



The events of 1648–1649: Contemporary reports and the problem of verification

NATALIA YAKOVENKO

Ukrainian National Research Institute, Kiev, Ukraine

Abstract. Writing the history of the events of 1648–1649 has been especially difficult. The chronicle sources used by modern historians to unravel the course of the war, irrespective of whether the author was a Jew, a Pole, or a Ukrainian, privilege argument over accuracy. Their priority is to justify national ideologies, and they are replete with motifs, topoi, and symbols that do not easily strip away. One motif is that of the “wars of mercenaries,” in which elements typical of professional soldiery appear to cut across religious or even national lines. Two additional topoi, “the purification of the land” and the “syndrome of the overturned world,” repeat constantly, both describing what must be either done or reversed to achieve national deliverance. To take the chronicles at face value is to risk simply reproducing the topoi, if not the myths, of the chronicles themselves. Yet the chronicles do convey the framework of ideas within which authors desired their accounts to be read: a framework that is perennially a cosmic one of purification and total renewal. By the same token, it is from this point, and this point only, that an actual reconstruction of events may begin.

The history of the Cossack Wars in the mid-seventeenth century has been repeatedly obscured. The cause, all too often, has been the paradigm of “national histories,” histories which were written in the nineteenth century to provide a basic ideology for national movements and which also “translated” authentic sources into the language and terminology of that time. For Ukrainians, the model was the sacred nature of the heroic struggle for independence. For Poles, the model was the noble mission of *antemurale* – the defense of the civilized world from Asian barbarians. For Jews, the model was sacrificial martyrdom. In each case, the attitude towards victims was distinct. The Ukrainian model as a whole shows little concern for victims; human life was of little importance in contrast to the ideal of sacred war. The Polish model overstated the crimes committed by the enemy and emphasized its savagery. The Jewish model, *sit venia verbis*, was biased toward martyrdom.

The seductivity of these models is great. Their historicity, however, does not hold up when measured against the context of other European wars at the end of the sixteenth century and in the seventeenth, a time when war first became a profitable occupation for multinational mercenaries.¹ To begin with, it is worth contrasting events in the Ukraine with the losses suffered by the warring sides in the Thirty Years War, when about 60–70% of the civilian population vanished from the North-western Germany. In some areas

of Württemberg, demographic loss was caused of up to 90% of the pre-war population; in Brandenburg, Thuringia, and Bavaria nearly 50%. Another example can be found in Eastern Europe, where about 50% of the civilian population was lost in Byelorussia during the course of the Polish-Muscovite War of 1654–1667. In some regions the demographic losses reached 98%.² A tentative calculation of civilian population losses in Southern Volhynia, at one of the epicenters of the 1648 Jacquerie and the Zbarazh War of 1649 based on fiscal declarations in the Kremenets district [*povit*] dated February 1650³ shows that out of nearly 23,000 households [*dymy*] recorded as of 1630,⁴ a little over 3,100 (i.e., 13.5%) remained intact. Assuming some exaggeration of losses claimed made in order to merit fiscal privileges, it is nevertheless clear that during the first two years of war, 80–85% of the civilian population disappeared, which meant no fewer than 100,000 persons. Declarations say that people were killed by Cossacks or soldiers of the Crown army [*liudei postynano*], were enslaved by Tatars [*liudei vybrano v Ordu*], or were finished by hunger [*dla holodu povymyraly*]. The more energetic managed to escape the dangerous region by fleeing “to the Ukraine,” meaning beyond the Dneiper, to the southern border territories of the Muscovite State. The similarity in numbers of these losses to analogous figures in other wars raises issues previously considered minor within the perspective of “national histories,” namely, to what extent do the chronicles speak in topoi, which must be first winnowed out before any attempt “to reconstruct what really happened” is made.

It is also necessary to gain a perspective. To what degree are the events noted in the chronicles *sui generis*. In fact, comparing the texts of 1648 with the behavior that was considered typical in various “wars of the mercenaries” from the end of the sixteenth to the seventeenth centuries, wars in which devastating “enemy land” and destroying the population, buildings, and material assets was the rule, it is clear that what is reported for 1648 is not at all unique. Indicative is the information found in two sources, the first a letter written by the Kyivan Wojewoda Prince Konstantyn Ostroz’ky, dated April 28, 1578, and the second a remark made by the soldier-poet and participant in the Zbarazh War of 1649, Marcin Kuchvarevich. Describing his campaign for the Chernihiv region, Ostroz’ky relates that he sent some detachments to the field: “to plunder the enemy’s land . . . [and later he inquired:] Whether you returned safely and fortunately, thanks to God’s grace, having devastated the enemy’s land more than 40 miles around Siverz, imprisoned several thousands and acquired not negligible spoils, as I was informed, and having burned and plundered several hundreds of villages?”⁵ As in the case of the Ukrainian wars, it was God’s grace, or “good fortune” which explained the results. A similar explanation is found in the remark of Marcin Kuchvarevich,

saying that, "Pan Kamienecki was fortunate, since he destroyed Ostropol by sword and fire."⁶

