

Zenon E. Kohut

**Habent sua fata libelli:
The Torturous Destiny of Two Monographs
on Hetman Petro Doroshenko**

On 30 June 1939, the prominent Ukrainian historian and political activist, Dmytro Doroshenko, completed a comprehensive manuscript devoted to his distant relative, Hetman Petro Doroshenko (1665–1676). It was the first major study devoted to this Cossack hetman¹.

Fate was unkind to this manuscript. As the Second World War broke out, Dmytro Doroshenko brought the manuscript with him from Warsaw to Prague. He was forced to leave his manuscript behind when he fled Prague in 1945. Dmytro Doroshenko himself never lived to see his monograph published. He died in Munich in 1951 without ever seeing his manuscript again. All efforts at attempting to locate the manuscript by his wife failed.

When Dmytro Doroshenko wrote his monograph, he already had a brilliant career as a civic figure, historian, and politician. Born in a Cossack officer family from the Hlukhiv region that had produced two hetmans (Mykhailo Doroshenko and Petro Doroshenko), Dmytro Doroshenko flung himself into the Ukrainian movement of the late nineteenth and the twentieth century, including membership in the Ukrainian Student *Hromada*, the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party, and later the Society of Ukrainian Progressives (TUP). He also contributed to political journals in Galicia and after the 1905 Revolution to newspapers and journals of national-democratic orientation in Eastern Ukraine.

Dmytro Doroshenko was politically active in the revolutionary period of 1917–1918. He was appointed commissar of Galicia and Bukovyna by the Russian Provisional Government. Subsequently, Dmytro Doroshenko was asked to form the new government (General Secretariat) of the Ukrainian Central Rada, but he declined due to differences with the Rada head, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi. After the coup that brought Hetman Pavlo Skoropads'kyi to power, he became Minister of Foreign Affairs

¹ See the *Foreword* by the editor Vasyli' Omel'chenko in: *Doroshenko Dmytro*. Hetman Petro Doroshenko. — New York: UVAN, 1985. — P. 17. For a brief overview of Dmytro Doroshenko's biography see: *Kohut Zenon E., Nebesio Bohdan Y., and Yurkevych Myroslav*. Doroshenko, Dmytro // *Historical Dictionary of Ukraine*. — Lanham, Maryland; Toronto; Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2005. — P. 143–145.

of the Ukrainian State — a position Dmytro Doroshenko held until the fall of Skoropads'kyi's government in December 1918.

From 1920, Dmytro Doroshenko lived as an émigré. He continued his political activity by helping to establish a Ukrainian monarchist union — the Ukrainian Union of Agrarian Statists. There Doroshenko worked closely with the Union's main ideologue, V'iacheslav Lypyns'kyi. In his ideology, Lypyns'kyi criticized the Ukrainian Central Rada and Directory governments for attempting to base the national liberation struggle on socialist principles and their rejection of the state-building capabilities of the landowning classes. Lypyns'kyi also believed that Ukrainian statehood was achievable only by the landowning elites — a philosophy also adopted by Dmytro Doroshenko².

It was during emigration that Dmytro Doroshenko experienced his most productive period as an historian. He was Professor of History at the Ukrainian Free University (then located in Prague) and headed the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin. Dmytro Doroshenko wrote many works on history, culture, and the church. Most notable were his survey works: *Narys istorii Ukraïny* (2 volumes, 1932–1933), *Istoriia Ukraïny, 1917–1923* (2 volumes, 1930–1932), and *Ohliad ukraïns'koi istoriohrafii* (1923). In 1936, the University of Warsaw offered Dmytro Doroshenko a Chair in Church History in the Department of Orthodox Theology. Throughout his stay in Poland, Doroshenko embarked on extensive research in archives in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, and L'viv on the Cossack period of Ukrainian history, especially the period of Hetman Petro Doroshenko, the monograph that he completed in Warsaw in 1939.

