

Mykhailo Hrushevsky

History of Ukraine-Rus'

---

Volume 9, Book 2, Part 2

The Cossack Age, 1654–1657

---

Translated by  
Marta Daria Olynyk

Edited by  
Yaroslav Fedoruk, *Consulting Editor*  
and  
Frank E. Sysyn, *Editor in Chief*

with the assistance of  
Myroslav Yurkevich



Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press  
Edmonton • 2010 • Toronto

# Overcoming Historical Stereotypes and Analyzing Ukrainian Foreign Policy, 1655–57

YAROSLAV FEDORUK

The main thematic axis of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, volume 9, book 2, part 1 was the Pereiaslav Council of 1654 and the subsequent Ukrainian-Muscovite agreement. In this portion of volume 9, one of Hrushevsky's most important subjects is Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky's foreign policy of the mid-1650s, a crucial period of European history. The developments on which Hrushevsky concentrates are the attack on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth by King Charles X Gustavus of Sweden in 1655 and his relations with Khmelnytsky in the years 1655–57; the Ukrainian-Muscovite struggle for Belarus and the Muscovite-Swedish war; Khmelnytsky's relations with the Ottoman Porte, the Crimea, and the Danube lands; the Vilnius negotiations between Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and King John Casimir in 1656; and the offensive against Poland by Prince György Rákóczi II. To these should be added Muscovy's conquests in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; the Baltic policies of the United Provinces and Denmark, directed against Swedish supremacy in that region; the Anglo-Swedish political alliance in the war waged by Oliver Cromwell and King Louis XIV of France against Spain, in which the Habsburg Empire was also involved; the uncertain status of Brandenburg-Prussia in the confrontation between Sweden and the Commonwealth; and the cautious policy of Austria. That gives us a general picture of the political situation prevailing in Europe during the first years after the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), when the continent had not yet recovered from the effects of the Thirty Years' War.

As I began work on this volume of Hrushevsky's *History*, which deals with the European crisis of 1655–57, I thought of something I had written in the course of my involvement in the republication of the original text of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* in Kyiv. At that time, I was reviewing a book by the British historian Robert I. Frost entitled *After the Deluge: Poland-Lithuania and the Second Northern War, 1665–1660* (Cambridge, 1993), in which Polish documents and secondary works were the only Slavic sources extensively utilized by the author. In my review I expressed the hope that a future English translation of Hrushevsky's *History* would give Western scholars access to the materials so acutely lacking in their research on this period.<sup>1</sup> That hope is now fulfilled with the publication of a work in which Hrushevsky collected and carefully analyzed a tremendous amount of material on the social and political history of the years 1655–57. Under the hetmancy of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Ukraine was actively involved in shaping the changes that took place in the political, economic, and social order of East Central Europe.

The isolation often encountered in historical scholarship, which the publication of this volume should help remedy, began to characterize many national historiographies from the early decades of the nineteenth century. Taking the case of Sweden as an example, we are

---

1. *Ukraina v mynulomu* (Kyiv and Lviv), vyp. 6 (1994): 183.

faced with the paradox that the works of Swedish historians published between the late seventeenth and mid-nineteenth centuries were more accessible to European scholarly circles than those written in the course of the twentieth century. Most notable here are the works of Samuel Pufendorf, written in Latin and published posthumously in the late seventeenth century, which are fundamental to the study of international relations in the mid-seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup> His books were translated into English, French, Russian and other languages and published in the first decades of the eighteenth century. The works of the noted Swedish historians Erik Gustaf Geijer and Fredrik Ferdinand Carlson, who devoted considerable attention to the European wars of the mid-seventeenth century, were published in English and German translation between the 1830s and 1880s.<sup>3</sup>

With few exceptions, however, present-day Swedish historiography on the mid-seventeenth century, a crucial period in Swedish history, is developing in isolation from Slavic historical discourse. Consequently, the works of such twentieth-century Swedish historians as Manfred Carlon, Johan Levin Carlbon, Bohdan Kentrschynskyj, Arne Stade, Stellan Dahlgren and a dozen others, without which it is difficult to imagine any serious study of East European diplomacy in the years 1655–57, remain incompletely appreciated in Ukrainian, Polish and Russian historical writing, despite isolated instances of citation or translation.<sup>4</sup> A leading student of seventeenth-century Swedish history, the English historian Michael Roberts, was well aware of this problem when he prepared a volume of seventeenth-century documents for publication. He translated the Swedish sources in toto but merely summarized the German documents, noting in his introduction that ‘it seemed probable that most historians might be able to read these in the [German] original (which is not the case in regard to despatches written in Swedish)...’<sup>5</sup>

Those undertaking to popularize the finest monuments of Russian historiography in European languages have put considerably more effort into breaking down scholarly isolation. Most notable with reference to the seventeenth century is the English translation of Sergei Soloviev’s *History of Russia from Earliest Times*, to be completed in fifty volumes. This translation, begun in the mid-1970s, is the first English version to be undertaken since the publication of the first edition more than 150 years ago (Moscow, 1851–79, 29 vols.); it is based on the Soviet edition of the 1960s.<sup>6</sup> Also worthy of mention is the five-volume English translation of Vasilii Kliuchevsky’s *A History of Russia*, published in the early twentieth

2. Samuel Pufendorf, *De rebus gestis Friderici Wilhelmi Magni, electoris Brandenburgici, commentariorum libri novendecim* (Berlin, 1695); idem, *De rebus a Carolo Gustavo Sveciae rege gestis commentariorum libri septem* (Nuremberg, 1696).

3. Erik Gustaf Geijer, *Geschichte Schwedens*, trans. Swen Peter Leffler, 3 vols. (Hamburg, 1832–36); idem, *The History of the Swedes*, trans. John Hall Turner (London, 1845); Friedrich Ferdinand Carlson, *Geschichte Schwedens*, trans. J. G. Petersen, *Geschichte der europäischen Staaten*, vols. 4–7 (Gotha, 1855–87). On nineteenth-century Swedish historiography, see Leslie F. Smith, ‘The Scandinavian Countries,’ in *The Development of Historiography*, ed. Matthew A. Fitzsimons, Alfred G. Pundt, and Charles E. Nowell (Harrisburg, Pa., 1954), pp. 279–83.

4. See, e.g., Arne Stade, ‘Geneza decyzji Karola X Gustawa o wojnie z Polską w 1655 r.,’ *Studia i materiały do historii wojskowości* 19, no. 2 (1973): 19–91; L. V. Zaborovskii, *Rossiiia, Rech’ Pospolitaia i Shvetsiia v seredine XVII v.* (Moscow, 1981), pp. 7–9; E. A. Kobzareva, *Diplomaticheskaia bor’ba za vykhod k Baltiiskomu moriu v 1655–1661 godakh* (Moscow, 1998), p. 12.

5. Michael Roberts, ‘Introduction’ to *Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell’s Court, 1655–1656: The Missions of Peter Julius Coyet and Christer Bonde*, ed. Michael Roberts (London, 1988), p. 3. Cf. also *Sweden as a Great Power 1611–1697 (Government, Society, Foreign Policy)*, ed. Michael Roberts (New York, 1968).

6. Sergei Soloviev, *History of Russia from the Earliest Times* (Gulf Breeze, Fla., 1976ff.), vols. 2–18, 21, 23–26, 29, 32, 34–35, 37–38, 40–43, 45–48.

century and reissued in 1960.<sup>7</sup> In the 1960s and 1970s, several of Kliuchevsky's books on the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were translated into English and published in the Quadrangle Series in Russian History;<sup>8</sup> French and German translations appeared between the mid-1940s and 1960s. English translations of Mikhail Pokrovsky's works appeared in the early 1930s, including a volume in the 'Marxist Library. Works of Marxism-Leninism,' issued in New York.<sup>9</sup> Boris Porshnev, the well-known historian of early seventeenth-century international relations and one of the few Soviet scholars recognized as an established authority in the West, also deserves mention here. His brilliant monographs and articles were published in French and English translation between the 1950s and 1990s.<sup>10</sup>

This subject could be developed at considerable length, but the examples presented here suffice to explain the main purpose of publishing this volume of Hrushevsky's *History* as a contribution to English-language historiography. This is not the place to consider earlier translations of Hrushevsky's works into European languages (including those published during his lifetime, such as the first volume of the *History* in German translation, issued in 1906) or their reception in contemporary reviews—subjects discussed earlier in this series and elsewhere.<sup>11</sup> Still, it is worth emphasizing that even during Hrushevsky's lifetime the publication of his works helped break down generally accepted stereotypes in historiography based on influential imperialist and even chauvinist schemas of Russian history. Quite often Western scholars availed themselves of such schemas with no particular reservations, which meant that the ideas presented in Hrushevsky's historical writings of the early twentieth century were frequently given a hostile reception.<sup>12</sup> This applies, for example, to certain American students of Russian affairs who happened to be in Russia in 1917 and witnessed the February Revolution. One of them, Frank Alfred Golder, a student of Russo-American relations, reviewed the German translation of Hrushevsky's *Ocherk istorii ukrainskogo naroda* (Outline History of the Ukrainian People, 1916), putting the scholarly community on notice that the author was an 'ardent Ukrainian nationalist.' As the reviewer correctly noted, Hrushevsky maintained that Ukrainians were a nationality distinct from their Great Russian neighbors; that they had always had some form of ethnic consciousness to a greater or lesser degree; and that they had professed democratic principles in organizing the administration of their lands, which had

7. V. O. Kliuchevsky, *A History of Russia*, trans. C. J. Hogarth, 5 vols. (London and New York, 1911–31).

8. With reference to the seventeenth century, see V. O. Kliuchevsky, *A Course in Russian History: The Seventeenth Century*, trans. Natalie Duddington, intro. by Alfred J. Rieber (Chicago, 1968).

9. M. N. Pokrovsky, *A Brief History of Russia*, trans. D. S. Mirsky, 2 vols. (New York, 1933); idem, *A History of Russia from the Earliest Times to the Rise of Commercial Capitalism*, trans. J. D. Clarkson and M. R. M. Griffiths (London, 1931); these volumes were reissued in 1968 and 1966, respectively.

10. Boris Porshnev, 'The Legend of the Seventeenth Century in French History,' *Past and Present*, 1955, no. 8: 15–27; Boris Porshnev, *Les soulèvements populaires en France de 1623 à 1648* (Paris, 1963); idem, *Les soulèvements populaires en France au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle* ([Paris], 1972); idem, *Muscovy and Sweden in the Thirty Years' War, 1630–1635*, trans. Brian Pearce (Cambridge and New York, 1995).

11. Frank Sysyn, 'Introduction to the History of Ukraine-Rus' in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 1 (Edmonton and Toronto, 1997), pp. xxxvi–xxxix. See also Vitalii Tel'vak, 'Postat' Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho v pol'skii istoriografii (kinets' XIX – XX st.),' *Ukrains'kyi istorichnyi zhurnal*, 2006, no. 5: 67–82; idem, 'Retseziia Nikolaie Iorhy na "Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes"' Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukrains'kyi arkhеohrafichnyi shchorichnyk* (Kyiv) 12 (2007): 840–44.

12. Thomas M. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: The Politics of National Culture* (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1987), pp. 65–68; Lubomyr R. Wynar, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Ukrainian-Russian Confrontation in Historiography* (Toronto, New York, and Munich, 1988), pp. 9–31; Serhii Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 2005), pp. 95–97, 106–7, 134; 343.

inspired them (however unsuccessfully) to put up resistance to Poland and Russia. Golder concluded with a warning: 'It is against this reading into history and this interpretation of historical facts that the reader should be on his guard.'<sup>13</sup>

This view may be contrasted with an opinion expressed eighty years later by Thomas Schaub Noonan (1938–2001), professor of history at the University of Minnesota, who was well respected for his work on early Rus' history and Eurasian nomad culture. On 18 September 1997, speaking at the launch of volume 1 of Hrushevsky's *History* at the University of Alberta, he described the process that led him to overcome stereotypes prevailing in his field of scholarship: 'The more I read and studied, the more I became aware of the predominance of the Great Russian approach to East Slavic history. The historical classics were the works of historians such as Vasilii Kliuchevsky.... [S]everal generations of North Americans have been indoctrinated to believe that East Slavic history was, in fact, Great Russian history. Ukraine and Ukrainians as well as Belarus and Belarusians are all seen through a Great Russian filter that often renders them invisible.... And this is where Hrushevsky's *History* becomes crucial.' Noonan went on to speak of the importance of English and German translations of Hrushevsky's works for the dissemination of his ideas beyond the East Slavic world.<sup>14</sup>

The problem of reaching a broader audience was well understood by Ukrainian scholars and cultural activists at the turn of the twentieth century, when a German translation of volume 1 of the *History* was under discussion in Lviv. Ivan Franko, Stepan Tomashivsky and many others who worked to realize that idea considered it imperative to propagate knowledge about Ukraine in what was then the dominant language of European scholarship.<sup>15</sup> As Hrushevsky's diary for those years makes clear, he took his work on preparing the German translation very seriously and made plans for French and Russian translations as well.<sup>16</sup>

Clearly apparent in Hrushevsky's work on the *History* is an overriding methodological feature: his effort to present the pertinent sources and secondary literature as comprehensively as possible. As one examines his way of writing about any important historical development, three characteristics stand out. Hrushevsky evinces a great desire to gather as many sources as possible that have a bearing on the development under study; to analyze its interpretation and discussion in the scholarly literature; and, finally, to present the reader with his own view of the matter. This was the classical method successfully employed in the writing of multi-volume histories of lands and peoples in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A comparison of Hrushevsky's *History* with similar works published in Germany, Russia, England, and other countries reveals the similarity in the tasks and objectives of such mega-projects as undertaken in the scholarly world of that day.

