatives of the educated elite of that time. The existence of private and public worlds and the specifics of the work performed led to the omission of representatives of this profession in censuses, official documents and personal diaries, and court case materials usually concerned conflict situations rather than daily practice. Therefore, the personal relationship between masters and servants requires caution in interpretation.

Key words: Hetmanshchyna, early modern society, Rumyantsev description, household, master, servant.

ГОСПОДАР-СЛУГА: ДЕЯКІ АСПЕКТИ ОСОБИСТІСНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ**Юлія Безсмертна***аспірантка кафедри історії України**Полтавського національного педагогічного університету імені В. Г. Короленка (Полтава, Україна)*e-mail: jbezsmertna@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4182-5490

Анотація. У статті з'ясовуються деякі аспекти особистісної взаємодії господарів та їхніх слуг у містах Гетьманщини другої половини XVIII ст. В основі аналізу – облікова документація, законодавчі та приватноправові акти, матеріали судових справ, щоденники, літературні твори. Ці джерела вже добре відомі дослідникам та є універсальними для ранньомодерної доби, однак вони потребують правильно поставлених питань та специфічних методів роботи. Це важливо ще й тому, що слуги не залишили письмових згадок про себе. Усе, що ми маємо, належить перу переважно канцеляристів або ж представників тогочасної освіченої еліти. Існування на перетині приватного та публічного світів та специфіка виконуваних робіт призводили до пропуску представників цієї професії в переписах, офіційних документах та особистих щоденниках, а матеріали судових справ зазвичай стосувалися конфліктних ситуацій, а не щоденної практики. Тож особистісні відносини між господарями й слугами вимагають обережності в трактуванні.

Ключові слова: Гетьманщина, ранньомодерне суспільство, Румянцевський опис, домогосподарство, господар, слуга.

Introduction. Among the works on the history of Hetmanshyna we can find numerous studies economic and social situation of different groups: the aristocracy, Cossacks, burghers, peasants, clergy and others. However, for some reason, researchers do not pay attention to the prevalence of the noticeable group domestic servants. Its representatives had an important place in the life of each of the above groups. A large number of people came to the city to search the work, there were salaried workers in many households in the city and in the countryside, their presence was also necessary for the functioning of the household of elite. After all, many researcher mentions about the existence of the servants indirectly, in the context of general social processes, but they do not go beyond the known claims and almost completely devoid of specifics. This means that we able say surprisingly little about the group that was not only an important part of the early modern society, but also played an important role in its functioning.

Given the significant proximity of daily cohabitation, the personal relationship between masters and servants requires caution in interpretation, because no written mention of his vision of life servants did not leave. For that time, service was an obvious concept and therefore did not require discussion. Therefore, today there are several views on the place of servants in the household. Some researchers consider servants as family members, while others speak of their complete dependence on the master and superior attitude towards them. However, everyday practices were likely to be contractual and changed depending on life circumstances.

Such studies have already become traditional in European historical science and have become an integral part of the study of the population of individual countries. However, various aspects of personal interaction between masters and servants in the cities of the Hetmanate have so far aroused the interest of only a few domestic researchers (Voronchuk, 2012; Voloshyn, 2016; Serdiuk, 2018). Therefore, the need to study these problems is palpable, because due to the lack of development of many issues in Ukrainian historiography, old sociological ideas and stereotypes continue to exist.

Presentation of the main provisions. When dealing with personal interactions, one should be very careful in interpreting certain situations, especially when it comes to the relationship between masters and servants. Unfortunately, the servants did not leave any written mention of their vision of life, and the crumbs of information that can be indirectly extracted from diaries, court cases or other official documents do not give a complete picture, because they are written on behalf of clerks or employers and do not contain any specifics on everyday life. Polish researcher R. Poniat explains this situation by the fact that service was an obvious concept for the society of that time, so it did not require discussion (Poniat, 2011: 64).

Researchers who have addressed this issue in their work, sometimes give radically different characteristics of the relationship between servants and employers. For example, I. Voronchuk calls the relationship between master and servant the most striking example of bilateral interpersonal relations, because “early modern society, differentiated according to social and material status, often functioned in a closed space of interdependence” (Voronchuk, 2012: 176). While researching households in Volyn, she paid a lot of attention to the study of the place of servants in the family hierarchy. The researcher claims that the servants, like the rest of the household, were completely subordinate to the head of the house, and appeals to ancient traditions comparing the servant with the child: “as a small child was completely dependent on the father, so the servant depended on his master” (Voronchuk, 2012: 176).