Although Dmytro Doroshenko penned the first comprehensive monograph on the hetman, there were already a number of views on Hetman Doroshenko's life and policies. The eighteenth-century Cossack chronicles castigated the hetman for his pro-Ottoman policies, the depredations caused by his Tatar and Turkish «allies», and his massive retributions against those disloyal to his authority³. However, there are indications that during the 1700s authors were already divided in their opinions about Petro Doroshenko and his policies. For example, while Hryhorii Hrabianka, who was more critical of Hetman Doroshenko, called this hetman «godless» for allegedly not condemning the desecration of holy icons in Kam'ianets' by his Ottoman allies, Samoïl Velychko was more sympathetic to Petro Doroshenko, presenting a different narrative and emphasizing Ottoman benevolence to the local residents who surrendered to the Ottoman troops⁴.

The imperial Russian narrative portrayed Hetman Petro Doroshenko in largely negative undertones, at least while referring to his political career prior to this

² Prymak Thomas M. Dmytro Doroshenko: A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. — 2001. — Vol. XXV. — No. 1/2. — P. 31–56 (on pages 33–34).

³ Grabianka Grigorii. Deistviia prezel'noi i ot nachala poliakov krvavshoi nebyvaloi brani Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo, getmana Zaporozhskogo, s poliaki...roku 1710, izdana Vremennoi kommissieiu dlia razbora drevnikh aktov. — Kiev: V Universitetskoï tipografii, 1854. — P. 201, 205–207; Velichko Samoïl. Letopis' sobytii v iugozapadnoi Rossii v XVII-m veke (1720)... izdana Vremennoi kommissieiu dlia razbora drevnikh aktov. — Vol. 2. — Kiev: V Lito-tipografskom zavedenii Iosifa Val'nera, 1851. — P. 334 passim.

⁴ Grabianka Grigorii. Deistviia prezel'noi. — P. 206–207; Velichko Samoïl. Letopis' sobytii. — P. 331.

hetman's surrender to the Muscovite authority in 1676. In their writings Doroshenko emerged as a shrewd and unscrupulous politician who in his drive for personal power even chose Muslim protection. Some even called his ascent to the hetman's office «illegal»⁵. At the same time, these historians recognized that Hetman Doroshenko was an able and steadfast opponent both of Moscow and Warsaw. For imperial Russian historians the opposition to Moscow was condemned.

Late nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians told a much more positive story. Mykola Kostomarov in his study of the period of the «Ruin» counted Petro Doroshenko among the most distinguished leaders of early-modern Ukrainian history⁶. According to Kostomarov, Hetman Doroshenko «was genuinely devoted and always true to the idea of independence and uniqueness of his fatherland» (*idee nezavisimosti i samobytnosti svoei rodiny*) — a vision that was the continuation of that of his predecessors, most notably Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and Ivan Vyhovs'kyi⁷.

Kostomarov's opinion that Petro Doroshenko was a distinguished statesman of his time and advanced the political course of the late Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi was shared by other Ukrainian scholars. For example, Andrii Storozhenko, while refusing to acknowledge «love for [one's] fatherland» and «political ideals» in other hetmans, considered Hetman Petro Doroshenko «unwavering in his desire [to guarantee] the political independence and uniqueness of Little Russia» (*stremlenii k politicheskoi nezavisimosti i samobytnosti Malorossii*)⁸. Oleksandra Efymenko counted this hetman among very few leaders of that tumultuous period, who emerged not owing to accidental play of various forces, but owing to individual qualities: first of all, his intellect, natural eloquence and aspiration for power, which turned him into a leader of the masses⁹. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi considered Hetman Doroshenko «an individual of extraordinary spirit, dedicated with his soul and body to [the task] of liberating Ukraine»¹⁰.

The late nineteenth-century tendency to portray Hetman Petro Doroshenko as a prominent early-modern Ukrainian statesman became predominant during the first decades of the next century. Most significantly this view was upheld by V'iacheslav

⁵ *Bantysh-Kamenskii Dmitrii*. Istoriiia Maloi Rossii (1823). — Kyiv: Chas, 1993. — P. 257, 264–266, 270–272; *Popov Aleksandr*. Russkoe posol'stvo v Pol'shche v 1673–1677 godakh. Neskol'ko let iz istorii otnoshcheniia drevnei Rossii k evropeiskim derzhavam. — St. Petersburg, 1854. — P. 55–61 passim; *Pavlishchev Nikolai*. Pol'skaia anarkhiia pri Iane Kazimire i voina za Ukrainu. — Vol. 2. — St. Petersburg: Tipografiia V. S. Balasheva, 1887. — P. 337–339.