The rich archival collections of Moscow, Vienna, Stockholm, Warsaw, and Cracow, as well as the Polish sources in the Ossolineum in Lviv pertaining to the mid-seventeenth

13. F. A. Golder, review of *Geschichte der Ukraine*. Teil I. Von Michael Hruschewskyj, Professor der Geschichte an der Universität in Lemberg (Lemberg: 'Bund zur Befreiung der Ukraine,' 1916. Pp. viii, 224), *American Historical Review* 24, no. 4 (July 1919): 666–67.

14. See the text of Noonan's speech in *The Hrushevsky Translation Project* [Edmonton, 1997], pp. 33–36. This brochure was published on the occasion of the book launch.

15. For detailed accounts of the Lviv discussions, see Vitalii Tel'vak, 'Pershyi tom "Istoriï Ukraïny-Rusy" v otsinkakh suchasnykiv,' *Istoriografichni doslidzhennia v Ukraïni* (Kyiv), vyp. 17 (2007): 16–38; Ihor Hyrych, 'M. Hrushevs'kyi i I. Franko: Do istoriï vzaïmyn,' *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2006, no. 5: 50–51.

16. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, 'Shchodennyk [1904–5],' ed. Ihor Hyrych and Ol'ha Todiihuk, *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 2006–7, nos. 4 (172)/1–2 (173–74): 25–27, 31, 33–34, 58, 61, 70–71; Ihor Hyrych, 'Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi y 1904–1905 rokakh (Za ioho shchodennykom),' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 2007–8, nos. 3–4 (175–76)/1–2 (177–78): 201.

century, gave historians in Poland, Russia, Sweden, Austria, and many other countries the opportunity to consult, first and foremost, sources created in their own states. Those working on international relations of the seventeenth century did not always take account of research being done in other countries whose influence in Europe of that period had been considerable or even decisive. Sergei Soloviev, to take an outstanding example, wrote his multivolume *History of Russia from Earliest Times* mainly on the basis of archival collections in Moscow. Other historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries whose works are now considered classics, such as Samuel Rawson Gardiner, an authority on Cromwellian England, and the Swedish historian Fredrik Ferdinand Carlson, also based their works primarily on the sources available in their homelands. The list could be extended at considerable length.

Prevailing circumstances rendered this method of research impossible for historians of Ukraine, particularly those writing on international relations of the 1650s. The catastrophic fate of the archives of the Zaporozhian Cossack Host, burned during the leveling of the hetman's capital of Baturyn by Russian troops under the command of Aleksandr Menshikov after the revolt of Ivan Mazepa in 1708–9; the devastation of Kyivan libraries and archives by fire, most notably in 1651, 1718, 1811, and 1964; the numerous disturbances and wars that resulted in the irretrievable destruction of Ukrainian cultural monuments or in their removal to Poland, Russia, Germany, and other countries—all this had a tremendous and, in some cases, decisive impact on historical sources and their use in Ukrainian historiography.

Hrushevsky, who developed as a scholar in the Kyivan milieu created by Volodymyr Antonovych and his school, the Kyiv Archaeographic Commission, and other academic institutions, was extraordinarily sensitive to the importance of sources in historical research and capable of exploiting them to the fullest. In cases where sources did not lend themselves to the accurate reconstruction of facts and events, he sought to utilize them for data on the reflection or influence of such facts as evidenced in their reception in social circles of the time.

It is therefore no accident that one of Hrushevsky's first large-scale projects after his arrival in Lviv in 1894 was the organization and publication of a corpus of materials, entitled *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy* (Sources on the History of Ukraine-Rus'), encompassing the history of Ukraine from the sixteenth century to the end of the eighteenth. Thus, while writing the first volumes of his *History*, which dealt with Kyivan Rus' and on which he had done considerable preparatory work since his student years, Hrushevsky was already engaged in extensive research and organizational activity intended to facilitate the writing of subsequent volumes devoted to the history of Cossackdom. To that end, he organized a whole series of expeditions at the turn of the twentieth century in order to collect and publish sources on Ukrainian history from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century held in the archives of the Austrian and Russian empires. Participating in those expeditions were Hrushevsky's best students, to whom he assigned research and publication tasks by chronological period: Ivan Krypiakievych published documents on the history of Cossackdom in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; Stepan Tomashivsky and Myron Korduba worked on the Khmelnytsky era; Vasyl Herasymchuk on the period after Khmelnytsky's death in 1657, and so on.<sup>17</sup> In the 1920s, as Hrushevsky worked on volume 9 of his *History* at the Historical

---

17. See Borys Krupnyckyj, 'Die archeographische Tätigkeit M. Hruševskyjs,' *Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven. Zeitschrift des Osteuropa-Instituts* (Breslau) 11 (1935): 614–15, 619–20; Ihor Hyrych, 'Orhanizatsiia M. S. Hrushevs'kym arkheohrafichnoi roboty u l'vivs'kyi period zhyttia i diial'nosti (1894–1914),' *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*,

Section of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences,<sup>18</sup> he returned to his large-scale project, dispatching new expeditions to Moscow and other cities, whose records are now preserved in the Academy of Sciences fond at the Manuscript Institute of the Volodymyr Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine in Kyiv. Reestablishing contacts with Lviv historians who had previously been his students, Hrushevsky again employed Vasyl Herasymchuk, who for a variety of reasons had not published the sources that he had collected in 1905–7 on the history of Cossackdom until the Ruin. They were now supposed to appear in the third issue of *Ukraïns'kyi arkhiv* (Ukrainian Archive, Kyiv), whose publication was prevented by Soviet censors in the 1930s. As in previous years, while writing the current volume Hrushevsky was already planning his work on the subsequent volume, devoted to the hetmancy of Ivan Vyhovsky.

This survey of Hrushevsky's organizational activity shows how many obstacles had to be overcome by a scholar who had set himself the goal in his adolescent years of writing a multi-volume history of Ukraine from the earliest times. The assiduous efforts of a whole group of his students and colleagues to gather sources from the archives of neighboring states compensated in some measure for the loss of materials on Cossack history that had been held in Ukrainian archival collections in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; it also provided a basis for the critical assessment of those sources and their subsequent use in the writing of Hrushevsky's *History*.

Archaeographic work on the collection and publication of sources was certainly a difficult challenge for the young scholars, many of whom were only just mastering the methodology of historical research. Some of them, such as Vasyl Herasymchuk, later complained that their professor had assigned them to gather sources that he intended to use in the writing of his *History*.<sup>19</sup> Others, such as Stepan Tomashivsky in 1913, rebelled against Hrushevsky's authoritarian ways, attempting to remove him as head of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, every one of Hrushevsky's students benefited from this work on historical sources in the course of his greater or lesser scholarly development; moreover, these archival expeditions, funded by the Shevchenko Scientific Society and, subsequently, the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, provided graduate students with financial support.

The archaeological research initiated by Hrushevsky is all-important for understanding his insatiable drive for comprehensiveness of archival material in his research, especially in the present volume. For a typical example of this insatiability, we may cite Hrushevsky's characterization of Ukraine's relations with Transylvania in the autumn of 1656. Attempting to make use of a previously unknown diary written in Old Hungarian, he wrote as follows: 'I have made considerable efforts to present the history of the Ukrainian-Transylvanian alliance and the joint campaign against Poland in greater detail but have not managed to attain the desired degree of completeness.' He then notes that he had the diary translated by professionals

---

1997, no. 1: 72–86.

18. On the circumstances in which this volume was written, see Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 260–62; idem, 'Renegotiating the Pereiaslav Agreement,' in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 9, bk. 2, pt. 1 (Edmonton and Toronto, 2008), pp. xxvii–xxviii.

19. True, Herasymchuk gave voice to his complaints about Hrushevsky in his final years, when Soviet rule and the war, in the course of which he lost his entire library, severely demoralized him and brought about the grave illness that caused his death in 1944.

20. Yaroslav Hrytsak, 'Konflikt 1913 roku v NTSh,' *Ukraïns'kyi istoryk*, 1991–92, nos. 3–4 (110–11)/1–4 (112–15): 319–32; Liubomyr Vynar, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1892–1934* (New York, Drohobych and Lviv, 2006), pp. 97–118.

working in Vienna, but the results of their labor proved unsatisfactory, and the matter was resolved only with the assistance of Professor Sándor Domanovsky of the University of Budapest. 'Thus the present work utilizes a good deal of material that has been neglected until now,' concludes Hrushevsky with reference to the result of his insistent efforts.<sup>21</sup> Examples of such indefatigable research abound in the volume. For example, analyzing Ukraine's relations with Transylvania in May 1656, he includes a point 'in order to make my survey complete.'<sup>22</sup>

Of all the volumes of the *History*, it is volume 9 in which one most clearly feels the author's desire to present the reader if not with *all* the available material then certainly with the *most important* items. The aptness and effectiveness of this approach to the assessment of seventeenth-century East European politics is attested, for example, by Hrushevsky's analysis of one of the most important diplomatic developments of the period—the Vilnius negotiations between Muscovy and the Commonwealth, which took place between 22 August and 3 November 1656 N.S. From the very beginning of chapter 11, which is devoted to the negotiations, Hrushevsky emphasizes that previous research has made rather limited use of the available sources. Sergei Soloviev, for instance, concentrated mainly on Russian archival material in his *History of Russia from Earliest Times*; Ludwik Kubala used mainly Polish sources from the Cracow archives in his *Wojna brandenburska i najazd Rakoczego* (The Brandenburg War and Rákóczi's Invasion); and Antoni Walewski drew on Austrian sources for his *Historia wyzwolenia Polski za panowania Jana Kazimierza* (History of the Liberation of Poland during the Rule of John Casimir), vol. 1.<sup>23</sup> In a single footnote, Hrushevsky gives the reader indirect notice of his ambitious intention to use and critically compare all these sources of Russian, Polish, and Austrian provenance in his analysis of the Vilnius negotiations. And it must be noted that he was the first historian to manage this feat.

Ever since the publication of volume 9, book 2 of the *History* in 1931, historians have often and justifiably criticized Hrushevsky for the style of his exposition, particularly the long documentary excerpts with which he burdens his text, making it difficult for the reader to assimilate.<sup>24</sup> One might go on to assert that volume 9 can serve as something of a compendium of documents, or summaries of documents, pertaining to certain research topics in the history of Ukraine and East Central Europe in the 1650s. Still, in rendering such judgments, it should be borne in mind that we are dealing with a monument of historiography and that this way of writing was quite common in academic history of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This does not mean, of course, that it was the most favored technique in historical writing of that day. Even if one refrains from comparing Hrushevsky with foreign historians of his generation and limits oneself to comparing volume 9 of the *History* with earlier volumes in the series—those dealing with the Principality of Galicia-Volhynia (volume 3) or the Lithuanian-Polish period and the Union of Lublin (volumes 4 and 5)—a great methodological difference is apparent. This point was already stressed by Myron Korduba in his comparison of volume 9 with the preceding one, when he noted that the ponderousness of Hrushevsky's writing was becoming particularly obtrusive.<sup>25</sup> Yet, turning to other historical works of the

---

21. See p. 219, n. 200 of the present volume.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 154, n. 1.

24. Miron Korduba, 'Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung,' *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* (Berlin) 6 (1932): 382–83; cf. Ploky, 'Renegotiating the Pereiaslav Agreement,' pp. xlix–l.

25. Korduba, 'Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung,' p. 382.



period, we can easily find similar instances, running on for pages at a time, of documents cited *in extenso*—an expression that Hrushevsky was fond of using.<sup>26</sup> The parallels are obvious and, quite aside from this particular example, they attest to the broad influence of German historiography of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries on European scholarship.<sup>27</sup>

Myron Korduba, whose opinions have often been cited in the introductions to previous volumes in this series,<sup>28</sup> expressed his critical assessment of this point as a member of the younger generation of historians that no longer accepted such a method of writing; hence his critique of older scholarly approaches that struck him as outdated. Yet the style of his own review of Hrushevsky's work, published in the 1930s, is that of a broad survey of basic themes in Ukrainian history of the Cossack era. It may therefore be regarded as one of the first accounts of the *History* that sought to acquaint Western readers with Hrushevsky's views on Cossackdom.

In comparing volume 9 with the subsequent volume, devoted to the hetmancy of Ivan Vyhovsky, we see that quotations from the sources are just as copious. Yet the attentive reader readily feels not only the lack of the previous volume's comprehensiveness but also the lack of desire (or, more precisely, opportunity) on Hrushevsky's part for such comprehensiveness. It is clear that volume 10 was left incomplete.<sup>29</sup> This is to be explained first and foremost by the conditions that the Stalin regime imposed on Ukraine at the beginning of the 1930s. Repressive measures, trials based on trumped-up charges (the 'Union for the Liberation of Ukraine,' the 'Ukrainian National Center,' and so on); the physical destruction of the intelligentsia; the overhaul of the Academy of Sciences and its research tasks; the arrests and interrogations by the NKVD, which Hrushevsky himself was not spared in 1931; and, finally, the banishment of intellectuals from Ukraine to other republics as 'honorary exiles' broke the spirit and hastened the death of many scholars, depriving them of normal working conditions. Thanks to his great authority, Hrushevsky, despite his age, managed to withstand the *Sturm und Drang* of the Stalinist totalitarian assault on Ukrainian society, culture, and politics. Nevertheless, he was forced to abandon Kyiv and settle in Moscow.<sup>30</sup> These catastrophic circumstances emerge with extraordinary clarity between the lines of volume 10 of the *History*, written shortly before Hrushevsky's death, under mysterious circumstances, at a sanatorium in Kislovodsk on 24 November 1934.