A similar vision is found in the above-mentioned R. Poniata. In examining this question, he draws attention to the treatment of servants as immature persons, although this did not always indicate a young age. He suggests that the source of such feedback in the literature was the indulgent attitude of the owners to their subordinates. There was an idea of the need to control these stupid creatures, which required the owner of willpower, self-control and patience, because the workers were too easy to succumb to instincts. Therefore, the duty of morally and intellectually developed employers was to protect them from themselves (Poniat, 2011: 72). However, this superior attitude of employers to servants was characteristic of the XIX century. Whereas the analysis of the sources created by the judiciary of the XVIII century shows a much closer relationship between masters and servants. Western researchers have a similar vision. They suggest that during the existence of the phenomenon of “life-cycle servants” the relationship between employers and servants was not characterized by such a great distance as in later times. The reason Polish researcher calls the social changes that occurred in the late XVIII century. and which made servants more isolated from the middle class. Most employers had no experience of working as servants and did not send children to work. In relations with employees, this has led to an increased sense of isolation (Poniat, 2011: 83).

So there is actually some debate among researchers trying to understand whether early modern servants perceived themselves more as family members or as employees. Recent studies have shown that in the XVI century. some servants behaved like “rational laborers” who tried to maximize their income if they found a farm that offered better working conditions. According to Gayle K. Brunelle, in the XVI century in Nantes, “the mistresses treated their servants as dependents, not quite relatives, but as completely subordinate to their authority, at least for the period specified in the contract”. Servants, on the other hand, perceived themselves “as wage workers who had the right to change or renew a contract when a more favorable offer appeared” (Brunelle Gayle, 1998). In other words, these servants perceived themselves as workers for money, not as subordinate family members. However, R. Sarti, calling such results very interesting, still warns that in early modern times it is possible (or even considered the norm) to be both workers and family members. “It is we, the people of the XX–XXI centuries, who see these two identities as opposites. In the (self-) perception of most servants (and masters) of that time, they probably merged” (Sarti, 2005: 6).

Another question to which there is no clear answer is what was the personal attitude of the servants to their occupation. For example, the Italian scholar Giovanna Da Molin argues that in southern Italian society in the seventeenth

and nineteenth centuries, hiring women was considered a disgrace, and in some cases it was better to starve. This vision was due to the strong influence of patriarchal traditions, when the head of the family had to protect the honor of women. The daughter could leave the family only after marriage. Women were not allowed to work. It was the husband who was obliged to earn the money needed to form a new family, while the contribution of the woman, at best, was given (Sarti, 2007: 23).

As a result, the servants were low-class people, marginal women without families. Most of them, according to Da Moline, were orphans, abandoned children, disgraced women and widows without families. All of these women took additional risks when entering the service because they could become victims of sexual violence. The existence of illegitimate offspring was quite common among maids. Sometimes such children even lived with their mother in the employer's house. Female servants had little chance of getting married. For them, service was often a lifelong occupation (Sarti, 2007: 23).

Domestic service was perceived as a source of possible shame in Sardinia, too. Life-cycle service was widespread there, but families avoided the placement of children as much as possible, and only extreme difficulties persuaded them to choose this path. That is, the servants, as a rule, were from the poorest strata of Sardinia (Sarti, 2007: 24).

The service was perceived differently in the western and northern European regions. For example, F. Aries wrote that service in the Middle Ages was not a degrading activity; J. Hainal emphasized that servants in pre-industrial North-Western Europe were not necessarily socially inferior to their masters, and P. Laslett argued that they could be of any social status. Obviously, the situation in Southern Italy and Sardinia differed, in particular, due to the emphasis on women's honor (Sarti, 2007: 24).

In the Hetmanate, extramarital affairs were also condemned by society, but this did not affect the number of women in the service, which was quite high. However, it should be borne in mind that the majority of maids were unmarried, single women or widows. According to Olena Borodenko, these categories were most prone to deviant antisocial behavior (Borodenko, 2012: 17).