⁶ *Kostomarov Nikolai*. Ruina 1663–1687: Istoricheskaiia monografiia. Getmanstva Brukhovetskago, Mnogogreshnago i Samoilovicha. — St. Petersburg and Moscow: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa-tipografa M. O. Vol'fa, 1882. — P. 512–513.

⁷ *Kostomarov Nikolai*. Ruina 1663–1687. — P. 512; *Stepankov Valerii*. Postat' Petra Doroshenka u vysvitlenni istoriykiv // Istynu vstanovliue sud istorii. Zbirnyk na poshanu Fedora Pavlovycha Shevchenka. — Vol. 2. — Kyiv: NAN Ukraïny; Instytut istorii Ukraïny NAN Ukraïny, 2004. — P. 418–448 (on pages 420–423); *Smolii Valerii and Stepankov Valerii*. Petro Doroshenko: politychnyi portret. — Kyiv: Tempora, 2011. — P. 24.

⁸ *Storozhenko Andrei*. Rodion Grigor'evich Dmitrashko, polkovnik Pereiaslavskii // Kievskaiia starina (hereafter — KS). — 1893. — Vol. 41. — P. 1–28 (on pages 2–3).

⁹ *Efimenko Aleksandra*. Istoriiia ukrainskogo naroda. — St. Petersburg: Tip. Akts. Obsch. Brokgauz Efron, 1906. — P. 250–253.

¹⁰ *Hrushevs'kyi Mykhailo*. Iliustrovana istoriiia Ukraïny. — Kyiv: Petro Bars'kyi, 1917. — P. 341.

Lypyns'kyi who dubbed Hetman Petro Doroshenko «the last [true] Cossack» and considered him to be an outstanding example of a Ukrainian native aristocracy that was the primary proponent of Ukrainian state autonomy¹¹.

It was an interpretation that was followed by Dmytro Doroshenko in his *Hetman Petro Doroshenko*. The work is primarily a political biography without much general discussion of Ukrainian history. As a statist, Dmytro Doroshenko viewed the Ukrainian Hetmanate as an early modern state. Unlike Hrushevs'kyi, who emphasized mass movements, Dmytro Doroshenko focused on the role of Ukrainian elites in the creating of such state structures. For Dmytro Doroshenko, therefore, Hetman Doroshenko served as a prime example of such a leader. The book demonstrates that Hetman Doroshenko was totally devoted to the cause of uniting Ukraine in the face of Ukrainian disunity as well as Polish and Muscovite intransigence. At the same time, Dmytro Doroshenko did not glorify the hetman and presented honestly the disastrous consequences of Hetman Doroshenko's pro-Ottoman policies¹².

Perhaps the work's greatest achievement was that for the first time it established a comprehensive chronology of Hetman Petro Doroshenko's life and political activity (over 700 pages in the printed edition). This detailed political biography was based on published sources as well as use of archives in Warsaw, Cracow, Poznań, and L'viv. In fact, virtually every event described by Dmytro Doroshenko is backed by extensive documentary citations and, on occasion, he cites or paraphrases major portions of memoranda. While this technique slows the narrative, it makes it more nuanced and detailed and gives the reader a better feel for the issues and language of the seventeenth century¹³.

Dmytro Doroshenko's extensive documentary citations become particularly important in the light of the subsequent destruction of some of the Polish archives. The historian used documents from major Polish archives: Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych (AGAD), Archiwum Koronne Warszawskie (AKW), Archiwum Radziwiłłów (AR) in Warsaw, as well as major Polish library manuscript collections (Biblioteka Zamoyskich, which included the family archive, Biblioteka Baworowskich, Biblioteka Czartoryskich, Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasińskich, and Biblioteka Narodowa)¹⁴. Overall, Polish archives and library manuscript collections suffered heavy losses during World War II. The worst affected were the Warsaw manuscript materials and documents which were 95 per cent destroyed¹⁵. The invaders destroyed the Sejm and Senate Library, the Przędziecki Library, the Zamoyski Library, the Załuski Library, the Central Military Library, the Radziwiłł collections in Warsaw, the Polish National

¹¹ *Lypyns'kyi V'iacheslav*. Tvory. Arkhiv. Studii. — Vol. 2. — Philadelphia, 1990. — P. 243; *Ibid.* — Vol. 3. — 1991. — P. 151–152, 169.