Fortune was also linked to what may be called the warrior's prerogative. Example after example boasts of total devastation, the affirmation of the right to create havoc, and the naïve conviction that this is the way "for people of virtue belonging to the order of knights who earn their bread with the sword." "Burned land," in particular, was more a knight's prerogative than a question of whose land was being destroyed. Professional warriors viewed other professional as being those "of their own kind," irrespective of the army in which these men were enrolled. During short pauses in the siege of Zbarazh in 1649, there were scenes in which the besieged and the besiegers treated each other to tobacco and inquired about home news.⁷ The civilian population was perceived as "alien," plundered, and crushed remorselessly – regardless of whether these civilians were town dwellers or farmers, people of the same or another religion. A striking example of the fate of victims regardless of ethnic identity is the settlement of Kyselyn in Volhynia that was plundered and burned by Cossacks, together with Tatars, in the autumn of 1648. Only 15 Christian households remained intact out of 35, and only 20 Jewish households out of 37.⁸ Those who lived in Christian households were Ukrainians, not Poles. So when the settlement was captured, no less than 100 Ukrainians and 75 Jews suffered. How minimal was religious identity as a determining factor is illustrated in two parallel stories of brigandage. In June 1648, the Wojewoda of Kyiv sent 400 mercenaries to defend Berdychiv and the Bernardine monastery the Wojewoda himself had founded. But defend is anything but what the soldiers did. In the words of one witness: "Having arrived, they told the monks to go away or else they would be drowned . . . and after taking more than 30,000 pieces of silver from the church they departed."⁹ Similarly, in October 1648, during the siege of Lviv, Cossacks and Tatars plundered the Orthodox Cathedral of St. Yurii. The Orthodox Church chronicle reports: "At the Church of St. Yurii 54 people were killed, and a Tatar, having fallen on the altar, was dashed to pieces."¹⁰

Robbery was accompanied by acts of vandalism towards simple people – not knights. Both Cossacks and *zhovnirs* of the Crown army behaved with the same cruelty, which was always perceived by warriors as a sign of a knight's strength, not characteristic of people who pursue occupations shameful for knights: craftsmen, merchants, or peasants.¹¹ In the summer of 1649, the Cossack Colonel, Martyn Nebaba, ordered his people who besieged the town of Homel in Byelorussia to: "Go, [my] brave strong heads, and defeat the townsmen and the Poles, and having defeated them, cut them all down, do not leave anybody alive, and burn the city!"¹²

The life of townsmen [*mieszczanie*] of the same confession was of no value in the eyes of Nebaba. Requisition of their property was perceived as determined by God himself, compensation for knights who undergo hardships and dangers. The civilian population, according to the text, must also compensate knights for their expenses in “gunpowder and bullets.”¹³ On the other hand, the feelings of simple people, including Ukrainian farmers and the lower middle classes regarding the Cossacks, who, in the language of national historiography, were called their “liberators,” can be demonstrated in one of the *Satires* by Krzysztof Opalin’ski written in 1650:

“Thou, soldier! From everywhere bloody tears raise to God
 And laments of poor farmers: God grant them
 No safe return! God place the goods
 That they have fleeced from us poor,
 In the hands of gentiles! Let their Tatar fields be imbued with innocent
 blood,
 That they have cruelly shed in [this] house.”¹⁴

* * *

A no less important corrective is to decipher the mental and ideological context that permeates the seventeenth century sources. Two general trends seem to have influenced the testimony of Ukrainian, Polish and Jewish parties in the conflict: first, what may be called the “purification of the land” and, second, the “syndrome of the overturned world.” The idea of the “purified land” appears for the first time in a panegyric recited by students in the Mohyla collegium of Kyiv, apparently on the occasion of the ceremonial entrance of Bohdan Khmelnyts’ky into the city at the end of 1648:

“Glory to God, eternal praise to the Dneiper Army,
 That thanks to God’s grace made Poles go to the Vistula port,
 And the stem of the cursed Jews cut off, *Ukraine became pure*,
 And sacred faith remained intact – good news.”¹⁵

Several years later the “purification of the blessed country of chosen people” would be mentioned by Pawel of Aleppo, the Greek-Orthodox priest from Antioch who traveled across the Cossack State in 1654 and 1656.¹⁶ In both cases the sacral boundary of “purification” is indicated – the Vistula, which was the ethnic borderline between Poland and the Ukraine. This powerful symbol was the same for both Ukrainians and Poles. The Polish nobility

[*shlakhta*] who remained alive fled “beyond the Vistula;” there the souls of the dead *zhovnirs* of the Crown army go;¹⁷ Khmelnyts’ky, having come to the Vistula, threatens to dictate his terms;¹⁸ there are rumors that the rebels will not come back unless they plunder everything up to the Vistula [*azh po Wislu*]. By contrast, Jewish accounts omit the topos of the Vistula-limit, although they more dramatically emphasize the total catastrophe, possibly because of the martyrological style of the narratives. In Polish memory, what may be considered simply as panic with regard to the words attributed to Bohdan Khmelnyts’ky: “I would like to destroy everybody so that not a single Pole [*Lach*] remains in the world”¹⁹ is depicted in Jewish narratives in terms of the end of time:

“Rebels will ambush in each corner,
 East and west, north and south,
 And nobody from among God’s Community will escape . . .
 And all those who hid themselves in fields and forests,
 In crossroads throughout the places,
 Also in caves and tops of mountains,
 Where innocent Jews found hiding:
 Youngsters and maidens, old and young,
 All were killed for the Creator of mountains.”²⁰

Totality of perception, similar to the Jewish one, is noticeable in Ukrainian examples. In particular, we frequently come across the semiotics of a literal “purification of land” demonstrated in the irrational devastation of everything associated with the physical presence of an “unclean” human, whether this human be Jew or Pole, specifically, the noble Catholic Pole, even if he a Ukrainian by birth.²¹ During the Jacquerie, the rebels ruined the stores in Jewish houses (compare *Zok Ha-Itim*), broke up dams, and burned mills in “Polish” farms.²² A kind of manifesto written by a participant of a similar, though more recent Jacquerie – the Hajdamak movement of the seventeenth century – is singular in that aspect:

“Having cut down about thirty Jews, the Cossacks became surprised: What kind of Cossacks had they [i.e., their predecessors] been, if Poles, Jews and noblemen are still found? After us, neither a Pole nor a Jew will remain, since we will slay them all.”²³

Destruction of the “alien” including babies seems corroborated in the avalanche of “land purification.” It is dramatically depicted in Jewish accounts

and indifferently enough in Polish ones. Jews who were far away from the theater of war were much more shaken than noble knights who were accustomed to war, as seen, for instance, in the testimony of a letter written by a *zhovnir*'s from somewhere near Moscow in 1612. This testimony is typical:

“... and it happened that we cut down not only boyars, peasants and women, but also that we cut in two the infants sucking their mother's breast. And this is how it should be done, since otherwise the arrogance of the adversary should be intolerable.”²⁴

The ways of destroying the enemy had semiotic connotations as well, the heavy overtones and implications of Cossacks burning victims and drowning them, which indicated for contemporaries dispatching these victims to Hell and thus “purifying the land” from “unclean souls.” Sometimes the rebels even intensified their efforts to differentiate “unclean souls” from the living. The victims in Chernihiv castle were thrown into the well, which was then blocked up with stones.²⁵ Most probably the same beliefs were shared by the neighbors of the Ukrainians – the Tatars and Russians. Supporters of Tsar Vasiliï Shuiskii during the capture of the town of Kostroma in 1608 thus:

“Slaughtered the Tsar's people [i.e., their opponents, the supporters of Tsar Lzhedmitriï], about 200 of boyars' brood, [and] they drowned their wives and children after severe tortures. [They used to] rip children out [of the bellies] of pregnant women, cut off their hands and legs, put them in the mouths of their mothers, and throw them into the river ...”²⁶