Stories about the rape of maids are quite common in court cases, which at that time, unfortunately, were a common domestic affair. For example, Senko Shaposhnyk, a burgher, raped a maid while intoxicated and threatened to kill her for allegedly slandering him. The case went to court, where Shaposhnyk was found guilty and sentenced to death. However, due to numerous requests from respected acquaintances, the defendant's sentence was changed and he was obliged to pay the victim 20 kopecks of money, give cattle, clothes and other small things (Levitsky, 1930: 103–109).

A similar story happened with the cossack Ivan Bozhko. The court sentenced him to death, as recorded in Magdeburg law. However, Ivan sincerely asked for pardon, so the court ordered to pay damages to the victim: a cow, five sheep, a featherbed with a pillow, a sheet, three shirts, two shawls, red boots, a belt and as much bread as she needs (Levitsky, 1930: 109–110). So we see how “expensive” at that time was the “honor” of the maids and the ransom from death.

Semyon Goncharenko, the son of a respected cossack from the town of Sokolka, also went unpunished. For a time he lived “as with his wife” with the widow Vivdea, who served in the house. When the parents found out about their relationship, the mercenary was kicked out. So she came to court because she found out she was pregnant and wanted to give the child to her father (Levitsky, 1930: 110–111). The story of Jacek Polyvejka, from whom the former maid gave birth to a child, also reached the court. His wife found out about this case and tried to poison the mother (Lokhvytsia town hall book, 1986: 168–169). As we can see, there were cases of illegitimate children of maids in the Hetmanshchyna, and it is almost impossible to find out how frequent this phenomenon was.

There were also cases when the hiring tried to slander the master to get a reward. In one such story, defendant Kuzma managed to acquit himself, and the court found the girl guilty of defamation and sentenced her to death with whips, as stated in the Statute. Nevertheless, although the owner was acquitted, he had to pay court fines (Levitsky, 1930: 113–114). Bezshantchikh's widow, who applied to the court on behalf of Khimki's daughter, also failed to prove paternity. While serving, the daughter allegedly had a relationship with Ivan, Mr. Manoilev's shafar, but he did not acknowledge the connection (Lokhvytsia town hall book, 1986: 74).

Therefore, among the lawsuits we find both cases of rape of maids by the owners, and cases of voluntary cohabitation, which ended in pregnancy and the requirement to recognize paternity and marry. It is noteworthy that the court was approached mainly due to pregnancy or related crimes, such as the disappearance of the girl. In many cases, the case did not reach the application of the victims (Serdiuk, 2018: 329–330). Many lawsuits also involve the birth of illegitimate children, attempted abortions, or even the killing of unwanted offspring. V. Masliychuk, researching the deviant behavior of women in Slobozhanshchyna, notes that the past appears in unattractive robes of violence (Masliychuk, 2005: 205).

In addition, maids, corrupted by their masters, and then expelled, often embarked on the path of prostitution, because they could not arrange their personal lives. Especially “dangerous”: in this sense was the service in the pub. In one of the poems, Klimentiy Zinoviyiv warned that some people go to the inn “... Not so much for a drink, but for that matter...” (Zinoviyiv, 1971: 104). Therefore, a warning about the possible loss of women's “honor” in the service took place in the Hetmanate, too, but did not deter from hiring. It is probable that this crime was not exclusively related to the subordinate position of the maids, but characterized the gender deviations of the society of that time as a whole. So women may not have felt the connection between the likelihood of being a victim of violence and the service, or they may have been hired, aware of the danger and hoping to avoid it.

Researchers note that when we consider hiring as a purely economic phenomenon, we forget that it functioned in a traditional patriarchal society based on obedience and submission (from religious precepts to family relationships). The power of the father had much in common with the power of the master. Because it was about dominating other people's children, emotional safeguards (sorry, attachment, love) didn't work here. Therefore, sources record numerous cases of abuse of this power (Serdiuk, 2017).