¹² *Doroshenko Dmytro*. Hetman Petro Doroshenko. — P. 641–670; *Stepankov Valerii*. Postat' Petra Doroshenka u vysvitlenni istorykiv. — P. 426.

¹³ *Prymak Thomas M*. Dmytro Doroshenko: A Ukrainian Émigré Historian of the Interwar Period. — P. 43–44. I have reconstructed such documents in my own research.

¹⁴ *Doroshenko Dmytro*. Hetman Petro Doroshenko. — P. 21–22.

¹⁵ For the history of the Polish archives see: *Tomczak Andrzej*. Zarys dziejów archiwów polskich. — Vols. 1–2. — Toruń, 1974–1980.

Library, the Krasin'ski Library, and other collections¹⁶. For example, after the war *AGAD* contained 370,000 archival units (groups of documents) of 2,000,000 archival units of the prewar collections¹⁷.

Establishing which documents related to Hetman Petro Doroshenko had been available to Dmytro Doroshenko and later lost during the war represents a major undertaking of its own and goes well beyond the topic at hand. However, it is possible to give representative examples of the documentary richness lost and now only available in Dmytro Doroshenko's monograph. In examining the first hundred pages of the monograph dealing with the first months of Hetman Petro Doroshenko's rule, there are 53 references to the *Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasin'skich* and another dozen to other Polish archives and libraries in Warsaw (Archiwum Radziwiłłów, Archiwum Zamoyskich, and Biblioteka Narodowa)¹⁸. Some of the more interesting documents from *Biblioteka Ordynacji Krasin'skich* deal with the overthrow of Petro Doroshenko's predecessor in the hetman's office (Stepan Opara), Petro Doroshenko's ascent to power with Tatar assistance, letter by a commander of the Polish garrison in Bila Tserkva¹⁹, and Petro Doroshenko's letter to the Polish king vehemently rejecting the charge that he, Doroshenko, had been elected hetman by the Tatars rather than by the Cossacks of all ranks²⁰. Another important document for reconstructing Hetman Doroshenko's early career includes this hetman's assurances to the king that he, Petro Doroshenko, «self-imposed the burden of hetmancy» without royal consent only because he saw «the imminent danger and great ruin of entire Ukraine»²¹.

The monograph also contains interesting documentation of Hetman Doroshenko's desperate attempt at maintaining the recently achieved unity of the Hetmanate (1668). After uniting both banks, the hetman appointed Dem'ian Mnohohrshnyi as

¹⁶ *Salmonowicz Stanisław*. Polskie państwo podziemne. — Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1994. — P. 229.

¹⁷ *Mathes William L*. Russian Collections in Libraries and Archives of Warsaw // *Slavic Review*. — 1974. — June. — Vol. 33 (2). — P. 323–335 (on pages 332–333). As an example of important archival collections being wiped out during World War II see references to the destroyed collections of documents from *Księgi Sądów: Asesorskiego, Relacyjnego i Sejmowego (1591–1744 [1795])*, such as *Protokół spraw sejmowych i relacyjnych 1659–1667*, and *Protokół spraw sejmowych i relacyjnych 1676–1681*. See: http://www.agad.archiwa.gov.pl/pomoce/MK_inw.xml#