On the other hand, Budzhak Tatars *murza* Kantemir, according to the *Annales* of the Turkish chronicler Naima, is a legendary hero because he “pushed so many unclean Cossack souls off to hell.”²⁷ Unlike the Cossacks, *zhovnirs* of the Crown army executed enemies impaling them on pikes. It should be noted that the considerable spread of this type of execution in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth territory was associated with the Cossack wars.²⁸ Beforehand, it was very rarely practiced, nor is it mentioned in the system of punishments stipulated in the laws. The paucity of evidence from the end of the sixteenth century to the first half of the seventeenth century concerning impalement indicates that it was exclusively associated with the military way of life and served as a punishment for particularly serious trespass, for instance, betrayal accompanied by bloodshed.²⁹ In this light, punitive expeditions into rebellious regions were made not to torture the civilian population, but to punish military betrayal: *sumpta de noxiis capitis poena*.³⁰ The fact that neither women nor Jews were impaled because they could not be considered active belligerents indicates that the war should not be defined as chaotic. It seems as if the warriors, the professional *zhovnirs* and their opponents, the

Cossacks, were conducting it according to rules, which, however, were never written down and remain unknown.

“Purification of land” includes, among other things, the profanation of what is sacred for the adversary in order to prove the powerlessness of the adversary’s magic.³¹ The intention to make the sacred profane appears in a well-known passage of the chronicle by Meir of Shebrshyn. The Cossacks, while torturing their victims, ask them: “Where is your God? Let Him come and rescue you from your enemies.”³² Moreover, descriptions of profanation in both Jewish and Polish sources derive from martyrological topoi (predominantly borrowed from the Book of Jeremiah), making them obviously untrustworthy. A letter by Prince Zaslavskiy to the Senate describing the events of July 1648 in Vinnytsya contains all the elements of profanation:

“... in the churches ... great disrespect of the Lord himself, especially in the Jesuit cathedral in Vinnica, where they threw out the Holy Sacrament and trampled on it, dressed in the [priests’] vestments and drank vodka from liturgical vessels. Clergymen were severely tortured, even the corpses were taken from the graves, cut into pieces and thrown to the dogs.”³³

A Jewish account of a similar set of profane acts is little different – disrespect for holy things, cruel murder of priests and the faithful, mockery of corpses, and unclean animals, such as dogs and swine, feeding on the dead:

“... [prayer shawls] were cut to pieces, sacks and shoes were made from them. They wound the straps of phylacteries around their legs, the phylacteries were cut off and thrown on the road. Some [Jews] were skinned and their bodies thrown to the dogs to be eaten, others had their hands and legs cut off and the trunks thrown on the road. Carriages crossed over them and horses trampled them ... Several thousand corpses were devoured by pigs and dogs.”³⁴

The rebels were convinced that they had a moral right to profane “alien gods” because the “genuine God” would protect them. In July 1648, one of the prisoners of war, recounting the rumors that Vladislav IV did not die but deserted to the Cossack troops, said: “There are three permanent tents in our camp: one is for God, the other is for the King ... and the third one is for Hetman.”³⁵ This differs from the symbolism of blood in Jewish, Polish and Ukrainian reports. In Jewish chronicles, the mention of the flow of spilled blood is to emphasize the scope of the catastrophe. Meir of Shebrshyn wrote that in Poland so many Jews were killed that their blood poured over the windowsills of the houses. In Polish accounts written by noble warriors who were accustomed to seeing blood, expression was metaphoric, sometimes

almost trivialized: “The blood flowed knee-high” or “From both sides, the black earth is washed by the rivers of blood.”³⁶ In contrast to this, in Ukrainian testimonies, the symbolism of blood is strikingly archaic: the enemy’s blood that is spilled on the ground sacrifices and purifies it, and after that, it flows to Hell. The appeal “to mix enemy’s blood in the field with yellow sand” as recorded in that period in Cossack *dumas* becomes more transparent if it is compared to a poem from the last quarter of the seventeenth century, in the period of the Turkish wars:

“It rains heavily. Let the evil blood of pagan bashis’

Be quickly washed by rain from our land!