Among such incidents, researchers note the gender aspect with some reservations. That is, the main victims of beatings were hired boys, while the most common crime against a girl was rape (Serdiuk, 2018: 328). One of the most serious crimes, of course, is murder, often committed through negligence or drunkenness. This is exactly what happened in the case of the Cossack Palazhka Hrytsykha. Drunken, she pointed a gun at the maid, wanting to scare her. The weapon allegedly accidentally fired, killing the maid (Levitsky, 1930: 84–88). There are also cases of murder of servants (Lokhvytsia town hall book, 1986: 29, 190), but “the murder itself was accidental, but not the beating”, because “education by the stick” was common in traditional society not only in the relationship between master and servant, but also in family relations (Serdiuk, 2018: 331–332). This was mentioned, for example, by Ilya Turchynovsky: “brought up in a good punishment” (*Autobiography of a South Russian priest, 1885*).

Frequent crimes also included theft of household property, escape and abuse of office. V. Masliychuk notes that in the case of disappearances and shortages, suspicion, first of all, fell on the servants, and often not without reason. The main objects of the crime were things (clothes) and money. For example, during the robbery of the Valka merchant Kramarenko, the maid, in addition to money, stole a fur coat, a scroll, skirts, corsets, haze, as well as jewelry – an amber necklace and dukachi. The researcher cites numerous cases of such thefts, noting the naivety and inexperience of the maids, because in most cases they did not even try to sell the stolen or somehow protect themselves from punishment (Masliychuk, 2005: 209–210). Numerous thefts are also found in case materials on the territory of the Hetmanshchyna. Thus, the Lokhvytsia shopkeeper Protsyk accused his maid Horpina of stealing money (Lokhvytsia town hall book, 1986: 42), and Pavlo Kgrechyn complained about his boyfriend Matviy, who stole “four pairs of garus belts” and took them to the fair for sale (Lokhvytsia town hall book, 1986: 45). The situation with the clothes that the servants received during the service was especially ambiguous. A classic situation is when the mercenary, leaving the service, took the issued clothes, but the owners considered it a theft (Serdiuk, 2018: 335).

Therefore, there was an infinity of individual relations between the master and the servant, and in general the institution of service was quite flexible (Holmes, 1989: 16). In general, we can identify several options for interaction between servant and master. According to I. Serdyuk, it could be an “evil” owner and an unfortunate mercenary; bad mercenary; “ideal” relationship (Serdiuk, 2018: 328–340). However, most of the documentary evidence concerns incidents, and we have more assumptions about daily interaction.

Researchers believe that both parties benefited from such interaction (Serdiuk, 2018: 338). In general, the concepts of hierarchy and patriarchy are central to a proper understanding of domestic service during this period. Patriarchy radiated from above the social structure in the form of patronage and was present at various levels in the form of paternalism. At all levels, the head of a dynasty or household was seen as a philanthropist, overseer, master, patron of his dependents and subordinates, who, in turn, were subordinated to him sometimes throughout life (Holmes, 1989: 16).

One of the characteristic features of the discussed interaction is a significant closeness between masters and servants in the cities of the Hetmanshchyna of the XVIII century. This was also facilitated by a similar social background, because both employers and servants in most cases were natives of the burghers, peasants or Cossacks. An important circumstance can be considered the experience of their own service, which was the employers, because then the owner could better understand the needs and aspirations of subordinates. Examples of the servants' sincere devotion to their masters and vice versa should also be taken into account, for after many years, and often throughout their lives, servants were concerned with the family affairs and interests of their masters, who were also attached to them. “This emotional contact contributed to the fact that the servants considered themselves members of the family they served” (Voronchuk, 2012: 179).

As a **conclusion** so, the analysis of the role of servants in the life of early modern households and personal relationship master-servant give reason to argue that this research topic is an urgent issue of the present and is of considerable scientific interest, and therefore requires the activation of scientists in this direction. Having lived under the same roof with their masters for many years, servants became an integral part of the family community. At the same time, employers were aware of their responsibility to care for them as well as for their own biological families. However, the personal factor should not be ruled out, because a lot also depended on the character or upbringing of both parties.