\* \* \*

---

26. See, e.g., François Guizot, *History of Oliver Cromwell and the English Commonwealth from the Execution of Charles the First to the Death of Cromwell*, trans. Andrew R. Scoble, vol. 2 (London, 1854), pp. 257–61; Johan Levin Carlbon, *Magnus Dureels negotiation i Köpenhamn, 1655–1657. Sveriges och Danmarks inbördes förhållande under åren närmast före Karl X första danska krig* (Göteborg, 1901), pp. 143–46 and passim.

27. For discussions of this influence, see George P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 3d ed. (Boston, 1959); Eduard Fueter, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Zurich, 1985; repr. of 3d edition, Munich and Berlin, 1936); Georg Iggers, *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*, rev. ed. (Middletown, Conn., 1983).

28. Sysyn, 'Introduction to the History of Ukraine-Rus', p. xxxix; Plokhly, 'Renegotiating the Pereiaslav Agreement,' pp. xlix–l.

29. Prymak, *Mykhailo Hrushevsky*, pp. 258, 269–70; Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, pp. 421–30.

30. See Volodymyr Prystaiko and Iurii Shapoval, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi i HPU-NKVD: Trahichne desiatylittia, 1924–1934* (Kyiv, 1996), pp. 98–105; idem, *Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi: Sprava 'UNT's'i ostanni roky (1931–1934)* (Kyiv, 1999), pp. 102–4; Iurii Shapoval, 'Nevidomi dokumenty HPU-NKVD pro zhyttia i diial'nist' M. Hrushevs'koho u 1924–1934 rokakh,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 32, nos. 1–4 (1996): 325–49; idem, 'Mykhailo Hrushevsky in Moscow and His Death (1931–34): New Revelations,' *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 24, no. 2 (winter 1999): 79–100.

As noted earlier, Ukraine's foreign policy during the years 1655–57 is one of the major subjects of this volume. In historiography of the mid- and late twentieth century, the events of that period provoked a lively discussion of the general crisis in seventeenth-century Europe. The editors of a volume of polemical articles published on that subject in the British journal *Past and Present* in the 1950s and 1960s saw it as one of their tasks to broaden the traditionally narrow framework of research on the period in English historical writing.<sup>31</sup> Historians in many countries followed the discussion with interest, seeking to fit their national historiographic traditions into a comprehensive discourse on seventeenth-century world history. In the early 1990s English historians of Germany returned to the debate, noting with alarm that Germany had been overlooked in the discussion of the general European crisis. It seemed that the Thirty Years' War had come to overshadow the rest of the seventeenth century in historical studies of Germany, leaving a very important period of that country's development out of account. 'All of these theories have one thing in common: they leave out Germany,' wrote Sheilagh C. Ogilvie in 1992.<sup>32</sup> The discussion became even more pointed when another collection of essays on the subject, which greatly influenced the ongoing debate, appeared in 1978 with no consideration of the German problem.<sup>33</sup> This was corrected in a revised edition.<sup>34</sup>

Ukraine was also left out of the discussion to some extent. However, thanks to the works of Bohdan Kentschynskyj, which appeared in the 1950s and 1960s, just as the discussion was getting under way and arousing greater interest, Ukraine and the Cossack wars of the Khmelnytsky era were not entirely lost to view.<sup>35</sup> The very title of the article that Kentschynskyj published in 1956 was congruent with the European historical discourse that was beginning to develop at the time. Although Kentschynskyj published his articles in Swedish, they became so well known among Swedish scholars working on the era of Charles X as to command the attention of other European historians of the seventeenth-century crisis, who valued them highly. 'Kentschynskyj had an advantage of a command of all Slavonic languages (not to mention others such as Magyar and Rumanian); he was himself of Ukrainian origin; a warm Ukrainian patriot, writing in the era of the Cold War. No previous historian had based his argument upon such an overwhelming abundance of material, spanning the whole of northern and eastern Europe,' wrote Michael Roberts.<sup>36</sup>

To be sure, Kentschynskyj often based his work on Hrushevsky's exposition of seventeenth-century developments,<sup>37</sup> but Hrushevsky's *History* was then inaccessible to

31. Christopher Hill, 'Introduction' to *Crisis in Europe 1560–1660: Essays from Past and Present*, ed. Trevor Aston (London, 1965), p. 3.

32. Sheilagh C. Ogilvie, 'Germany in the Seventeenth-Century Crisis,' *The Historical Journal* 35, no. 2 (June 1992): 421.

33. *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith (London, 1978).

The correction took the form of a reprint of Ogilvie's article (cf. n. 32 above). See *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith, 2d ed. (London and New York, 1997), pp. 57–86; see also bibliographic references to German publications on p. 77, nn. 2–4.

35. Bohdan Kentschynskyj, 'Karl X Gustav inför krisen i öster 1654–1655,' *Karolinska förbundet årsbok 1956* (Stockholm, 1956), pp. 1–140; idem, 'Till den karolinska Ukraina-politikens förhistoria,' *Karolinska förbundet årsbok 1959* (Stockholm, 1959), pp. 121–79 (cf. the section 'Sverige och ukrainska revolutionen,' pp. 145–78); idem, 'Ukrainska revolutionen och Rysslands angrepp mot Sverige 1656,' *Karolinska förbundet årsbok 1966* (Stockholm, 1966), pp. 7–86.

36. Michael Roberts, 'Charles X and the Great Parenthesis: A Reconsideration,' in his *From Oxenstierna to Charles XII: Four Studies* (Cambridge and New York, 1991), pp. 104–5. See also his review of the article that Kentschynskyj published in 1956 (*English Historical Review* 72, no. 285 [October 1957]: 705–7).

37. On Kentschynskyj's historical views, see Stellan Dalgren [Dahlgren], 'Shvetsia i strany Vostochnoi Evropy v

English-speaking readers. Its translation, which Ukrainian historians and community activists sought to undertake in the 1960s, remained unrealized at the time.<sup>38</sup> The volume now offered to the reader abounds in material on the crisis of East Central Europe in the mid-seventeenth century. It brings Ukraine into the historiographic discourse on that crisis with a rich contribution of facts, sources, and historiographic analysis. In this brief introduction, it is clearly impossible to discuss all the problems of Ukrainian foreign policy in 1655–57 that Hrushevsky treated in his work. Those selected for consideration here are the ones that loom largest in the volume and have also proved most important in the development of historical writing since the publication of the Ukrainian text in 1931.

### *Ukraine and Sweden*

The outstanding Ukrainian Orientalist Omeljan Pritsak (1919–2006) was fond of noting that one of his main stimuli for the study of Oriental sources was the fact that Hrushevsky made no use of them. The same may be said of the use of Swedish sources and secondary literature in Hrushevsky's *History*. The lack of such material is particularly apparent when it comes to the era of King Charles X Gustavus, with the exception of documents compiled by Nykandr Molchanovsky in Stockholm in the late nineteenth century. They were published as a separate volume of *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* (Archive of Southwestern Russia) and provided the basis for Hrushevsky's treatment of Bohdan Khmelnytsky's relations with the Swedish king in the years 1655–57.<sup>39</sup>

It is no accident that Swedish historiography has been singled out for attention in this introduction, for it has dropped almost completely out of Ukrainian historians' field of vision, just as Ukrainian historiography has been neglected in Swedish historical research. Dmytro Doroshenko sought to remedy this situation in 1937, when he published a general survey of Ukrainian scholarly literature on Ukrainian-Swedish relations, with considerable attention to Hrushevsky's *History*.<sup>40</sup> For the most part, however, while Swedish historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries made frequent reference to Charles X's relations with the Cossacks, the topic remained marginal in analyses of Sweden's policy toward the Commonwealth in the years 1655–60.<sup>41</sup> As noted above, it was the publication of Bohdan

---

piatidesiatye gody XVII v.: Istoriografiia i istochniki,' in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatia v Evrazii: 50-e gody XVII veka*, ed. L. E. Semenova et al. (Moscow, 2000), pp. 81–90; Andrei Kotliarchuk, 'Diplomaticheskie otnosheniia Shvetsii i Ukrainy v 1654–1660 gg.: Shvedskaia istoriografiia i istochniki,' in *Ukraina i sosednie gosudarstva v XVII veke: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii*, ed. Tatiana Iakovleva (St. Petersburg, 2004), pp. 91–94; idem, *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia: The Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Sweden in the European Crisis of the Mid-17th Century* (Huddinge, 2006), p. 19.

38. Sysyn, 'Introduction to the *History of Ukraine-Rus*,' pp. xxxi–xl; Liubomyr Vynar, 'Do istorii anhlomovnoho vydannia "Istoriï Ukraïny-Rusy" Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 2002, nos. 1–4 (152–55): 266–73.

39. Arkhiv IuZR, pt. 3, vol. 6 (Kyiv, 1908). The documents were published a year after the editor's death. On his work and plans associated with Swedish sources, see Nikandr Molchanovskii, 'Pis'mo k redaktoru iz Stokgol'ma (o bumagakh Shvedskogo gosudarstvennogo arkhiva po istorii Malorossii),' *Kievskaiia starina*, 1899, no. 4 (April): 75–89; 'Nykandr Vasylievykh Molchanovsk'kyi (Nekroloh),' *Ukraina*, 1907, no. 1: 98.

40. D. Doroshenko, 'Svensk-ukrainska förbindelser under 1600- och 1700-talen i belysning av den nyaste ukrainska historieskrivningen,' *Historisk Tidskrift* (Stockholm) 57 (1937): 129–49 (material about Hrushevsky on pp. 132–36). Cf. Doroshenko's obituary of Hrushevsky, which emphasizes Ukrainian-Swedish relations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: 'Michael Hruschewskij,' *Historisk Tidskrift* 55 (1935): 67–69.

41. Fredrik Ferdinand Carlson, *Sveriges historia under konungarne af Pfalziska huset*, 7 vols. (Stockholm, 1855), vol. 1, *Carl X Gustaf*, pp. 120, 127, 191, 210; Carl Wibling, *Carl X. Gustaf och Georg Rákóczi II* (Lund, 1891), pp. 8–11, 13–17; Johan Levin Carlbom, *Magnus Dureels negotiation i Köpenhamn, 1655–1657*, pp. 138–39, n. 3; 172; Manfred Carlon, *Ryska kriget 1656–1658* (Stockholm, 1903), p. 22; Nils Edén, 'Grunderna för Karl X Gustafs anfall på Polen,' *Historisk*

Kentschynskyj's articles, which promptly gained wide recognition in Swedish and world historiography, that fundamentally changed this situation.

In 1932 Myron Korduba twice criticized Hrushevsky for what he considered inadequate or erroneous treatment of Commonwealth and Ukrainian relations with Sweden. To begin with, he wrote that since Ukraine was part of the Commonwealth in the 1630s, and Sweden was then attempting to establish relations with the Cossacks, Hrushevsky should have paid greater attention to Polish-Swedish relations. This is more in the nature of a suggestion than a criticism. But Korduba's second observation concerns a very important episode in Ukrainian politics and diplomacy of 1655 that led to the further worsening of relations between the Zaporozhian Host and Sweden. Hrushevsky believed that it was Charles X Gustavus who prompted Khmelnytsky to abandon the siege of Kamianets-Podilskyi and proceed to Lviv, since the Swedish troops who were then approaching Cracow and very rapidly occupying Polish territory needed Cossack support against the Crown Army. Hrushevsky provided a detailed analysis of the conditions negotiated between the Ukrainian hetman and the Swedish embassy headed by Alexander Julius Torkvat at Kamianets-Podilskyi, referring to this agreement as a Ukrainian-Swedish convention.<sup>42</sup> Korduba did not share this view, writing that Hrushevsky's account of the matter was difficult to reconcile with the subsequent attitude of the Swedish king.<sup>43</sup> Korduba offered no detailed discussion of this important diplomatic development, nor did he explain his own view of it at any length, but there is no doubt that he was referring here to the deterioration of relations between Charles X Gustavus and Bohdan Khmelnytsky in the months that followed.

Yet the two episodes were in fact almost unrelated: the Swedish king dispatched his embassy to Kamianets-Podilskyi in the course of his advance on Cracow, but he did not demand Khmelnytsky's withdrawal from Lviv until he was in control of Cracow, which fell to the Swedes on 17 October 1655 N.S. In accepting the Swedish protectorate, the Polish nobility, entire palatinates, and the Crown Army unanimously demanded the restoration of the Polish Kingdom's eastern boundaries. The Swedish king therefore found himself obliged to renege on his responsibilities vis-à-vis the Ukrainian hetman as agreed at Kamianets-Podilskyi, and thus he demanded that the Cossack forces abandon Lviv. Moreover, after Khmelnytsky's withdrawal from the city, Charles X himself moved into Galicia, provoking a sharp response from the Cossack officers. 'As for the Swedish king—a curse on his mother—he took and captured Lublin, which had sworn an oath to us. In taking Zamość as well, he had to storm it four times. And he is heading directly for Lviv to capture it,' as the secretary of Romen, Ioan Vasyliovych, wrote unabashedly to the captain of that town.<sup>44</sup> Thus, Korduba's opinion to the contrary, Hrushevsky's assessment of Ukrainian-Swedish relations during the autumn campaign of 1655 was strikingly accurate. Not surprisingly, his account greatly influenced subsequent treatments of this important Ukrainian-Swedish convention and of the Swedish embassies to Kamianets-Podilskyi and Lviv.<sup>45</sup>

---

*Tidskrift* 26 (1906): 11, 16.

42. See pp. 20–21 of the present volume.

43. Korduba, 'Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung,' pp. 45, 362.

. See p. 80 of the present volume.