Those dogs’ blood is unworthy for us to behold

Dignum est that the dogs’ blood flowed down to Hell with rain. . . .”³⁷

* * *

The Cossack Wars upset at one stroke a stable world. Not surprisingly, they were associated with a global catastrophe, hence “the syndrome of the overturned world.” The sense of the end of time is rendered most expressively in the introduction to Natan Hannover’s *Yeven Metzulah*. The improbability of events is imprinted in the reflections of the three parties to the conflict, reflections which articulates social, symbolical, and mystical concerns. The social hierarchy, in particular, was pictured as literally “overturned.” In February 1649, Bohdan Khmelnyts’ky spoke to commissars of the King: “I will teach you, all you Poles, to be with *your legs turned upward*.”³⁸ The same picture appears in the contemporary poem by Zimorovich, which expresses the view of the nobility: “Our own serfs, badly smelling and purulent, / *Have sat on the heads* of their native landlords.”³⁹

One may suspect that there is a certain mysticism in this kind of “turning upside down,” and it is not by chance that the Catholic fanatics, during the profanation of Calvinist cemeteries in Cracow in 1575, 1578, 1597, and 1607, put the bodies of the dead with their legs turned up.⁴⁰ It is difficult to say whether it was just recorded in rumors or whether the semiotics of valuables and violence was really changed: valuables lost their usual value, and violence was perceived as inevitable in spite of real circumstances. A typical episode appears in Temberski’s *Annales* about the flight of the Crown army from Pylawtsi in September 1648, telling that what was amassed by robbery lost its value to such a degree that a Tatar youth, a servant, covers a horse with a sable coat:

*“Unus habebat vestem pellibus zebellinis subductam, cum fimbriis adamantinis, 80 millibus florenorum aestimatam, quam arreptam calo Scythicus dorso equino apposuerat praedam occulturus.”*⁴¹

The possibility of such a scene is confirmed by the behavior of the Cossacks who conquered towns (for example, in Kremenets) and threw the property of the residents out of the houses and onto the streets and burned it.⁴²

The perception of violence as mystically inevitable is illustrated by an episode from Hannover's narrative about the massacre in Bar: “When a single Cossack entered a house with several hundred men in it, there was no resistance, so that only one Cossack slaughtered everyone.”⁴³ In the long run, one of the convincing features of the “overturned world” syndrome may be the appearance of contrasting demonic figures, the Cossack Colonel Maxym Kryvonis and Prince Yarema Wishniewiecky. Neo-Romantic historiography once defined this as axiological antagonism, the irreconcilable clash of “two of the most terrible men in the Ukraine,”⁴⁴ or the two vivid symbols of opposite worlds, the “Polish authorities and the Ukrainian masses.”⁴⁵ In contemporary Polish and Jewish perceptions these antagonists represent the devilish and just vengeance. Kryvonis is perceived as the quintessence of evil, “the greatest tyrant and murderer of towns, villages, churches, clergy, noblemen, Jews, married women and children;”⁴⁶ an ethnic “alien,” he is assumed to be of foreign, Highland, origin; a creature of that vampire world, as put by Wespasian Kochowski in *Annalium Poloniae Climacter primus*, Kryvonis “ob agitata latrocinia capitalium damnatus,” but he still saved himself;⁴⁷ and finally he is the demon of cruelty and death. There were even rumors that signifying Kryvonis' cruelty, the King gave him a standard with a red cross and red outline.⁴⁸ Interpreted in a language comprehensible to the people of the times, red indicated among other things the desire for killing: cruelty, according to the manuals of symbology, was manifested as a woman in red strangling a baby.⁴⁹

The axiological antagonist of Kryvonis was Prince Yarema Wishniewiecky – a just avenger, who, like the biblical Moses, led the noblemen and the Jews out of the dangerous zone of the Cossack revolt. It suffices to cite a parallel from Cecishovski's homily proclaimed at the opening of the Diet in 1652:

*“In the sky there was also a war with the Lord, as Lucifer rebelled against the Lord, but Michael Archangelus praelibatur adversus eum et angeli eius. Count Michael fought violently against the rebels and was accompanied by brave knights.”*⁵⁰

The comparison of Prince Yarema (his second name was Michael) to the Archangel Michael, empowered as avenger by God, makes the rumor

of a standard under which the Prince was reportedly entering Warsaw in September 1648 more understandable:

“Count Wishniewiecky is *in parvo comitatu* only, but [he] has the Cossack’s insignia with him. The insignia are black, and [there is] a white hand with a blood-spattered sword and the words: “*Tetigisti nos Domine pro peccatis nostris.*”⁵¹

The semiotic meaning of that “standard” is the emphasis on the avenging function of the Prince (black) who, with a clean hand in God’s name (white) punishes cruel rebels (red). A propos, the battle-ax [*berdysh*] of Bohdan Khmelnyts’ky also had on its edge the picture of the Archangel Michael.⁵²