¹⁸ *Kamieniecki Witold*. Straty Biblioteki Ordynacji Krasin'skich w zakresie zbiorów rękopiśmiennych // *Straty bibliotek i archiwów warszawskich w zakresie rękopiśmiennych źródeł historycznych*. — Vol. 3 («Biblioteki»). — Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955. — P. 142–176; *Wolff Adam*. Zniszczone dokumenty Biblioteki Ordynacji Krasin'skich // *Straty bibliotek i archiwów warszawskich w zakresie rękopiśmiennych źródeł historycznych*. — Vol. 3 («Biblioteki»). — Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955. — P. 177–318. Also see *Tomkiewicz Władysław*. Straty kulturalne Warszawy. — Warszawa, 1948 and *Wojenne losy Biblioteki Ordynacji Krasin'skich* at: <http://www.bn.org.pl/download/document/1236004197.pdf> For the catalogue of manuscripts in the pre-WWII collection and documents, related to Hetman Petro Doroshenko, see: *Pułaski Franciszek*. Opis 815 rękopisów Biblioteki Ord. Krasin'skich. — Warszawa: Nakładem Funduszu Świdzińskich, 1915. — P. 291, 292, 297, 501, 532, 541, 714, 716–718.

¹⁹ *Doroshenko Dmytro*. Hetman Petro Doroshenko. — P. 55.

²⁰ *Ibid.* — P. 53.

²¹ *Ibid.* — P. 63–64.

acting hetman for the Left Bank while Hetman Doroshenko pursued military campaigns on the Right Bank. Muscovy was able to pressure Mnohohrishnyi to become a full-fledged Left Bank hetman under its authority. The monograph contains extensive fragments of a letter written by Hetman Doroshenko to Mnohohrishnyi (January 1669) attempting to avert the split of the Left Bank from his rule²².

These are just a few examples of important sources cited, paraphrased, or extensively quoted in Dmytro Doroshenko's monograph that are no longer available to researchers. It is, therefore, very fortunate that this monograph did not disappear, but resurfaced in the West following the Prague Spring of 1968 and was brought to light in the spring of 1970. Apparently, it was sent by Ukrainian scholar and activist in Czechoslovakia, Orest Zilyns'kyi, to the then president of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in the U.S., Oleksander Ohloblyn. Details of how the manuscript survived and how it was smuggled out have never been revealed. Those involved feared Communist reprisals and covered up their tracks. In fact, Orest Zilyns'kyi, whose collection of Ukrainian folk ballads was banned from publication by the Czechoslovak authorities (1971), was killed under mysterious circumstances in July 1976²³. The work was finally published in 1985 by UVAN, the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US.

When Dmytro Doroshenko's work was finally published it offered a very different portrait of Hetman Petro Doroshenko from the one presented in Soviet Ukraine. In the Soviet historiography of the 1940s, Hetman Doroshenko is named among the «foremost enemies of the Russian state»²⁴. In fact, after the publication of the «Theses on the 300-Anniversary of the Reunification of Ukraine with Russia» (1954), all historical events and personalities had to be viewed through the prism of their relation (and attitude) towards Russia. Thus, works written by Soviet Ukrainian scholars during the 1960s and 1970s tended to label Hetman Doroshenko (as well as other «treacherous hetmans») an egotistical power-monger who sacrificed Ukraine to his «narrow class interests»²⁵. Olena Apanovych wrote in her 1961 monograph: «With Doroshenko's power solidified the condition of Ukrainian populace much worsened... Since the very beginning of his career Doroshenko proved himself to be a power-monger who in his strife for personal power employed actions which harmed the interests of the entire country»²⁶. At the same time, the «official» version of history

²² Ibid. — P. 227.

²³ *Senkus Roman*. Zilynsky, Orest // Encyclopedia of Ukraine, ed. Danylo Husar Struk. — Vol. 5. — Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 1993. — P. 865; *Nevrlyi Mikulash*. Orest Zilyns'kij iak literaturoznaveť // *Suchasnist'*. — 1994. — Vol. 11. — P. 156–164.

²⁴ For example see: *Stetsiuk Kateryna*. Vplyv povstannia Stepana Razina na Ukraïnu: Z istorii spil'noi borot'by rosiiskoho i ukraïns'koho narodu proty feodal'no-kriposnyts'koho hntu / Pid. red. M. P. Petrovs'kyi. — Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSSR, 1947. — P. 24.

²⁵ References are made to: *Stetsiuk Kateryna*. Narodni rukhy na Livobverezhnii i Slobids'kii Ukraïni v 50-kh–70-kh rokakh XVII st. — Kyiv: AN URSSR, 1960. — P. 256–257, 281–283, 349–356; and *Apanovych O.M.* Zaporoz'ka Sich u borot'bi proty turets'ko-tatars'koi ahresii (50-ti–70-ti roky XVII st.). — Kyiv: AN URSSR, 1961. — P. 195, 197. See discussion of that period's historiographical views on Petro Doroshenko in: *Stepankov Valerii*. Postat' Petra Doroshenka u vysvitleni istoriykiv. — P. 429.