45. See, e.g., Bohdan Kentschynskyj, 'Ukrainska revolutionen och Rysslands angrepp mot Sverige 1656,' *Karolinska förbundet årsbok 1966* (Stockholm, 1966), pp. 42–43; Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Zakharii Gamots'kyi — virmenyn z Ukraïny, dvorianyn u Shvetsiï, ta ioho zustrichi z Bohdanom Khmel'nyts'kym (1655),' in his *Postati: Narysy pro diiachiv istoriï, polityky, kul'tury*, 2d ed. (Lviv, 2007), pp. 130–38.

The same cannot be said of Swedish historiography, in which the Ukrainian-Swedish convention of 1655 still remains an almost unknown episode in the diplomacy of Charles X Gustavus<sup>46</sup>—this despite the fact that as long ago as the 1930s Dmytro Doroshenko reported Hrushevsky's opinion of it in a work intended for Swedish historians.<sup>47</sup> To this one might add that the Cossack advance on Poland in league with Muscovite forces was debated (with no particular attention to the Ukrainian-Swedish convention) at a session of the Council of State in Stockholm on 26 July 1655 o.s.<sup>48</sup>—that is, just at the time when Charles X Gustavus and Bohdan Khmelnytsky were making their simultaneous advances on Warsaw and Kamianets-Podilskyi, respectively. Nykandr Molchanovsky's above-mentioned edition of Stockholm documents, published in Kyiv in 1908 and so often cited by Hrushevsky in the present volume, was 'lost' in Swedish historiography several times and 'rediscovered' in the 1920s and 1930s thanks to the works of Georg Wittrock, Franz Babinger, and Dmytro Doroshenko.<sup>49</sup> Until Kentschynskyj's publications of the 1950s, however, Molchanovsky's collection remained little known and without serious influence in European historiography.

This situation attests to the isolated development of national historiographic traditions discussed above. Striving to overcome it, Swedish historians made efforts to cooperate with Polish and Ukrainian scholars in the 1920s; then with Soviet scholars in the 1970s and 1980s, holding annual joint symposia; and, most recently, at the turn of the twenty-first century, with Ukrainian and Russian historians. But these efforts have proved insufficient to promote marked reciprocal influence between Swedish historical writing on the one hand and Ukrainian and Russian writing on the other.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, individual English-language works discussing Scandinavian sources on Muscovite history during the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich, in which problems of Swedish-Ukrainian relations were frequently mentioned, attracted little notice in the 1950s and 1960s and are now half-forgotten.<sup>51</sup>

The autumn campaign of 1655 was decisive for Hrushevsky's assessment of Ukrainian-Swedish relations as they developed in the next two years. The hopes nourished by Ukrainian politicians during their negotiations with Sweden took on a completely different cast when Bohdan Khmelnytsky became aware of Charles X Gustavus's outright unwillingness to concede territory east of the Vistula to the Zaporozhian Host. Developments in the Common-

46. See, e.g., Kotljarchuk, *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia*, p. 246.

47. 'Torkwats beskickning gav till resultat en svensk-ukrainsk krigskonvention, avslutat i lägret vid Kamianetz, och i kraft av denna inleddes en gemensam aktion mot Polen' (Doroschenko, 'Svensk-ukrainska förbindelser,' pp. 132–33).

48. Svenska riksrådets protokoll med understöd av statsmedel i tryck utgivet av Riksarkivet, ed. Per Sondén, vol. 16, 1654–1656 (Stockholm, 1923), p. 253.

49. See Kentschynskyj, 'Karl X Gustav inför krisen i öster 1654–1655,' p. 12. To Babinger's article, which Kentschynskyj mentions, one may add the publication in the 1930s of the diary of Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt, with Babinger's survey of the literature on Ukrainian-Swedish relations in 1656–57 (including Molchanovsky's collection). See *Conrad Jacob Hildebrandts dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise nach Siebenbürgen, der Ukraine und Constantinopel (1656–1658)*, ed. Franz Babinger (Leiden, 1937), p. xviii, n. 1.

50. See, e.g., David Norrman, 'Nyare polsk historisk litteratur,' *Historisk Tidskrift* 55 (1935): 77–82; Doroshenko, 'Svensk-ukrainska förbindelser,' pp. 129–49; Władysław Konopczyński, 'O wojnie szwedzkiej i brandenburskiej r. 1655–1657,' *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 1918: 241–54; *Polens krig med Sverige 1655–1660. Krigshistoriska studier*, ed. Arne Stade and Jan Wimmer (Stockholm, 1973); Dalgren, 'Shvetsiia i strany Vostochnoi Evropy,' pp. 81–90; idem, 'Sources on the Russian-Swedish Negotiations in 1655–1657,' in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniakh v Evrope serediny XVII v.*, ed. Boris Floria et al. (Moscow, 2007), pp. 50–136; Kotljarchuk, 'Diplomaticeskies otnosheniia Shvetsii i Ukrainy,' pp. 90–107.

51. Heinz Eberhard Ellersieck, 'Russia under Aleksei Mikhailovich and Feodor Alekseevich, 1645–1682: The Scandinavian Sources' (Ph.D. diss.: University of California, Los Angeles, 1955), pp. 162–71.

wealth itself—the rise of the Polish liberation movement beginning late in 1655 and the return of John Casimir from the emigration—also forced Charles X to revise his policy toward Ukraine. From that time on, Khmelnytsky managed his Ukrainian-Swedish relations with great caution, distrust, and demands of firm guarantees.

That was how matters stood in May 1656, when the Muscovite tsar declared war on Sweden. This development, which Hrushevsky mentions only in passing,<sup>52</sup> proved decisive for the course of international diplomacy in Eastern Europe in 1656–57—a point made very clearly in Russian historiography as early as the nineteenth century.<sup>53</sup> It was also addressed in the writings of Swedish scholars.<sup>54</sup> Naturally, Hrushevsky made a detailed analysis of those aspects of the Muscovite-Swedish war that had a direct bearing on Ukraine. For example, he devoted considerable space to problems of Muscovite-Swedish relations arising from the correspondence between Charles X Gustavus and Ivan Zolotarenko, who was Khmelnytsky's acting hetman in Belarus in 1655. In the opinion of Gustaf Bielke, a Swedish envoy in Moscow in 1655–56, that correspondence was one of the reasons for Muscovy's declaration of war. This idea has surfaced from time to time in scholarly writing on Ukrainian-Swedish relations.<sup>55</sup>

In assessing Khmelnytsky's Galician campaign in the autumn of 1655, it is worth dwelling on one of the most interesting episodes in Ukrainian-Swedish relations, which involved several European countries and the Ottoman Empire. It began with Khmelnytsky's instructions to his envoy to Sweden, the Reverend Daniel Kaluger, which were issued near Lviv in October 1655. At his audience with Charles X in Warsaw in early November, Kaluger proposed a combined offensive against the Ottoman Empire involving the naval forces of Venice and England, as well as the land armies of Ukraine, Muscovy, and Sweden.<sup>56</sup> Ukrainian scholars have often adverted to this episode, speculating endlessly on this seemingly pointless plan for a campaign by the joint forces of Khmelnytsky, Charles X, and Cromwell against the Ottoman Empire.<sup>57</sup> Hrushevsky's opinion was as follows: Daniel Kaluger 'presented his own memorandum indicating how that campaign against the Turks might be carried out: the Cossacks, together with the Venetians and the English (led by Cromwell!), would conduct the seaborne operations, while the Swedes, Muscovites, and Cossacks would fight on land. All this was quite preposterous, but it was presented with a modicum of knowledge of the circumstances and situation.'<sup>58</sup>

Grasping the basis of Kaluger's proposals requires some acquaintance with English foreign policy in late 1654, when two sea expeditions were undertaken: one to the West Indies under

52. See pp. 153–54 of the present volume.

53. S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, 15 vols. (Moscow, 1961), 5: 657–59.

54. Carlon, *Ryska kriget 1656–1658*, pp. 13, 24–25.

55. Kentschynskyj, 'Karl X Gustav inför krisen,' p. 99; idem, 'Ukrainska revolutionen och Rysslands angrepp,' pp. 75, 83–85; Kotliarchuk, 'Diplomaticheskie otnosheniia Shvetsii i Ukrainy,' pp. 95–96; idem, *In the Shadows of Poland and Russia*, pp. 193, 245.

56. Arkhiv IuZR, pt. 3, vol. 6, pp. 85–88; cf. pp. 42–43 of the present volume.

57. See Viacheslav Lypyn's'kyi, *Ukraina na perelomi, 1657–1659* (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 45, 163–64; Panas Fedenko, 'Z dyp'omatychnoi diial'nosty Danyla Hreka (Prychynok do znosyn B. Khmel'nyts'koho zi Shvedamy),' *Pratsi Ukrains'koho vysokoho pedahohichnoho instytutu im. Mykhaila Drahomanova u Prazi. Naukovyi zbirnyk*, vol. 1 (Prague, 1929): 444–45; Ivan Kryp'iakevych, *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*, 2d ed. (Lviv, 1990), p. 318; idem, 'Danylo Oliveberh de Hrekani, diplomat chasiv Khmel'nychchyny,' ed. Valentyna Matiakh, in *Doba Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'* (Kyiv, 1995), pp. 246–47.

58. See p. 43 of the present volume.

William Penn; the other to the Mediterranean under the command of Admiral Robert Blake. Even today, Cromwell's motives for authorizing the second expedition remain obscure and continue to arouse controversy among historians.<sup>59</sup> In early April 1655, Blake's squadron attacked galleys manned by Tunisian pirates, who were then preparing to join the Ottoman fleet for a new campaign against Venice.<sup>60</sup> The encounter made a tremendous impression in Europe. The Venetian envoy Giovanni Sagredo was immediately dispatched to London, departing from Paris in July in an effort to persuade Cromwell to make war on the Porte.<sup>61</sup> At the same time, Greek emigrants in Paris (Daniel Kaluger, who was in the service of the Swedish king, the Ukrainian hetman, and the elector of Brandenburg, also belonged to that milieu) sent an envoy to Cromwell and to the Swedish resident in London, Krister Bonde, assuring them that in the event of an Anglo-Swedish offensive they would raise a revolt against the Ottomans in the Peloponnesus.<sup>62</sup> There was great alarm in Istanbul in September 1655 about the English menace, as attested in a letter from the Dutch envoy to the Porte, Levinus Warnerus.<sup>63</sup>

Given this context, it becomes clear why Kaluger made proposals to Charles X in Khmelnytsky's name that had no basis in Ukrainian or Swedish politics of that day.<sup>64</sup> Moreover, Cromwell's envoy Edward Rolt arrived in Warsaw at the beginning of November 1655 N.S. and, as he wrote in his reports, met Daniel Kaluger with an escort of Cossacks who were there on an embassy from Bohdan Khmelnytsky.<sup>65</sup>

Understandably, Russian historians have shown considerable reserve in commenting on Ukrainian-Swedish relations in this period, given that Khmelnytsky was attempting to establish relations with a country that was then hostile to Muscovy. Kentrschynskyj's articles have been considered tendentious, and there have been unfounded accusations that his research was based exclusively on Swedish sources.<sup>66</sup> Vasilii Kliuchevsky, whose influence on Western Slavists remains enormous, described Khmelnytsky's efforts to form a new coalition against the Commonwealth as follows: 'A true representative of Cossackdom (which was accustomed to serve towards every quarter of the compass), Bogdan [Khmelnytsky] could be servant or ally or betrayer of any one of his ruler-neighbours—of the King of Poland, of the Tsar of Moscow, of the Khan of the Crimea, of the Sultan of Turkey, of the Prince of

---

59. Menna Prestwich, 'Diplomacy and Trade in the Protectorate,' *Journal of Modern History* 22, no. 2 (June 1950): 107; Ralph Davis, 'England and the Mediterranean, 1570–1670,' in *Essays in the Economic and Social History of Tudor and Stuart England in Honour of R. H. Tawney*, ed. F. J. Fisher (Cambridge, 1961), p. 131; Gerald M. D. Howat, *Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy* (London, 1974), p. 86; Richard A. Stradling, *Europe and the Decline of Spain* (London, 1981), pp. 123, 138.

60. John Rowland Powell, *Robert Blake General-at-Sea* (London, 1972), pp. 262–63; Roger Beadon, *Robert Blake sometime Commanding all the Fleet and Naval Forces of England*, (London, 1935), pp. 226–27.

61. *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, vol. 30, 1655–1656 (Nendeln and Lichtenstein, 1970; repr. of 1930 ed.), docs. 104, 107, pp. 78, 80.

62. *Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655–1656*, pp. 142–43.

63. *Levini Warneri de rebus Turcicis epistolae inediti*, ed. G. N. Du Rieu (Lund, 1883), doc. 17, p. 20.

64. Yaroslav Fedoruk, 'Polityka Anhlii i antyosmans'ka diial'nist' Danyla Kaluhera u 1655 rotsi,' *Ukrains'kyi arkhoehrafichnyi shchorychnyk* (Kyiv and New York), n.s. 7 (2002): 232–42.

65. *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe*, ed. Thomas Birch, vol. 4 (London, 1742), pp. 140–41, 181; Johan Levin Carlbon, *Sverige och England 1655–aug. 1657* (Göteborg, 1900), p. 82.

66. E. I. Kobzareva, 'Zarubezhnaia istoriografiia o russko-shvedskikh otnosheniakh 1655–1661 gg.,' *Otechestvennaia istoriia* (Moscow), 1993, no. 4: 121; idem, *Diplomaticheskaia bor'ba*, p. 12.