* * *

It goes without saying that the reflections of our informers – participants and victims of the Cossack wars – leaves no choice but to accept their narratives cautiously, particularly their figures of losses or descriptions of cruelties. In terms of the “overturned world” this information has lost its literal meaning. The figures reflect the perceived meaning of all events in terms of “very much” or “very little.” Describing the shameful defeat of royal detachments near Korsun’ in May 1648, the anonymous poet-soldier offers an inversely proportionate figure of participants in the battle, if only to emphasize how bizarre these events were: “Cattle good-for-nothing, and what is still more shameful, / Five hundred of them persecutes five thousand of ours.”⁵³

Natan Hannover, too, describes the armies coming to Berestechko in 1651 and refers to a huge Crown army of 381,000, which, however, must engage a vastly greater army of rebels. To persuade his readers, emotionally at that, Natan Hannover resorts to a biblical topos: “Tatars and Cossacks were as many as the sands of the sea that cannot be counted.”⁵⁴

The description of cruelties renders the syndrome of the “overturned world” expressively, because the “end of days” should correspond with the commission of inhuman crimes, as well as with their unusual punishment: horrifying scenes of heads sawed off, skin flayed, eyes gouged out, children boiled in cauldrons. The model for such scenes was undoubtedly the Hebrew Bible, but also martyrologies, textbook accounts of ancient history, literary sagas⁵⁵ or simply visual ones, as in the pictures of Doomsday on the walls of ancient temples. For instance, the statement attributed to Yarema Wishniewiecky: “Torture them so that they feel like dying” paraphrases a corresponding statement of cruelty by the Roman emperor Caligula mentioned in schoolbook accounts. The image of people going in up to their knees in blood is a favorite baroque topos; fables about flaying people are probably

associated with the martyrdom of St. Bartholomew; boiling in cauldrons is, most probably, a replication of Doomsday icons and frescoes.

In conclusion, therefore, let me return to where I began. The chronicles and reports convey their message through topoi and symbols. They may not be used at face value. What they do tell us, what they do convey, is the framework of ideas within which authors desired their accounts to be read: a cosmic one of purification and utter renewal. It is from this point, and this point alone, that those who wish to make an actual reconstruction of events are forced to begin. To do otherwise is to risk doing no more than reproducing the topoi, if not the myths, of the chronicles themselves.

Abbreviations

AGAD	Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych w Warszawie
AIZR	Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, izdavaemyi Vremennoi komissiei dlia razbora drevnikh aktov. Kiev, 1859–1914, 8 parts, 34 vols.
Akty IZR	Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, sobrannyye i izdannyye Arkheograficheskoi komissiei. St. Petersburg, 1863–1892, 15 vols.
BCz	Biblioteka Muzeum im Ks. Czrtoryskich w Krakowie
BJ	Biblioteka Jagiellońska w Krakowie
TsNB NANU	Tsentral'na Naukova Biblioteka Nacional'noi Akademii Nauk Ukrainy (Institute of Manuscripts), Kyiv
Even Metzulah	M. Balaban, ed., <i>Jawein Mecula t.j. Bagno Głębokie: Kronika zdarzeń z lat 1648–1652</i> , in F. Rawita-Gawroński, ed., <i>Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie</i> . Lwów, 1914, 6–76.
Zok Ha-Itim	Tsok Ha'ittim by Shmuel ben Meir of Shebrshyn (Szczębrzeszyn), trans. Mordekhai Nadav, in <i>Harvard Ukrainian Studies</i> , VIII, N ¾ (1984), 388–393.

Notes

1. See, for example, M. Howard, *War in European History* (Oxford, 1976) especially Chapter II.
2. H. Sahanovich, *Nieviadomaia vaina 1654–1667* (Minsk, 1995), 139, 140.
3. TsNB NANU, F. 83 (Arkhiv I. M. Kamanina), N 53, f. 1–22 v.
4. M. H. Krykun, *Chysel'nist' naseleunia Volyns'koho voievodstva u pershii polovyni XVII st.*, in *Z istorii starodavnosti i seredniovichcha* (L'viv, 1988) N 24, 73, 74.
5. AGAD, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, dz. V, rps 11078, k. 97.
6. Marcin Kuczwawicz, *Relacia ekspedyciey zbaraskiey w Roku Pańskim 1649 rythmem polskim*, W Lublinie w drukarni Jana Wieczorkowicza, 1650, k.B 2 v.