²⁶ *Apanovych O.M.* Zaporoz'ka Sich. — P. 195.

was subverted by the evolution of certain views by some Ukrainian scholars (first of all, Olena Apanovych). Utilizing Soviet shibboleths of anti-Polish noble sentiment and pro-unification of the Ukrainian lands, in addition to criticizing Hetman Doroshenko for his «narrow class interests», they indicated that this hetman fought for clearing Ukraine from the rule of the Polish nobility and the unification of the divided parts of Ukraine²⁷. Soviet Ukrainian historians —among them Volodymyr Holobuts'kyi and Olena Apanovych— pointed out in their studies that Hetman Doroshenko's policy was centered on the denunciation of the Truce of Andrusovo and the unification of Ukraine²⁸. This line of thought among Ukrainian historians could only develop freely after Ukrainian independence. Fortunately, historians, such as Oleksandr Hurzhii, Volodymyr Horobets', Valerii Smolii, Valerii Stepankov as well as other scholars were able to turn to Dmytro Doroshenko's work for material in their rethinking of Petro Doroshenko and his hetmancy²⁹.

In 1970 another historian was completing the second major study of Hetman Petro Doroshenko. Jan Perdenia (22.12.1898–5.1.1973) was born in a largely Ukrainian area of Polissia and had shown an abiding interest in Ukrainian folklore and history. He taught at Polish middle school and as the Senior Assistant of the Chair of Modern Polish History at the Jagellonian University (Kraków) (1945-1948). He also lectured and conducted research at the university level. While at this position, Perdenia wrote a monograph on the history of Kam'ianets' (Kamieniec) and the Kam'ianets' (Kamieniec) *starostvo*. He also showed what became an abiding interest in Cossack Ukraine. Between 1952 and 1969, Jan Perdenia taught at the Higher Pedagogical School in Kraków. During this time, he continued his historical research and was habilitated at the Jagellonian University in 1963. His dissertation, *About the Position of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's Gentry in Relation to Ukrainian Affairs on the Cusp of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, was published in that year and received numerous acclaims as a valuable and well-researched treatise³⁰. Yet Jan Perdenia's most significant contribution to Ukrainian and Polish history, his political biography of Hetman Petro Doroshenko, was not published soon after it was written, but only reached readers thirty years later³¹.

Unfortunately for Jan Perdenia, Dmytro Doroshenko's manuscript was unavailable to him and he had to do much of the same fundamental spadework in researching his *Hetman Piotr Doroszenko a Polska*. Perdenia's study benefited from access to surviving Polish archival collections and was augmented by the documents from the archival collections of Moscow, including substantial materials not used by Doro-

²⁷ Ibid. — P. 202–203, 207–209.

²⁸ Golobutskii V.A. Zaporozhskoe kazachestvo. — Kiev: AN USSR, 1957. — P. 312; Apanovych O.M. Zaporoz'ka Sich. — P. 207–209.

²⁹ Stepankov Valerii. Postat' Petra Doroshenka u vysvitlenni istoriykiv. — P. 436–437.

³⁰ Stanowisko Rzeczypospolitej szlacheckiej wobec sprawy Ukrainy na przełomie XVII–XVIII w. — Wrocław: Wydaw. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, PAN, 1963. Winiarska Agnieszka. In Memoriam: Jan Perdenia (22 XII 1898 – 5 I 1973) // Kwartalnik Historyczny. — Warszawa, 1973. — No. 3. — P. 777–778.

³¹ Perdenia Jan. Hetman Piotr Doroszenko a Polska. — Kraków: Universitas, 2000.

shenko. Nevertheless, he lacked access to the destroyed Polish sources that had been utilized by Dmytro Doroshenko³². Thus, the two works complement each other.