Moldavia, of the Prince of Transylvania.<sup>67</sup> This characterization takes no account of the Zaporozhian Host's political interests or of Khmelnytsky's political goal in waging war against the Commonwealth—to unite all the Ukrainian lands under his rule. Given the prevalence of such opinions, Western scholarship was poorly equipped to make an objective assessment of mid-seventeenth century developments in Ukraine, and Hrushevsky's research provides a necessary corrective.

### *Ukraine and the Ottoman Protectorate*

Hrushevsky devotes considerable space in his *History* to Khmelnytsky's relations with the Ottoman Porte, the Crimean Khanate, and the Danube principalities—Moldavia, Wallachia, and Transylvania. After the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654, the question of relations with the Zaporozhian Host became a major dilemma for Istanbul. On the one hand, the extension of Muscovy's boundaries constituted a threat to the Ottoman Empire and its provinces; on the other, an outright confrontation with the Cossacks and Muscovites would expose the Porte to many dangers. That is why Istanbul avoided overt hostilities with Khmelnytsky, although it also remained fairly loyal to the Crimean Khanate as the latter set about forming a new alliance with Poland in October 1654.

This political line of the Porte, which became apparent in the spring and early autumn of 1654, evolved steadily toward the end of the year in the direction of maintaining friendly relations with Ukraine. The main reason for that evolution was the difficult situation of the Porte, given its preparations for a new campaign against Venice and the threat of Zaporozhian and Don Cossack expeditions to the Black Sea. The growing strength of the Muscovite tsardom and its military successes against the Commonwealth in the course of 1654 were another reason for Istanbul's efforts to establish good relations with Khmelnytsky in the following year. The situation was complicated by acute internal conflicts in the senior ranks of the Ottoman court when yet another change of viziers came about in May 1655, on the eve of the arrival of Cossack and Polish envoys.<sup>68</sup>

Relations with the Porte were important to Ukraine because of Khmelnytsky's new effort to revive his alliance with the Crimean Tatars, which had collapsed after the Pereiaslav Council of 1654. He had made such an effort in the course of the Okhmativ campaign, as Hrushevsky shows very convincingly. At the Battle of Okhmativ, which took place at the end of January 1655, Crimean Tatar forces appeared to stand aside, as Polish contemporaries noted, taking no part in the assaults on the Cossack camp carried out by their allies in the Crown Army. This largely saved the situation for Khmelnytsky, who not only emerged from the battle undefeated but also managed to take war booty, notably Polish cannon. Hrushevsky supports the opinion of contemporaries that covert Ukrainian and Muscovite diplomacy was hard at work bribing the Tatar mirzas and khans.<sup>69</sup> Interestingly enough, the major English newspaper published during Cromwell's Protectorate, *Mercurius Politicus*, carried reports to the same effect on the basis of dispatches from Gdańsk of 13 January 1655 (several weeks before the battle itself) and of 1 March of the same year from Warsaw: 'Here's report that the

---

67. Kliuchevsky, *A History of Russia*, 3: 124.

68. Joseph Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 5, 1623–1656 (Pest, 1829), pp. 629–32.

69. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 9, bk. 2, pt. 1, p. 455. For Korduba's comment on this point, see his 'Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung,' p. 359.



Muscovites labour to draw off the Tartars from assisting the Poles, by giving them monies: which to[ge]ther with the influence the Cossacks have upon them, may peradventure easily be procured'; 'It is said also, that Chmielniski, the Cossacks Generall, had sent a mule laden with money to corrupt the chiefe Tartarian officers....'<sup>70</sup>

Ukrainian-Ottoman relations in the spring and summer of 1655 were a subject to which Hrushevsky devoted particular attention. In 1931, just as volume 9, book 2 of the *History* was about to be published, the Czech Orientalist Jan Rypka issued a series of articles concerning Khmelnytsky's submission to the Porte in 1655.<sup>71</sup> Hrushevsky was greatly influenced by the first two of these publications and responded to them by writing reviews and corresponding with the author.<sup>72</sup> By the 1920s the All-Ukrainian Scholarly Association of Eastern Studies was already active, and the young historian Vasyl Dubrovsky was working on Ukrainian-Ottoman relations in the second half of the seventeenth century, but Rypka's publications were the first to put Ottoman sources on Ukraine of the 1650s from the Göttingen collection into scholarly circulation.

Given Hrushevsky's aspiration to collect the greatest possible number of sources for his research, he turned 'avidly' to the study of this material. It must be said that he did so in such masterly fashion that historians who studied the problem after him were convinced for several decades that Hrushevsky had made use of all Rypka's articles.<sup>73</sup> In fact he was unable to do so, as Rypka's third article, which dealt particularly with Ottoman documents of 1655, did not appear until 1931, when volume 9, book 2 of the *History* was published.<sup>74</sup> Since Hrushevsky made his final corrections to the volume in December 1930,<sup>75</sup> he could have taken Rypka's information only from the latter's general survey article on the Göttingen manuscript, which was published in 1928.<sup>76</sup> That was a particularly important source, for Rypka published a letter from the sultan to Khmelnytsky that summarized the hetman's letter sent to Istanbul in the spring of 1655 with the Cossack envoys Roman Zhdanovych and Iakiv Chelebi, who were accompanied by the Ottoman envoy Shahin Agha.

It was Hrushevsky's signal contribution to the study of Ukrainian-Ottoman relations to make available a large number of Muscovite and, in particular, Hungarian reports on the subject. The correspondence of Prince György Rákóczi II of Transylvania with the Moldavian hospodar, the reports of Hungarian envoys to the prince and those of the Transylvanian resident at the Porte—all this was source material of the first order that few historians before Hrushevsky had studied in such quantity or compared with sources of other provenance.

Hrushevsky himself was almost overwhelmed by his huge collection of factual material, sometimes becoming confused or falling into error in his analysis of Ukrainian-Ottoman

70. *Mercurius Politicus*, no. 241, 18–25 January 1654 [= 1655] N.S., p. 5079; no. 251, 29 March–5 April 1655 O.S., p. 5235.

71. Jan Rypka, 'Z korespondence Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým,' in *Z dějin Východní Evropy a slovenstva: Sborník věnovaný Jaroslavu Bidlovi, profesoru Karlovy University k šedesátým narozeninám* (Prague, 1928), pp. 346–350, 482–498; idem, 'Weitere Beiträge zur Korrespondenz der Hohen Pforte mit Bohdan Chmel'nyčkyj,' *Archiv Orientální* (Prague) 2 (1930): 262–83.

72. Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, 'Z pryvodu lystuvannia B. Khmel'nyts'koho z Otomans'koiu Portoiu,' *Ukraina*, no. 42 (July–August 1930): 7.

73. See, e.g., the observation in Zaborovskii, *Rossia, Rech' Pospolitaia i Shvetsiia*, p. 161, n. 91.

74. Jan Rypka, 'Další příspěvek ke korespondenci Vysoké Porty s Bohdanem Chmelnickým,' *Časopis Národního Musea* 105 (1931): 209–31.

75. See Hrushevsky, *History*, vol. 9, bk. 1, p. 688; cf. Plokhyy, *Unmaking Imperial Russia*, p. 262; idem, 'Renegotiating the Pereiaslav Agreement,' pp. xxvii–xxviii.

76. See p. 444 of the present volume.

relations, which created difficulties for him and for those using his work as they sought to deal with the subject. For example, Hrushevsky confused the dates of 21 and 26 April 1654 N.S. when writing about the arrival of a Ukrainian embassy in Istanbul.<sup>77</sup> What looks like a petty detail at first glance turns out to be important for explaining the Ottoman attitude to Ukraine and Poland in the period immediately after the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654. Since 26 April 1654 N.S. was the date of the farewell audience of Mikołaj Bieganowski, the Polish envoy to Istanbul, it is important to know that the date of the Ukrainian embassy's arrival coincided with that of the Polish embassy's departure. This in turn offers grounds for further deductions about priorities in the Ottoman government's relations with Bohdan Khmelnytsky and John Casimir.<sup>78</sup>

Hrushevsky was also inconsistent in dating the discharge of the Ukrainian embassy from Istanbul in 1655, probably because he was attempting to reconcile the information in Rypka's new publications with Mykola Kostomarov's established dating of the sultan's letter to Khmelnytsky. In the 1870s, Kostomarov used a copy of an eighteenth-century Polish translation of that letter preserved in the archive of the imperial Ministry of Foreign Affairs and dated 'In 7bri 1655.'<sup>79</sup> Rypka, however, referred to an Ottoman copy of the letter in the Göttingen manuscript and interpreted its date as referring to the last ten days of Ramazan 1065 (that is, the period between 24 July and 3 August 1655 N.S.).<sup>80</sup> It is in fact impossible to reconcile these data, although historians who came after Hrushevsky also attempted to do so.<sup>81</sup> Rypka himself, noting the discrepancy between the date in the Göttingen copy and the one given by Hrushevsky in the present volume of his *History*, saw no way of resolving it and made no substantive comment on this important fact.<sup>82</sup>

In his text, Hrushevsky wrote initially that the Cossack envoys left Istanbul on 19 or 20 July 1655 N.S., accompanied by Shahin Agha and bearing letters to Khmelnytsky from the vizier and the sultan. Hrushevsky gave the date of 20 July on the basis of information provided in Moscow by Theodore the Greek, an envoy from the patriarch of Jerusalem.<sup>83</sup> This was followed by a number of factual inconsistencies. Mentioning the envoys' discharge from Istanbul, together with Shahin Agha, in the last third of July 1655, Hrushevsky nevertheless continued to accept Kostomarov's dating of the sultan's letter to September 1655. 'Unable to verify his [Kostomarov's] evidence, I conclude that in any event it must have been sent approximately at that time,' he wrote.<sup>84</sup> Sensing an inaccuracy here and attempting to correct himself in the supplements to the volume, Hrushevsky again noted that the letter must have been written in July, but earlier than Rypka's suggested date of the last ten days of Ramazan: 'The evidence that I have collected on pp. 8–9 suggests that the decree was issued approxi-

77. Hrushevsky, *History*, vol. 9, bk. 2, pt. 1, p. 294, n. 77.

78. Ia. O. Fedoruk, *Mizhnarodna diplomatiia i polityka Ukrainy 1654–1657*, pt. 1, 1654 rik (Lviv, 1996), pp. 107–9.

79. See N. I. Kostomarov, 'Bogdan Khmel'nitskii dannik Ottomanskoi Porty,' in his *Sobranie sochinenii*, bk. 15, vol. 14 (St. Petersburg, 1905), pp. 611–12. The document is now preserved in Warsaw: AGAD, Archiwum Koronne Warszawskie, Dział Kozacki, no. 60.

80. Rypka, 'Další příspěvek,' pp. 224–31. For comparison, Rypka cited the text of the eighteenth-century Polish copy following his 'literal' Czech translation (as he termed it) of the Ottoman original.

81. See, e.g., G. A. Sanin, 'Otnosheniia Rossii i Ukrainy s Krymskim khanstvom,' p. 106; Iu. A. Mytsyk, 'Natsional'no-vyzvol'na viina ukrains'koho narodu seredyny XVII st. u pershodzherelakh,' *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 1998, no. 6: 104, 115–16, 117, n. 24.

82. Rypka, 'Další příspěvek,' p. 213.

83. See p. 444 of the present volume.

84. See p. 10 of the present volume; cf. pp. 8–9.

mately one week earlier, about 18 July [N.S.], but delivered to the hetman in September.<sup>85</sup> Hrushevsky was relying here on a report from the Transylvanian resident in Istanbul to György Rákóczi II. He went on to make another error associated with Shahin Agha's mission to Khmelnytsky in the autumn of 1655, confusing it with the same envoy's mission in the spring of that year. Owing to this unfortunate error, the date of the audience at which Shahin Agha was discharged from Chyhyryn and the date of the hetman's letter to the sultan were also inaccurately established.<sup>86</sup> Given these inaccuracies, which may initially appear minor and inconsequential, one of the most important episodes in Ukrainian-Ottoman relations in the years 1648–57 was left without appropriate comment.

This is a highly significant point, given the tremendous influence of the present volume of Hrushevsky's *History* on further scholarly research in Ukraine, Russia, and Poland. On the basis of Shahin Agha's two missions to Bohdan Khmelnytsky (April and October 1655) and the Ukrainian mission to Istanbul (June–July 1655), historians who followed Kostomarov, Rypka, and Hrushevsky developed extensive polemical discussions. The point at issue comes down to whether Khmelnytsky accepted the Ottoman protectorate in the course of his hetmancy (for example, in 1648, 1651, 1653 or 1655). On the one hand, historians opposing that thesis cited as one of their main arguments that the hetman could not have accepted the protectorate, given his occasional requests for new protection in subsequent years.<sup>87</sup> On the other hand, those arguing the case for the protectorate have insisted mainly on the need for more thorough study of the Ukrainian government's correspondence with the Porte, as well as on taking account of the Ottomans' relations with their vassals in that period.<sup>88</sup> According to the latter camp, there is no doubt that in 1655 Khmelnytsky requested submission to the sultan, sending Roman Zhdanovych and Iakiv Chelebi to Istanbul for that purpose, and the sultan granted his request. The only question that remains open is whether Khmelnytsky confirmed that request of his half a year later at Lviv in the presence of an Ottoman envoy. The Cossack mission dispatched to Istanbul with Shahin

85. See p. 444 of the present volume.

86. See p. 49, n. 130, of the present volume.

87. See the following articles published after 1931: Ivan Krypiakievych, 'Turets'ka polityka B. Khmel'nyts'koho (Materiialy),' *Ukrains'kyi arkhoehrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, n.s., vyp. 10–11 (2006): 111–60; Zygmunt Abrahamowicz, 'Comments on Three Letters by Khan Islam Gerey III to the Porte (1651),' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, nos. 1–2 (1990): 137–38; Iu. A. Mytsyk, 'Dyplomatychnye lystuvannia Osmans'koï imperii iak dzherelo do istorii Vyzvol'noï viiny ukrains'koho narodu seredyny XVII st.,' in *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia i gosudarstvennye struktury v Tsentral'noi, Vostochnoi i Iugo-Vostochnoi Evrope v IV–XVIII vv.* (Zaporizhia, 1993), p. 45; Boris Floria, 'Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi i turets'ka "proteksiiia,"' *Kyivs'ka starovyna*, 2001, no. 3: 103–4; Valerii Stepankov, 'Mizh Moskvou i Stambulom: chy isnuvala problema vyboru protektsii u 1648–1654 rr.?' *Ukraina v Tsentral'no-Skhidnii levropi (Z naidavnishykh chasiv do kintsia XVIII st.)* (Kyiv), vyp. 4 (2004): 223–36.