7. See, for instance, *Dyaryusz obszerny oblężenia Zbaraża*, on July 21–24, on August 23, in *Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, wyd. Antoni Zygmunt Helcel (Kraków, 1864), 451–469.
8. TsNB NANU, F.83 (Arckiv I.M. Kamanina), N 52, f. 9 v.
9. From the letter of F. Starovolski, July 15, 1648: BJ, rps 90, k. 5 v.
10. “They occupied the Vysokyj Zamok and butchered the people, as well as plundered everything from monasteries and churches. At the Church of St. Yurii 54 corpses of the slaughtered [were found] and a Tatar, having fallen on the altar, was dashed to pieces” (O.A. Bevzo, ed., *L'vivsky litopys i Ostroz'ky litopysets'*, Kyiv, 1971, 123).
11. See G. Duby, *La societe chevaleresque* (Flammarion, 1988), 54–69.
12. F. Rawita-Gawroński, ed., *Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie. Materjały do dziejów kozaczyzny* (Lwów, 1914), 126.
13. See for similar reasons: S. Lepiakov, *Kozats'ky viiny kintsia XVI st. v Ukarini* (Chernihiv, 1996), 163 (the letter of Cossack *hetman* Severyn Nalyvaiko, October 24, 1595); A. Grabowski, ed., *Ojczyście spominki w pismach do dziejów dawnej Polski* (Kraków, 1845), t.1., 16 (the letter of Cossack Colonel Mykhailo Tysha, Arpil 1649) etc.
14. K. Opaliński, *Satyry*, wyd. L. Eustchiewicz (Wrocław, 1953), 163 (księga II, satyria IX).
15. (Old Ukrainian) “Честь Богу, хвала навiки Вiйську Днiпровому, \ Що з Божой ласки загнало ляшки ку порту Вишняному, \ а род проклятий жидовський стятий, *чиста Україна*, \ а вiра свята вцале зостала – добра новина” (V. I. Krekoteń, M. M. Sulyma, ed., *Українська поезiia seredy ny XVII st.* (Kyiv, 1992), 100).
16. *Putieshestviie antiokhiiskogo patriarkha Makariia v Rossiiu v polovinie XVII veka, opisan-noie ... arkhidiakonom Pavlom Aleppskim* (Moskva, 1897), vyp.2, 27.34.
17. BCz. rps 379, k.143 (from the letter of Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky, November 8, 1648).
18. “And having come to the Vistula, I will tell the alien Poles: sit [quiet] and shut up, you Poles!” (“A stanąwszy nad Wisłą powiem dalszym Lachom: Sedite i molczite Lachy!” – *Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, 376).
19. (Polish) “Chcę wszystkich wygubić, izby żadnego Lacha na świecie nie było” (*Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, 389).
20. *Zok Ha-Itim*, 292, 293.
21. Compare the information from the letter of Yan Yedlicki from Volhynia, September 3, 1648: “. . . wherever they found a governor-general, a Catholic or a nobleman, even [if he was] Ukrainian, they performed unheard of murders, destroying [everything] completely by sword and fire” (F. Rawita-Gawroński, ed., *Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie*, 113).
22. TsNB NANU, F.83 (Arckiv I. M. Kamanina), N 53, f.43 passim.
23. AIZR, iii, vol. 4, 73.
24. T. N. Koprejewa, ed., *Listy polskie spod Smoleńska*, in *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, t.21 (1976), 194.
25. From the so-called “Newsletter” July 2, 1648 (BCz, rps 379, k. 57).
26. From the diary of Waclaw Diamentovski, October 7, 1608 (A. Hisrchberg, ed., *Polska a Moskwa w pierwszej polowie wieku XVII. Zbiór materjałów do historii stosunków polkso-rosyjskich za Zygmunta III* (Lwów, 1901), 209).
27. I. S. Sękowski, ed., *Collectanea z dziejopisów tureckich rzeczy do historii polskiej służąc-ych* (Warszawa, 1824), t.1, 171.
28. Compare, among others, the words of Boguslav Maskievich on February 22, 1649: “Every day as long as we stayed in Bobruisk, they used to execute the prisoners by impaling