The traditional Polish narrative (for example, Antoni Rolle, Tadeusz Korzon and Adam Darowski) tended to view Hetman Petro Doroshenko as an adventurer and unscrupulous politician, whose ambition for power resulted in him upsetting the political balance in the region and adversely affecting the state interests of both the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Russia³³. Thus, Tadeusz Korzon described Hetman Doroshenko as a devious politician, whose actions were instrumental in inspiring Hetman Ivan Briukhovets'kyi's uprising (1668): «Doroshenko has proven to be a crafty player when he, with the mediation from [Metropolitan] Tukul's'kyi convinced Briukhovets'kyi that he, [Doroshenko], would lay down his [ceremonial hetman's] mace for the good of Ukraine...Doroshenko wanted that uprising to happen for his own benefit...»³⁴.

After the Second World War, despite pressures to adhere to the same interpretation as was propagated in Soviet Ukraine, Polish specialists began to discuss the difficult circumstances under which Hetman Doroshenko had to operate, the magnitude of the task he was facing as well as the constricted space for political maneuvering available to him. Pioneering this paradigm shift from the old Polish historiography was Zbigniew Wójcik, who wrote as early as 1959 that numerous historians were quick to recognize an adventurer in Doroshenko, though it was very difficult to evaluate the leader, who was struggling to unite his Fatherland delivering it from the authority of Poland and Russia and submitting it to the Ottoman Porte³⁵.

Subsequently, historians such as Matwój Jaworski and Janusz Woliński, began to pay specific attention to the relationship between Doroshenko's Cossack polity and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, especially during the reign of Jan III Sobieski, and the circumstances under which Hetman Doroshenko chose to accept the suzerainty of the Turkish sultan³⁶. Scholars, like Wiesław Majewski, even acknow-

³² This can be seen from comparing the archival sources, employed by both authors. See *Doroshenko Dmytro*. Hetman Petro Doroshenko. — P. 22; *Perdenia Jan*. Hetman Piotr Doroshenko a Polska. — P. 475.

³³ Dr. *Rolle Antoni Jósef*. Zemsta kozacza. Nowe opowiadania historyczne: Pod krzyżem. Losy kresowego miasteczka. Wartabiet. Zemsta kozacza. Porwanie króla. Nioszące legion. — Lwów: Nakładem Księgarni Gubrynowicza i Schmidta, 1878. — P. 208–229; *Korzon Tadeusz*. Dola i niedolia Jana Sobieskiego, 1629–1674. — 3 vols. — Kraków: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1898; *Darowski Adam*. W przededniu tureckiej nawałnicy // *Szkice Historyczne*. — Warszawa: Nakładem Księgarni T. Paprockiego i S-ki, 1901. — P. 11–14.

³⁴ *Korzon Tadeusz*. Dola i niedolia Jana Sobieskiego. — Vol. 2. — P. 296–297.

³⁵ *Wójcik Zbigniew*. Traktat Andrusowski 1667 roku i ego geneza. — Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. — P. 217–249.

³⁶ *Jaworski Matwój*. Kampania ukraińska Sobieskiego 1671 r. // *Studia i Materiały do Historii Wojskowości*. — Vol. 11, part 1. — Warszawa: Wojskowy Instytut Historyczny, 1965. — P. 69–130; *Woliński Janusz*. Z dziejów wojen polsko-tureckich. — Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1983. — P. 21–160. For the views of Woliński on Ukrainian history and particularly on Hetman Petro Doroshenko see: *Wagner Marek*. Dorobek Profesora Janusza Wolińskiego (1894-1970) w zakresie badań nad dziejami Ukrainy // *Ukraina: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'*. — L'viv, 2008. — Vol. 17. — P. 571–578.

ledged the state-building impetus of the Cossack hetman and pointed at Doroshenko's attempt to unify divided Cossack Ukraine³⁷.

In the late 1960s, Perdenia, working independently in Communist Poland, came to similar conclusions as Dmytro Doroshenko, namely that Hetman Petro Doroshenko's policy was aimed at securing the unity and autonomy of Ukraine. According to Perdenia all of Hetman Doroshenko's political maneuvering during the 1668–1670 period was devoted to this purpose and the hetman even re-entered negotiations with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in his bid to secure the recognition of the Ukrainian Cossack state—as the Great Principality of Rus'—as one of three components of the Commonwealth³⁸.