88. See the following works: Omelian Pritsak, 'Soiuz Khmel'nyts'koho z Turechchynoiu 1648 roku,' *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Munich) 156 (1948): 143–60; idem, 'Das erste türkisch-ukrainische Bündnis (1648),' *Oriens* (Leiden) 6 (1953): 266–98; idem, 'Shche raz pro soiuz Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho z Turechchynoiu,' *Ukrains'kyi arkhoehrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, n.s., vyp. 2 (1993): 177–192; Chantal Lemerrier-Quelquejay, 'Les relations entre la Porte ottomane et les Cosaques zaporogues au milieu du XVIIe siècle. Une lettre inédite de Bohdan Hmelnicki au Padichah ottoman,' *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique*, 1970, no. 11 (3): 454–61; *Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée du Palais de Topkapı* (Paris and The Hague, 1978), pp. 188–97; V. Dubrov's'kyi, 'Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi i Turechchyna,' *Ukrains'kyi istoryk*, 1975, nos. 3–4: 22–27; András Riedlmayer and Victor Ostapchuk, 'Bohdan Xmel'nyts'kyj and the Porte: A Document from the Ottoman Archives,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, nos. 3–4 (December 1984): 453–72; Yaroslav Fedoruk, 'Problema turets'koho protektoratu Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho u 1655 rotsi,' in *Terra Cossacorum: Studii z davn'oï i novoï istorii Ukraïny. Naukovyi zbirnyk na poshanu doktora istorychnykh nauk, profesora Valerii Stepankova*, ed. Valerii Smolii et al. (Kyiv, 2007), pp. 155–86.

Agha in the autumn of 1655 may have attested to such confirmation. The fact that until recently there was no source material available on Khmelnytsky's dispatch of such a mission strengthened the position of those who argued against the protection thesis. Given such great disparity in the assessment of the sources, one finds scholars appealing for a new and thorough examination of the problem.<sup>89</sup>

In very general terms, it may be asserted that Khmelnytsky's minimum goal in dispatching his envoys to Istanbul in 1655 was to neutralize the Crimea with regard to his Galician campaign, preparations for which were under way that spring. At a maximum, he wanted to break the Polish-Tatar alliance. In order to resolve those two cardinal problems, the Ukrainian hetman asked the sultan to accept his submission. This leaves a great deal of room for discussion about the forms of dependence that characterized the Ottoman Empire at the time and about Khmelnytsky's motives in taking on obligations toward one protector (even formally) without renouncing the other.<sup>90</sup> Not only present-day historians but even seventeenth-century politicians found it difficult to explain this aspect of the hetman's diplomacy. Thus, for example, the instructions to the Crown guardian Mariusz Stanisław Jaskólski, who was sent on a mission to the Porte in early 1657, directed him to ask the sultan: 'If the Cossacks have sworn to the Ottoman Porte, then why are they standing by Muscovy and thus showing outright hostility to the Ottoman Porte?'<sup>91</sup>

The potential for new discoveries in the sources is demonstrated by the archaeographic research of the Moscow scholar Vera Chentsova. Studying Greek reports and those of Russian ecclesiastical figures who came to Moscow from Istanbul and the Danube lands, she found a mention of a mission from the Ukrainian hetman that had departed for Istanbul with Shahin Agha or soon after his departure in the autumn of 1655. This mention occurred in the account of the archimandrite of the Arkhangel'sk Monastery, who gave an account of his journey from Moldavia through Ukraine at the Ambassadorial Office in Moscow on 22 January 1656 O.S. After the Battle of Ozerna, when Khmelnytsky was on his way back to Chyhyryn, the archimandrite had a meeting with him in Korsun, where the hetman told him about his truce with the Tatars. 'And he [the archimandrite] heard in the Cherkasian towns that the Turkish envoy [Shahin Agha] has been discharged by the hetman, and the hetman has sent his own envoys to the Turkish sultan, a colonel at first, but which colonel he has sent, and what his name is, that he does not know, and why the Turkish envoy came to the hetman, and why the hetman sent his envoys to the Turkish sultan, that he does not know.'<sup>92</sup> Although this note provides no information about the tasks of the Ukrainian mission to Istanbul, it shows that there was such a mission in November or December 1655.<sup>93</sup> This may be one more indirect

---

89. See Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Ukraïna v skladi Osmans'koï imperii,' *Ratusha* (Lviv), no. 20 (199), 29 February 1992: 2; Viktor Brekhunenko, 'Pereiaslavs'ka rada 1654 roku v rosiis'kii istoriografii,' in *Pereiaslavs'ka rada 1654 roku (Istoriografii ta doslidzhennia)*, ed. Pavlo Sokhan', Iaroslav Dashkevych, Ihor Hyrych et al. (Kyiv, 2003), p. 626.

90. For more detail on this aspect of Khmelnytsky's policy, see Omeljan Pritsak and John Reshetar, 'Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-Building,' *Slavic Review* 22, no. 2 (1963): 239; Taras Chukhlib, *Het'many i monarkhy: Ukraïns'ka derzhava v mizhnarodnykh vidnosynakh* (Kyiv and New York, 2003), pp. 76–77; on Ukrainian-Ottoman relations in the years 1648–53, see especially Stepankov, 'Mizh Moskvoiu i Stambulom,' pp. 223–36.

91. AGAD, Archiwum Koronne Warszawskie, Dział Tatarski, carton 62, file 15, no. 346, fol. 5; Dział Turecki, carton 75, file 416, no. 717, published in *Zherela do istorii Ukraïny-Rusy* 12, doc. 509, p. 425.

92. V. G. Chentsova, *Vostochnaia tserkov' i Rossiia posle Pereiaslavskoi rady 1654–1658. Dokumenty* (Moscow, 2004), doc. 12, p. 99.

93. For a letter of that period (with no precise date) from Khmelnytsky to Sultan Mehmed IV, see *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, comp. Ivan Kryp'iakevych and Ivan Butych (Kyiv, 1961), doc. 345, pp. 461–63.

piece of evidence in favor of the thesis that Khmelnytsky may have become a vassal of the Ottoman Porte in 1655.

### *The Vilnius Negotiations*

If one considers the influence of the Muscovite-Swedish war of 1656 on Ukraine, what comes immediately to mind is the collapse of Khmelnytsky's plans to form an anti-Polish coalition composed of Ukraine, Muscovy, and Sweden. Consequently, in chapters 11 and 12 of this volume Hrushevsky makes frequent reference to that subject, stressing that between the latter half of 1656 and the middle of 1657 Moscow's official line ran counter to the aims and objectives of Ukrainian policy, which had been striving in various ways ever since 1648, locked in battle with the Poles, to unite all the Ukrainian lands under the rule of the Zaporozhian Host within the boundaries of the old Rus' principalities. Not surprisingly, chapter 11, in which Hrushevsky discusses the Muscovite-Polish negotiations at Vilnius (22 August–3 November 1656 N.S.), to which Ukrainian envoys were not admitted, is harshly titled 'The 'Muscovite Betrayal' and the New League (Summer 1656–Spring 1657).' As one takes in the Ukrainian hetman's reaction to the news that Ukrainian representatives had been excluded from the negotiations, the point of this title, which seems excessively categorical at first glance, becomes clear. It is Hrushevsky's way of conveying the sentiment that prevailed in Chyhyryn while the Vilnius commission was in session and afterwards.

As noted earlier, Hrushevsky was the first historian analyzing the Vilnius negotiations who sought to utilize sources from all the major countries involved—Muscovy, Poland, and Austria. Naturally, Hrushevsky reacted very strongly to the fact that the Ukrainian delegation, led by Captain Roman Haponenko, had been barred from taking part in the formulation of the agreement. Having collected and summarized as fully as possible the factual material on the subject, Hrushevsky drew a clear distinction between the formal and actual position of the Muscovite delegation with regard to the Ukrainian question. In formal terms, the Muscovites held firmly to the points of Khmelnytsky's instructions to the Cossack delegates, who had brought them to the tsar at his camp near Riga. In fact, however, the Muscovite delegates followed their own secret instructions, according to which they were on no account to allow a breakdown of the negotiations, and points of contention between the Muscovites and the Poles would be presented for resolution at the Diet. 'This would have been the point on which the Cossack envoys, well acquainted with Polish practices, would probably have contested Muscovite tactics in the most serious manner,' writes Hrushevsky.<sup>94</sup>

The subject remained extraordinarily important in subsequent Russian, Polish, Austrian, and Ukrainian historiography, and the principal developments deserve attention.

Russian historians, especially those of recent decades, have often emerged as opponents of Ukrainian scholars concerning the participation of the Cossack mission in the Vilnius negotiations. Categorical statements that are to be encountered in Ukrainian historical writing on the subject have often been criticized. Mainly on the basis of research in the Russian archives, many of the facts in question have been significantly modified or revised. Particularly significant in this regard are the works of Lev Zaborovsky and Boris Floria, who have criticized the assertions of Ukrainian historians, including Hrushevsky, that the Muscovite government decided the Ukrainian problem without taking the interests of Ukraine

---

94. See p. 166 of the present volume.

into account. 'In fact, such a treatment was at odds with reality,' writes Zaborovsky.<sup>95</sup> And Floria comments: 'Actually, the Russian envoys set themselves no such goal.'<sup>96</sup> But the disputes between Muscovy and the Commonwealth concerning the Ukrainian-Polish boundary that are discussed in this volume of the *History* oblige one to examine such assertions critically.

Of the historians active between the 1960s and 1990s, the Moscow historian Lev Zaborovsky (1930–98) made the greatest contribution to research on the Vilnius negotiations, particularly to the study of the religious issue, which was raised in the course of the Muscovite-Polish discussions.<sup>97</sup> Zaborovsky often mentioned the need to publish Russian sources on the negotiations and began to do so, focusing mainly on the discussions of religious issues held at Vilnius. In collaboration with N. S. Zakharina, he published such important materials as the tsar's missives to Khmelnytsky and the Muscovite delegates at Vilnius, as well as fragments of Aleksei Mikhailovich's instructions and secret orders of July 1656 to the delegates.<sup>98</sup>

Lev Zaborovsky continued his work, gathering source materials for the publication of a documentary collection devoted to religious problems. He published lengthy extracts of instructions, reports from Muscovite envoys to the tsar, missives from Aleksei Mikhailovich, and the like.<sup>99</sup> In his notes for this collection, Zaborovsky dealt with many problems concerning the Vilnius agreements, putting new documents and scholarly literature into circulation and going far beyond the bounds of religious discussions alone.

He noted the inferior status of the Ukrainian mission, which was headed by a captain, as compared with the Austrian, Polish, and Muscovite representatives at Vilnius.<sup>100</sup> On that basis, he supported the view of another Moscow historian, Gennadii Sanin, concerning the hetman's plans to sabotage the Vilnius agreements.<sup>101</sup> Zaborovsky stressed that, although the Muscovite diplomats did not admit the Ukrainian envoys to the negotiations because of Roman Haponenko's inferior status, they 'took very careful account of the hetman's proposals and included them in the documents.'<sup>102</sup> But the historian contradicted himself in his conclusions. Sensing the injustice of the Muscovite attitude toward the Ukrainian mission at the negotiations, Zaborovsky made simultaneous efforts to justify Aleksei Mikhailovich's treatment of Ukraine in 1656 and to find an explanation of that treatment in Muscovy's overall strategic policies of the mid-seventeenth century, which gave priority to the northwestern theater of war. Once Muscovy and Sweden intervened in the Ukrainian-Polish war, maintained Zabo-

---

95. L. V. Zaborovskii, *Katoliki, pravoslavnye, uniaty. Problemy religii v russko-pol'sko-ukrainskikh otnosheniakh kontsa 40-kh–80-kh godakh XVII v. Dokumenty. Issledovaniia* (Moscow, 1998), p. 338, n. 177; cf. p. 332, n. 161.

96. Boris Floria, 'Ukrainskii vopros na peregovorakh pod Vil'no v 1656 g.,' in *Ukraina i sosednie gosudarstva v XVII veke: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii*, p. 169.

97. See the bibliography of his articles in L. V. Zaborovskii and N. S. Zakhar'ina, 'Religiozniy vopros v pol'sko-rossiiskikh peregovorakh u der[evni] Nemezha v 1656 g. (Predystoriia). Dokumenty,' *Slaviane i ikh sosedi* (Moscow), vyp. 3, *Katolitsizm i pravoslavie v srednie veka*, (1991), docs. 1–4, pp. 171–72, n. 2; idem, 'Nedootsenennyi dokument Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo?' *Slavianovedenie* (Moscow), vyp. 6 (1992): 57; 'Pamiati kollegi: Lev Valentinovich Zaborovskii,' *Slaviane i ikh sosedi*, vyp. 9 (1999): 238–42.