- them” (A. Sajkowski, ed., *Pamiętniki Samuela i Bogusława Maskiewiczów. Wiek XVII* (Wrocław, 1961), 265).
29. See, for instance, the reference to this in the diary of Moskorovski during the Polish-Moscovite War, February 13, 1634: “... [hetman Khodkievich once] had indeed set everybody free, but he commanded to impale a Frenchman, Fiutensi, who had killed his captain, Konte ... that was given him *ex contractu* by the adversary” (A. Rembowski, ed., *Dyaryusz wojny moskiewskiej 1633 roku* (Warszawa, 1895), 95).
 30. A. W. Kojalowicz, *De rebus anno 1648 et 1649 contra Zaporovios cosacos gestis* (Vilnae: Typis Academicis, 1651), 57.
 31. See D. Crouzet, *Les guerries de Dieu: La violence au temps des troubles de religion (vers 1525 – vers 1610)* (Paris, 1990), t. 1–2.
 32. *Zok Ha-Itim*, 391.
 33. From the diary of the Convocation Diet, July 20, 1648 (*Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, 112–113).
 34. *Even Metzulah*, 23, 24, 52.
 35. From the letter of Woitekh Miaskovski, August 4, 1648 (by the addition to: K. Szajnocha, *Dwa lata dziejów masznych, 1646, 1648. Opowiadanie i źródła* (Krakow, 1900), t.2, add. 35).
 36. *Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, 158; Marcin Kuczwarewicz, *Relacia expedyciey zbarskiej w Roku Pańskim 1649 ...*, f.D4.
 37. (Old Ukrainian) “Дождь идет частый, скверна кровь поганських башей \ Дождем да истекает скоро с земли нашей! \ Недостойна тых псов кров, дабы нам світила, \ Праведено ест, бы псов кров дождем во ад снисходила...” (V. I. Krekoteń, M. M. Sulyma, ed., *Ukraińska poezia seredy ny XVII st.* (Kyiv, 1992), 118, 119).
 38. From the account by Woitekh Miaskovski on February 22, 1648 (*Jakuba Michałowskiego ... Księga pamiętnicza*, 374).
 39. B. Zimorowicz, *Sielanki nowe Ruskie różnym stanom dla zabawy ...*, ed., K. Turowski (Warszawa, 1857), 73.
 40. J. Tazbir, *Okrucieństwo w dawnej Polsce* (Warszawa, 1997), 72, 73.
 41. S. Temberski, *Annales 1647–1656*, ed., V. Czermak (Cracoviae, 1897), 89.
 42. See, for instance, the fiscal declarations of the inhabitants of Kremenets: TsNB NANU, F. 83 (Arkhiv I. M. Kamanina), N 53, f. 32.
 43. *Even Metzulah*, 38.
 44. W. Tomkiewicz, *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki (1612–1651)* (Warszawa, 1933), 220.
 45. W. Lypyns’ky, *Uchast’ shlakhty u velykomu ukrains’komu povstanni pid provodom Bohdana Khmelnysts’koho*, ed., L. R. Bilas (Philadelphia, 1980), 321.
 46. From Marcin Golinski’s report of 1648 (cit. by M. Hrushevs’ky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* (Kyiv-Viden’, 1922), t.8, ch. 3, 47).
 47. V. Kochowski, *Annalium Poloniae Climacter primus regnante Ioanno Casimiro* (Cracoviae, Ex officina N. A. Schedel, 1683), 47.
 48. *Akty IZR*, t.3, 288.
 49. Comp.: C. Ripa, *La piu che novissima iconologia*, Padua 1630, t.1, 159. See also: J. Tazbir, *Okrucieństwo w dawnej Polsce* (Warszawa, 1997).
 50. BJ, rps 108, k. 245.
 51. From the letter of K. W. Kowalski, September 22, 1648 (F. Rawita-Gawroński, ed., *Sprawy i rzeczy ukraińskie*, 116).

52. See the illustration: Z. Wójcik, *Wojny kozackie w dawnej Polsce* (Kraków, 1989), 64.
53. *Jakuba Michałowskiego . . . Księga pamiętnicza*: 475. There were in fact near Korsun' about 5,000 *zhovnirs* and about 45,000 Cossacks and Tatars (M. Hrushevs'ky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, t.8, ch.2, 184, 188).
54. *Even Metzulah*: 64. Concerning Hannover's exaggerated figures in general, see: J. Pelenski, "The Cossack Insurrections in Jewish-Ukrainian Relations", in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed., H. Aster, P. Potichny (Edmonton, 1990), 35, 36.
55. As an example, one might mention a saga about punishment with an incandescent crown. According to Hungarian chronicles, György Dorsa was executed in 1514 in this way. The legend is that the Cossack *hetman* Severyn Nalyvaiko was *candenti corona coronatus* in 1597. The same motive is present in the *Even Metzulah*, 16.