Bibliography:

1. Автобиография южнорусского священника 1-й половины XVIII ст. «Киевская старина», 1885, т. XI, С. 321–332. URL: http://litopys.org.ua/old18/old18_35.htm
2. Борошенко О. Розпуста як прояв девіантної поведінки самотніх жінок в суспільстві Гетьманщини XVIII століття. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*. 2012. вип. XXXIII. С. 17–21.
3. Волошин Ю. «Служители» і «работники» в домогосподарствах мешканців міста Полтави другої половини XVIII ст. *Patrimonium. Студії з ранньомодерної історії Центрально-Східної Європи XVI-XVIII ст.* Київ – Краків: LAURUS – Historia Iagiellonica, 2015. С. 391 – 402.
4. Волошин Ю. Козаки і посполиті: Миська спільнота Полтави другої половини XVIII ст. Київ: К.І.С., 2016. 356 с.

5. Ворончук І. О. Населення Волині в XVI – першій половині XVII ст.: родина, домогосподарство, демографічні чинники: Монографія. К.: НАН України, 2012. 712 с.
6. Зіновійв К. Вірші. Приповіді посполиті. Підг. тексту І. П. Чепіги. К.: Наукова думка, 1971. 392 с.
7. Левицький О. І. По судах Гетьманщини. Нариси народного життя Гетьманщини 2-ої пол. XVIII ст. Передмова, редакція й переклад М. Горбаня. Харків: Рух, 1930. 252 с.
8. Лохвицька ратушна книга другої половини XVII ст. (збірник актових документів). АН Української РСР, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О.О. Потебні; відп. ред.: І. П. Чепіга. К.: Наукова думка, 1986. 221 с.
9. Маслійчук В. Девіантна поведінка жінки на Слобожанщині у 80-х – 90-х рр. XVIII ст. (за матеріалами повітових судів Харківського наміництва). *Соціум*. 2005. № 5. С. 197 – 215.
10. Сердюк І. Вогонь, вода та неостанні клейноди. Декілька слів про історію дитячої праці в Гетьманщині. *Historians.in.ua*. URL: <http://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/en/avtorska-kolonka/2252-igor-serdyuk-vogon-voda-ta-neostanni-klejnodii-kilka-sliv-pro-istoriyu-dityachoji-pratsi-v-getmanshchini>.
11. Сердюк І. Дитяча праця. *Маленький дорослий: Дитина й дитинство в Гетьманщині XVIII ст.* Київ: К.І.С., 2018. С. 299–340.
12. Brunelle Gayle K. Contractual Kin: Servants and Their Mistresses in Sixteenth-Century Nantes. *Journal of Early Modern History*. 1998. Volume 2. Issue 4. P. 374–394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/157006598X00036>
13. Holmes J. Domestic service in Yorkshire 1650-1780. University of York, 1989. 380 p.
14. Poniat R. Służba domowa w miastach na ziemiach polskich od połowy XVIII do końca XIX wieku. Praca doktorska napisana pod kierunkiem prof. dr hab. Cezarego Kuklo. Białystok, 2011. 387 s.
15. Sarti R. Criados, servi, domestiques, Gesinde, servants: for a comparative history of domestic service in Europe (16th-19th centuries). *Obradoiro de Historia Moderna*. 2007. № 16. P. 9 – 39.
16. Sarti R. Who are servants? Defining domestic service in Western Europe (16th – 21st centuries) in Suzy Pasleau and Isabelle Schopp (eds), with Raffaella Sarti. *Proceedings of the Servant Project*. Liège, Éditions de l'Université de Liège, 2005 (but 2006). 5 vols., vol. 2. P. 3 – 59.

References:

1. Avtobyohrafiya yuzhnorusskoho sviashchenyka 1-yu polovyny XVIII st. (1885) [Autobiography of a South Russian priest of the first half of the 18th century]. «*Kyevskaia staryna*». Issue XI, pp. 321–332. URL: http://litopys.org.ua/old18/old18_35.htm [in Ukrainian].
2. Borodenko O. (2012). Rozpusta yak proiav deviantnoi povedinky samotnikh zhinok v suspilstvi Hetmanshchyny XVIII stolittia [Debauchery as a manifestation of deviant behavior of single women in the society of the Hetmanate of the XVIII century]. *Naukovi pratsi istorichnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu*. Issue XXXIII, pp. 17–21 [in Ukrainian].
3. Brunelle Gayle K. (1998). Contractual Kin: Servants and Their Mistresses in Sixteenth-Century Nantes. *Journal of Early Modern History*. Volume 2, issue 4, pp. 374–394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/157006598X00036> [in English].
4. Holmes J. (1989). Domestic service in Yorkshire 1650-1780. University of York. 380 p. [in English].
5. Levytskyi O.I. (1930). Po sudakh Hetmanshchyny. Narisy narodnoho zhyttia Hetmanshchyny 2-oi pol. XVIII st. [According to the courts of the Hetmanshchyna. Essays on the people's life of the Hetmanshchyna in the second half of the XVIII century]. Peredmovna, redaktsiia y pereklad M. Horbania. Kharkiv: Rukh. 252 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Lokhvytska ratusna knyha druhoi polovyny XVII st. (zbirnyk aktyvokh dokumentiv). (1986). [Lokhvytsia town hall book of the second half of the XVII century]. AN Ukrainkoï RSR, In-t movoznavstva im. O.O. Potebni; vidp. red.: I. P. Chepiha. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 221 p. [in Ukrainian].
7. Masliichuk V. (2005). Deviantna povedinka zhinky na Slobozhanshchyni u 80-kh – 90-kh rr. XVIII st. (za materialamy povitovykh sudiv Kharkivskoho naminytstva) [Deviant behavior of women in Slobozhanshchyna in the 80's–90's of the XVIII century (based on the materials of the district courts of the Kharkiv diocese)]. *Sotsium*. Issue 5, pp. 197–215. [in Ukrainian].
8. Poniat R. (2011). Służba domowa w miastach na ziemiach polskich od połowy XVIII do końca XIX wieku. Praca doktorska napisana pod kierunkiem prof. dr hab. Cezarego Kuklo. Białystok. 387 s. [in Polish].
9. Sarti R. (2005). Who are servants? Defining domestic service in Western Europe (16th – 21st centuries) in Suzy Pasleau and Isabelle Schopp (eds), with Raffaella Sarti. *Proceedings of the Servant Project*. Liège, Éditions de l'Université de Liège. 5 vols., vol. 2., pp. 3–59. [in English].
10. Sarti R. (2007). Criados, servi, domestiques, Gesinde, servants: for a comparative history of domestic service in Europe (16th-19th centuries). *Obradoiro de Historia Moderna*. Issue 16, pp. 9–39. [in English].
11. Serdiuk I. (2017). Vohon, voda ta neostanni kleynody. Dekilka sliv pro istoriiu dytiachoi pratsi v Hetmanshchyni [Fire, water and the last jewels. A few words about the history of child labor in the Hetmanshchyna]. *Historians.in.ua*. URL: <http://www.historians.in.ua/index.php/en/avtorska-kolonka/2252-igor-serdyuk-vogon-voda-ta-neostanni-klejnodii-kilka-sliv-pro-istoriyu-dityachoji-pratsi-v-getmanshchini>. [in Ukrainian].
12. Serdiuk I. (2018). Dytiacha pratsia [Child labor]. *Malenkyi doroslyi: Dytna y dytynstvo v Hetmanshchyni XVIII st.* Kyiv: K.I.S., pp. 299–340. [in Ukrainian].
13. Voloshyn Yu. (2015). “Sluzhytely” i “rabortnyky” v domohospodarstvakh meshkantsiv mista Poltavy druhoi polovyny XVIII st. [“Servants” and “workers” in the households of Poltava citizens in the second half of the 18th century]. *Patrimonium. Studii z rannomodernoï istoriiï Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy XVI-XVIII st.* Kyiv – Krakiv: LAURUS – Historia Iagiellonica, pp. 391–402 [in Ukrainian].

14. Voloshyn Yu. (2016). Kozaky i pospolyti: Miska spilnota Poltavy druhoi polovyny XVIII st. [Cossacks and the Commonwealth: Poltava City Community of the second half of the XVIII century]. Kyiv: K.I.S. 356 p. [in Ukrainian].
15. Voronchuk I. O. (2012). Naseleattia Volyni v XVI – pershii polovyny XVII st.: rodyna, domohospodarstvo, demohrafichni chynnyky: Monohrafia [The population of Volyn XVI – first half XVII .: family, household demographic factors: Monograph]. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy. 712 p. [in Ukrainian].
16. Zinoviiv K. (1971). Virshi. Pripovisti pospolyti [Lyrics. Common parables]. Pidh. tekstu I. P. Chepihy. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 392 p. [in Ukrainian].