98. Zaborovskii and Zakhar'ina, 'Religiozniy vopros,' pp. 161–70.

99. Zaborovskii, *Katoliki, pravoslavnye, uniaty*, docs. 100–113, pp. 251–85.

100. Zaborovskii and Zakhar'ina, 'Religiozniy vopros,' pp. 174–75; Zaborovskii, *Katoliki, pravoslavnye, uniaty*, p. 333, n. 165.

101. G. A. Sanin, *Otnosheniia Rossii i Ukrainy s Krymskim khanstvom v seredine XVII veka* (Moscow, 1987), p. 179.

102. Zaborovskii, *Katoliki, pravoslavnye, uniaty*, pp. 16; 333, n. 165.

rovsky, they ‘pursued their own goals, of which settling the situation in Ukraine was not the first.’<sup>103</sup>

The Russian historian Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva has been greatly influenced by Hrushevsky’s research. Her monograph places particular stress on Khmelnytsky’s instructions to the Ukrainian mission to Vilnius and on the analysis of developments following upon the refusal to admit the Cossacks to the negotiations. She has also studied the reaction of Ukrainian politicians in Chyhyryn to the Vilnius discussions.<sup>104</sup>

A chapter of Elena Kobzareva’s important monograph on diplomatic history is devoted to the Vilnius negotiations.<sup>105</sup> It concentrates on problems of the influence of the Polish-Muscovite talks on the policy of Charles X Gustavus and his relations with Aleksei Mikhailovich. In recent years Kobzareva has also published basic sources on the history of Muscovite-Swedish relations and translated Swedish documents from the Stockholm State Archives.<sup>106</sup>

Dmitrii Ivanov has provided fairly substantial material on preparations for the discussions between Muscovy and the Commonwealth. The main object of his research was Piotr Galiński’s mission of April 1656 to Moscow, which resulted in an agreement between Aleksei Mikhailovich and John Casimir to hold talks in Vilnius.<sup>107</sup> In a subsequent article on preparations for the Vilnius negotiations, Ivanov dealt with a number of important problems concerning relations between Ukraine, Muscovy, and the Commonwealth between the winter and summer of 1656, especially instructions to Muscovite negotiators, the demarcation of the Muscovite-Commonwealth border in Lithuania and Ukraine, and Bohdan Khmelnytsky’s attitude toward making peace with John Casimir.<sup>108</sup>

The Moscow historian Boris Floria has also devoted a number of significant articles to this subject.<sup>109</sup> He continued the work that Zaborovsky began but was unable to complete the analysis of the Vilnius negotiations and the publication of Russian sources about them. In 2007 he published a large corpus of sources from the holdings of the Russian State Archive of Older Documents: instructions from the tsar and reports from the Muscovite delegation, missives, official reports, correspondence, and so on.<sup>110</sup> Thanks to the work of Hrushevsky’s Archaeographic Commission in Moscow in the 1920s, as noted earlier, much of this material was utilized in the writing of the present volume of the *History*, but Floria’s publication considerably extends the amount of source material pertinent to the subject.

103. Ibid., p. 12.

104. T. Iakovleva, *Het'manshchyna v druhii polovyni 50-kh rokiv XVII stolittia: Prychyny i pochatok Ruiny* (Kyiv, 1998), pp. 182–91.

105. Kobzareva, *Diplomatiicheskaia bor'ba*, pp. 13–127.

106. E. Kobzareva, ‘Rossiiskie arkhivnye materialy po rusko-shvedskim otnosheniiam sere diny XVII v.,’ in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniakh v Evrope sere diny XVII v.*, pp. 9–49.

107. D. I. Ivanov, ‘Rusko-pol'skie peregovory 1656 g. Missiia P. Galinskogo,’ *Russkoe srednevekov'e, 1998 god* (Moscow), vyp. 2, *Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia* (1999), pp. 67–81.

108. D. I. Ivanov, ‘Rech Pospolitaia v planakh moskovskikh politikov nakanune Vilenskikh peregovorov 1656 goda (Iz istorii mezhdunarodnogo krizisa v Vostochnoi Evrope sere diny XVII veka),’ *Slavianovedenie* (Moscow), 2002, no. 2: 52–68.

109. See B. N. Floria, ‘50-e gg. XVII v. v istorii mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii v Tsentral'noi chasti Evrazii i zadachi publikatsii materialov o deiatel'nosti russkoi i ukrainskoi diplomatii v eti gody,’ in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v Evrazii: 50-e gg. XVII veka*, pp. 9–23; idem, ‘Ot Potopa do Vil'na. Russkaia politika po otnosheniiu k Rechi Pospolitoi v 1655–1656 gg.,’ *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 110, no. 2 (2003): 25–49; idem, ‘Ukrainskii vopros na peregovorakh pod Vil'no v 1656 g.,’ pp. 160–74.

110. B. N. Floria, ‘Rusko-pol'skie otnosheniia v 50-e gody XVII v.,’ *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniakh v Evrope sere diny XVII v.*, pp. 137–230.

With regard to the crisis of Ukrainian-Russian relations at Vilnius, Floria emphasized that the refusal to admit the Ukrainian envoys to the negotiations gave Aleksei Mikhailovich a 'negative experience' in dealings with Ukraine. He acknowledged, however, that the tsar failed to take that experience into account in his foreign policy of the ensuing years.<sup>111</sup>

Among Polish historians, Zbigniew Wójcik has devoted most attention to this subject. His research has been based mainly on the correspondence of the commissioners in Vilnius with Polish-Lithuanian officials, which is now preserved in the Crown Archive in Warsaw. Wójcik often draws attention to problems of Muscovite-Polish discussions in Vilnius associated with claims to Ukrainian territory, stressing that this question was one of the most difficult and posed a serious obstacle to establishing a truce between the two countries.<sup>112</sup> However, of all the problems discussed by the Polish and Muscovite envoys, Wójcik attributes greatest importance to those bearing on the election of Aleksei Mikhailovich or his son to the Polish throne.<sup>113</sup> He pays particular attention to the attitude of Austrian mediators to this proposal from the Muscovite delegation, discussing and analyzing the rather complex relations that developed between the mediators, Allegretto Allegretti and Johann Teodor Lorbach, and the Polish-Lithuanian delegates. However, in an article focusing on Polish-Austrian relations of the period, Wójcik does not go into that question in any depth.<sup>114</sup>

Generally, according to Wójcik, the Vilnius agreement called a temporary halt to the Polish-Muscovite war that had been going on since 1654 and constituted a truce between the two countries. In his opinion, the most important points of the agreement were those pertaining to conditions for the election of the tsar to the Polish kingship and joint military operations in the war against Sweden. These are the two points most strongly emphasized in his assessment of the truce of 3 November 1656.<sup>115</sup>

A monograph by Konrad Bobiatyński also deserves mention here. Although it is not specifically devoted to the Vilnius negotiations, the author gives an extensive account of relations between Poland and Muscovy in 1654–55, which soon led to the truce between them.<sup>116</sup> In the 1990s Sławomir Augustiewicz studied the military campaign waged by the Lithuanian hetman Wincenty Aleksander Gąsiewski in Ducal Prussia in the autumn of 1656.<sup>117</sup> As is well known, this war against the elector Frederick William influenced the attitude of the Polish delegates at Vilnius: for example, Gąsiewski insisted that Muscovite troops be dispatched to Ducal Prussia immediately to reinforce his army.

Austrian historiography has naturally focused in large measure on those aspects of the Vilnius negotiations that involved the emperor as a mediator in arranging the truce. Yet Ferdinand III (unlike his son, Emperor Leopold I) has not yet become the subject of a comprehensive monograph; hence Austrian diplomatic activity of the 1650s has been examined only in particular aspects. The Vilnius negotiations have not been a popular subject

111. Floria, 'Ukraiński vopros na peregovorakh pod Vil'no v 1656 g.,' pp. 170–71.

112. Zbigniew Wójcik, 'Polska i Rosja wobec wspólnego niebezpieczeństwa szwedzkiego w okresie wojny Północnej 1655–1660,' in *Polska w okresie Drugiej wojny Północnej 1655–1660*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1957), pp. 357, 359 and passim.

113. Ibid., pp. 355–60; cf. idem, 'Russian Endeavors for the Polish Crown in the Seventeenth Century,' *Slavic Review* 41, no. 1 (spring 1982): 60–61.

114. Zbigniew Wójcik, 'Stosunki polityczne polsko-austriackie w drugiej połowie XVII wieku,' *Sobótka. Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Gdańsk and Łódź) 38, no. 1 (1983): 490–91.

115. Wójcik, 'Polska i Rosja,' pp. 367–68, 369.

116. Konrad Bobiatyński, *Od Smoleńska do Wilna. Wojna Rzeczypospolitej z Moskwą 1654–1655* (Zabrze, 2004).

117. Sławomir Augustiewicz, *Działania militarne w Prusach Książęcych w latach 1656–1657* (Olsztyn, 1999).



since the 1930s. The works of Alfred Pribram, written in the nineteenth century, and the sources that he published (the reports of Franz Lisola) have been and continue to be influential in scholarship on this question, and important monographs were written under the influence of Pribram's publications at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>118</sup> To this one should add the fundamental work of the German historian Eckardt Opitz, who devoted considerable attention to Austrian policy in Eastern Europe in the mid-seventeenth century.<sup>119</sup>

In recent years the Vienna historians Iskra Schwartz and Christoph Augustynowicz have worked on Austrian foreign policy of the 1650s. Schwartz emphasizes that Austro-Polish relations were a top priority in the eastern policy of Ferdinand III, and they largely determined the course of Austria's relations with Muscovy in the mid-seventeenth century. In her general assessment of the results of the Vilnius agreement, Schwartz makes the sound observation that the truce of 3 November 1656 halted the Muscovite army's penetration of the Commonwealth, allowing the Polish king gradually to reconquer the territory lost to Charles X Gustavus.<sup>120</sup>

In 2007 Schwartz and Augustynowicz published important documents from the Vienna archives concerning the participation of Allegetti and Lorbach in the negotiations.<sup>121</sup> These include envoys' instructions and reports, correspondence, and many other sources already noted by historians in the late nineteenth century. In a well-known article written in the 1880s, Pribram drew particular attention to the importance of Lorbach's official report, of which he made considerable use.<sup>122</sup> The recent publication of these materials provides new opportunities for the study of the question.

Christoph Augustynowicz's work deals particularly with the emperor's role as mediator in international relations of the 1650s, which naturally led him to focus on the Austro-Polish negotiations of 1656.<sup>123</sup>

It is also important to note a Croatian article on the journey of Austrian envoys to Moscow in 1655 to request that Aleksei Mikhailovich agree in principle that Ferdinand III arrange a peace treaty with the Commonwealth.<sup>124</sup> In English-language historiography, the subject has been studied by George Vernadsky, Carl Bickford O'Brien, Andrew B. Pernal, and Robert I. Frost.<sup>125</sup>

118. Johan Levin Carlbom, *Sveriges förhållande till Österrike under Ferdinand III's sista regeringsår (1655–1657)* (Gothenburg, 1898); Edmund Jerusalem, *Die Teilnahme Österreichs am ersten nordischen Krieg bis zu den Verträgen von Wehlau und Bromberg 1655–1657* (Vienna, 1908); Anton Neuber, *Der schwedisch-polnische Krieg und die österreichische Politik (1655–1657)*, Prager Studien aus dem Gebiete der Geschichtswissenschaft, no. 17 (Prague, 1915).

119. Eckardt Opitz, *Österreich und Brandenburg im Schwedisch-Polnischen Krieg 1655–1660. Vorbereitung und Durchführung der Feldzüge nach Dänemark und Pommern* (Boppard am Rhein, 1989), pp. 1–65.

120. Iskra Shvarts, 'Vena-Moskva: Diplomatičeskie otnosheniia v seredine XVII veka,' *Slaviane i ikh sosedi*, vyp. 9, *Slaviane i nemtsy* (1999), p. 186; idem, 'Avstro-russkie diplomatičeskie otnosheniia v pervye gody Severnoi voyny,' in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v Evrazii: 50-e gody XVII v.*, pp. 31–46.

121. Iskra Shvarts and Christoph Augustynowicz, 'Otnosheniia Gabsburgov s Rossiei i Ukrainoi v period mezhdunarodnogo krizisa serediny XVII v.,' in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniakh v Evrope serediny XVII v.*, pp. 231–310.

122. Alfred Pribram, 'Österreichische Vermittelungs-politik im polnisch-russischen Kriege 1654–1660,' *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* (Vienna) 75 (1889): 445.

123. Krisstof Augustinovich (Christoph Augustynowicz), 'Russko-pol'skaia voina 1654–1657 gg. i posrednichestvo Gabsburgskoi imperii,' in *Russkaia i ukrainskaia diplomatiia v Evrazii: 50-e gody XVII v.*, pp. 47–52.