Perdenia brings out the importance of Tatar support in Hetman Doroshenko's rise to power and that Doroshenko was leaning towards securing the patronage of the Ottoman Porte as early as 1666. In fact, Perdenia shows very well how the Truce of Andrusovo (1667), which partitioned Cossack Ukraine between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Muscovy, sparked the emergence of a pro-Ottoman political orientation among Cossack officers. The scholar further demonstrates that Hetman Doroshenko's loss of support was directly tied to the hetman's pro-Ottoman policy, which despite great human sacrifice in Ukraine failed to meet its objectives.

While Perdenia's monograph is no doubt the apex of the paradigm shift on Hetman Petro Doroshenko in Polish historiography, it does exhibit some echoes of the old historical outlook. On the one hand, Perdenia conclusively demonstrates Hetman Doroshenko's dedication to salvaging a Cossack state on both sides of the Dnipro River³⁹. On the other hand, Perdenia portrays the Cossack hetman as a shrewd and unscrupulous politician (to whom «the oath [of allegiance to Poland] represented empty words») and who is to blame for the collapse of the Commonwealth-Cossack negotiations⁴⁰. At the same time, throughout Perdenia's monograph King Jan III Sobieski is represented in a somewhat idealized portrait. It is impossible to know whether these views were sincerely held by Jan Perdenia or whether he inserted them in the hope of getting his book published.

Fate was equally unkind to Perdenia's manuscript. Although he completed it in 1971, he was not able to get a publisher because the topic was considered inappropriate by the Polish communist authorities. At that time Frank Sysyn was on an IREX research scholarship in Poland (September 1972 to June 1973) and met with Professor Jan Perdenia. Unfortunately Perdenia died in January 1973. Sysyn was given a copy of the manuscript for safekeeping in the West. Sysyn heard that the family attempted to turn to the highest level to get the manuscript published, but received an answer that there are topics about which one should not write⁴¹.

Jan Perdenia's monograph finally found its audience in the year 2000. In a brief foreword, Poland's premier historian of early modern Ukraine Zbigniew Wójcik

³⁷ *Majewski Wiesław*. Podhajce — letnia i jesienna kampania 1667 r. // *Studia i Materiały do Historii Wojskowości*. — Vol. 5. — Part 1. — Warszawa: Wojskowy Instytut Historyczny, 1960. — P. 49.

³⁸ *Perdenia Jan*. Hetman Piotr Doroszenko a Polska. — P. 143–260.

³⁹ *Ibid.* — P. 78, 111–112.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.* — P. 129.

⁴¹ Interview with Dr. Frank Sysyn (held on 22 March 2012 in Edmonton, AB).

explained that although a long period had elapsed since the work had been written, it still remains a fundamental work of great scholarly value. He also listed some of the more important works published on the topic since Perdenia completed the manuscript, including Dmytro Doroshenko's *Hetman Petro Doroshenko*⁴².

As a result of politics and individuals' fate, the first two and only major monographs on Hetman Petro Doroshenko of the middle of the twentieth century became part of the scholarly discourse only at the end of the century. At least for Dmytro Doroshenko's work, published in New York and not reprinted in Ukraine after Ukrainian independence, some scholars and the general reading public do not have full access to this day. Perdenia's work published later and in nearby Poland was much more accessible after 2000, but had not been able to influence Polish readers during the critical rethinking of Ukrainian history and Ukrainian affairs that occurred in Poland in the last third of the twentieth century. Both monographs are united in forming the underpinnings for the third major monograph on Hetman Petro Doroshenko by Valerii Smolii and Valerii Stepankov, published in 2011⁴³. Thus, ended the torturous destiny of two book manuscripts on Hetman Petro Doroshenko. Indeed, habent sua fata libelli.

⁴² See the *Foreword* by Zbigniew Wójcik in: *Perdenia Jan. Hetman Piotr Doroszenko a Polska*. — P. 7–8.

⁴³ *Smolii Valerii and Stepankov Valerii. Petro Doroshenko: politychnyi portret*. — Kyiv: Tempora, 2011. — 632 pages.