124. Mirko Deanović, 'Frano Dživa Gundilića i njegov put u Moskvu 1655 g.,' *Starine* (Zagreb), 1948, no. 41: 7–60.

125. George Vernadsky, *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine* (New Haven, Conn., 1941), pp. 108–9; Carl Bickford O'Brien, *Muscovy and the Ukraine: From the Pereiaslavl Agreement to the Truce of Andrusovo, 1654–1667* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), 38–44; Andrew B. Pernal, 'The Polish Commonwealth and Ukraine: Diplomatic Relations 1648–1659'

Owing to Soviet ideological and political restrictions in Ukraine pertaining to the study of Ukrainian history after the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654, the Vilnius negotiations could not be freely studied there until after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. If Ukrainian historians such as O. Savych and Ivan Krypiakievych addressed the subject during the Soviet period, they were obliged to present it to the reader through a rose-tinted view of Ukrainian-Russian relations. Even so, individual historians suggested ideas whose further development might be at variance with the official ideological clichés of Soviet historiography. Thus, Savych took the view earlier expressed by Hrushevsky and other Ukrainian historians, writing that the Muscovite government's decision to make peace with John Casimir had been an error.<sup>126</sup> Krypiakievych, who had been one of Hrushevsky's best students in Lviv, provided accurate information about the Vilnius negotiations and Khmelnytsky's misunderstandings with the Muscovites. However, in order to get around Soviet censorship, he gave only superficial reasons for those misunderstandings: for instance, Ivan Vyhovsky's father had given the Muscovite envoy Fedor Buturlin false information about the hetman's annoyance over the tsar's actions. Or again, the Ukrainian mission supposedly failed to accomplish its task, since it did not obtain accurate information about the negotiations and therefore 'fell victim to a provocation on the part of Polish nobiliary agents' and the like.<sup>127</sup> The Western reader, having no experience of Soviet reality and restrictions on freedom of speech, may find it strange to think of reading or speaking 'between the lines,' but for many conscientious historians who worked between the 1930s and 1980s, encountering Soviet censorship of Ukrainian historical studies on the period after 1654, it was standard practice.

Rethinking Ukrainian history on the basis of classic works of historiography became possible only after the late 1980s, when the writings of Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Viacheslav Lypynsky, Dmytro Doroshenko, and many others were reprinted. New studies of the Vilnius negotiations have been published by the historians Valerii Smolii, Valerii Stepankov, Volodymyr Tsybulsky, Taras Chukhlib, and Viktor Horobets, among others.<sup>128</sup> Andrii Hurbyk has published several historiographic surveys of the subject.<sup>129</sup> But there is as yet no special study in any language of this important event in the histories of Ukraine, Russia, and Poland.

In my view, the presence of the Cossacks at the negotiations was inconvenient to the Poles, Muscovites, and Austrians alike, since the Ukrainian question was an obstacle to making peace between them and taking joint action against Sweden. The Polish and Muscovite delegates had instructions to make peace at any price. The Muscovite position was very

---

(Ph.D. diss., University of Ottawa, 1977), pp. 180–279; Robert I. Frost, *After the Deluge: Poland-Lithuania and the Second Northern War 1655–1660* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 81–85.

126. O. A. Savych, 'Andrusivs'ke peremyr'ia 1667 roku,' *Naukovi zapysky. Instytut istorii i arkeolohii Ukraïny AN URSR* (Kyiv), 1946, no. 2: 140–45.

127. Ivan Krypiakievych, *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi* (Kyiv, 1954), pp. 508–12; 2d ed. (Lviv, 1990), pp. 322–25.

128. Valerii Smolii and Valerii Stepankov, *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'ky: Sotsial'no-politychnyi portret* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 450–55; Volodymyr Tsybul's'kyi, 'Vilens'ka uhoda 1656 roku u zarubizhnii istoriografii,' in *Ukraïns'ka kozats'ka derzhava: Vytoky ta shliakhy istorychnoho rozvytku (Materialy Respublikans'kykh istorychnykh chytan')*, vyp. 2 (Kyiv and Cherkasy, 1993), pp. 193–97; Taras Chukhlib, 'Problema podilu Ukraïns'koï derzhavy u svitli pol's'ko-rosiis'kykh stosunkiv (1656–1667 rr.),' in *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi ta ioho doba: Materialy konferentsii (24–25 zhovtnia 1995 r.)* (Kyiv, 1996), p. 91; Viktor Horobets, 'Ukraïns'ka zovnishnia polityka naperedodni ta v chasy viiny z rosiis'koiu derzhavoiu (1657–1659 rr.),' in *Istynu vstanovliue sud istorii': Zbirnyk na poshanu Fedora Pavlovycha Shevchenka*, ed. Hennadii Boriak et al., vol. 2, *Naukovi studii* (Kyiv, 2004), pp. 235–42.

129. Andrii Hurbyk, 'Ukraïns'kyi het'manat v umovakh Videns'ko-radnots'koï systemy mizhnarodnykh vidnosyn 50-kh rokiv XVII st.: Istoriografichniy aspekt problemy,' *Ukraïna v Tsentral'no-Skhidnii Levropi (Z naidavnishykh chasiv do kintsia XVIII st.)* (Kyiv), 2008, vyp. 8: 195–219.

heavily influenced by Aleksei Mikhailovich's military operations during the siege of Riga, which took place in September and October 1656. The Muscovite reverses that forced the tsar to lift the siege made it vitally important to reach a peace agreement with the Commonwealth. Although present-day Russian historians do not support this view, the connection between Muscovy's military position and its attitude at the negotiations can hardly be denied and is often stressed by Ukrainian and Polish historians.<sup>130</sup>

As Lev Zaborovsky noted, throughout the Khmelnytsky era and especially during the Muscovite-Polish war of 1654–56, Muscovy, like any other country, was guided by its pragmatic interests in the formulation of its foreign policy. Hence the basic reason why Haponenko was not admitted to the negotiations was not so much his status as envoy as the contradictions that arose between Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Aleksei Mikhailovich. Symptoms of them were already apparent in 1654, when the Muscovite government forced the hetman to dispatch Cossack regiments in the direction of Lutsk and then to reinforce its northward offensive against Belarus and Lithuania instead of authorizing a westward march on Lviv. The status of the Ukrainian envoys or any other reason could only have served as a formal pretext to bar the Cossack mission from taking part in formulating the agreement.<sup>131</sup>

On the other hand, the tsarist government did indeed acknowledge considerable embarrassment in its dealings with Ukraine after the incident involving Roman Haponenko in Vilnius, and Aleksei Mikhailovich subsequently took this into consideration. Thus, in the early summer of 1658 the tsar ordered his envoy to Chyhyryn, Ivan Apukhtin, to propose that Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky send Cossack envoys 'from among the colonels' to a new meeting of Muscovite and Commonwealth delegates.<sup>132</sup> By that time, however, Ukraine, which had just undergone a period of tumult and civil war between Ivan Vyhovsky and Colonel Martyn Pushkar of Poltava, was much weaker than it had been in Khmelnytsky's day, while Muscovite influence on the Hetmanate was much stronger.

Such is the general view of the Vilnius negotiations in post-Hrushevsky historiography. After the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654, this was the most important diplomatic development in Eastern Europe during the crisis of the mid-seventeenth century; hence it deserves the extended treatment it has received here. The Vilnius negotiations laid the foundations for the Truce of Andrusovo (1667), which divided Ukraine along the Dnipro River, and the Eternal Peace (1686), which confirmed that division in an official agreement between Muscovy and the Commonwealth.

### *Ukraine's Ties with Transylvania and György Rákóczi's Advance on Poland*

Another country that fundamentally influenced the formulation of Ukrainian foreign policy in 1655–57 was the Principality of Transylvania. In late 1654 and the first half of 1655, Transylvanian policy was wholly subordinate to the new course developed by György Rákóczi II in order to gain the Polish crown. Ever since the beginning of the twentieth century, historians have occasionally raised the problem of when exactly the Transylvanian prince set out on the path that would lead him two years later to invade Poland and join the

---

130. Savych, 'Andrusivs'ke peremyr'ia 1667 roku,' p. 143; Wójcik, 'Polska i Rosja wobec wspólnego niebezpieczeństwa szwedzkiego,' pp. 353, 365; Ia. Fedoruk, 'Perehovory Rechi Pospolytoi z Moskvou i ukladannia Vilens'koho myru (1654–1656),' in *Pereiaslavs'ka rada 1654 roku (istoriohrafia ta doslidzhennia)*, pp. 843, 853.

131. Fedoruk, 'Perehovory Rechi Pospolytoi z Moskvou,' pp. 842–44.

132. *Akty IuZR*, vol. 7 (St. Petersburg, 1872), p. 226.

struggle for its throne. It is this period of Transylvanian politics that is now conventionally regarded as the point of departure for the new course in the principality's foreign policy.<sup>133</sup> Rákóczi's decision is also associated with the beginning of Sweden's preparations for the invasion of the Commonwealth.

Until early 1656, Rákóczi's policy was mainly one of temporizing and maneuvering among the Cossacks, Poles, Swedes, the Porte, and the Crimean Tatars. In practice this took the form, on the one hand, of establishing good relations with Bohdan Khmelnytsky, with whom Rákóczi had frequent diplomatic exchanges in 1655–56, and, on the other, attempts to sound out the Protestant countries of Northern Europe: in December 1654 Rákóczi dispatched a mission headed by his secretary, Constantin Schaum, to Sweden, Holland, and England.

Although Hrushevsky delicately passed over in silence the highly controversial question of correspondence between Oliver Cromwell and Bohdan Khmelnytsky, often raised in historiography of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries,<sup>134</sup> he did not refrain from exaggerating the importance of the Lord Protector and English policy with regard to the organization of the Ukrainian-Transylvanian league in the summer and autumn of 1655. Influenced by emotion, Hrushevsky wrote that the league was formed, inter alia, 'under the protectorate of the great Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell.'<sup>135</sup> In fact, however, it is difficult to speak here of any particular English influence on the formation of the new 'Cossack-Balkan league,' as Hrushevsky called it, aside from the above-mentioned mission of Constantin Schaum. But we find no analysis of that mission in Hrushevsky's text: planned under the influence of Jan Amos Komenský, it was of more formal than practical significance. Contemporary politicians were well aware that Schaum's principal task was to sound out the possibility of forming an anti-Habsburg league, in which Sweden, Holland, and Denmark were to be involved along with England and Transylvania.<sup>136</sup>

The Swedish king's attack on the Commonwealth and his first astounding successes strengthened the Transylvanian prince's resolution to make war on John Casimir. Inspired by the imminent prospect of war between Sweden and Austria, Komenský, according to reports from Gdańsk in December 1655, sent couriers to Rákóczi on a monthly basis, urging him to join the Swedes and invade Poland or Austria.<sup>137</sup>

Hrushevsky made a very thorough analysis of relations between Ukraine and Transylvania, paying special attention to diplomatic missions exchanged between them. Rákóczi was particularly disturbed by the closeness of Ukrainian forces to the Danube border: in August

133. N. Jorga, *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*, vol. 4 (Gotha, 1911), p. 82; L. V. Zaborovskii, 'Kanun i nachalo russko-pol'skoi voiny i pozitsii gosudarstv Iugo-Vostochnoi Evropy,' in *Karpato-Dunaiskie zemli v srednie veka* (Chişinău, 1975), p. 256; idem, 'Rossiia, Rech' Pospolitaia i Shvetsiia v seredine XVII veka,' p. 76; idem, *Velikoe kniazhestvo Litovskoe i Rossiia vo vremena pol'skogo Potopa (1655–1656). Dokumenty, issledovanie* (Moscow, 1994), p. 165.

134. See Aleksandr Lazarevskii, 'Khmel'nitskii v predstavlenii Kromvelia,' *Kievskaiia starina*, 1882, no. 1: 212. On the historiography of the problem and the place of Hrushevsky's views in it, see Iaroslav Fedoruk, 'Stolimi tradytsii istorichnoho mifu pro Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho ta Olivera Kromvelia,' in *Silva rerum: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats' na poshanu profesora A. Pernalia*, comp. Mariia Vavrychyn, ed. Iaroslav Dashkevych et al. (Lviv, 2007), pp. 443–76. See also Mark Vishnitzer, 'Oliver Cromwell and Bohdan Chmielnitzky,' *Notes and Queries* 12, ser. 6, no. 103 (3 April 1920): 88.

135. See p. 20 of the present volume.

136. Schaum had an audience with Cromwell on 4 May 1655 o.s. and was discharged in the following month. See Wilbur Cortez Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell with an Introduction, Notes and an Account of His Life*, vol. 3, (1653–1655) (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), pp. 709, 710; *Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655–1656*, docs. 14, 21, pp. 67, 80. Cf. also Zaborovskii, *Rossiia, Rech' Pospolitaia i Shvetsiia v seredine XVII veka*, p. 76.

137. Jędrzej Giertych, *U źródeł katastrofy dziejowej Polski: Jan Amos Komensky* (London, 1964), p. 252.

and early September 1655 they were encamped at Kamianets-Podilskyi. Khmelnytsky's above-mentioned submission to the Porte also gave grounds for concern. Sultan Mehmed IV sought to influence Rákóczi on the latter question: for example, in discharging the Cossack mission that had come to Istanbul, he sent his letter, which mentioned that the Ukrainian hetman had become a vassal of the Porte, to Transylvania as well.<sup>138</sup>

In early 1656, however, when preparations for Muscovite-Polish negotiations reached a decisive stage, the inevitability of a realignment of military alliances in East Central Europe became apparent. Negotiations between Sweden and Transylvania took center stage.<sup>139</sup> In the early months of 1656, when Charles X was raiding the palatinates of Great and Little Poland, his appeals for an alliance were particularly compelling. Intensive correspondence and exchanges of envoys between the two countries gave rise to considerable rumor in Europe that an agreement already existed between them. On 13 January 1656 O.S., for example, there was a report from Hamburg that Rákóczi had established a 'strict union' with Charles X, according to which he was supposed to dispatch forty or fifty thousand of his infantry and cavalry to assist the Swedish forces in Poland. Rákóczi was also said to be in command of 'the Cossacks innumerable legions' that supposedly had already sworn a 'solemn oath or *juramentum clientelare*' to him.<sup>140</sup> In another source we encounter a report that in March 1656 Rákóczi's army, thirty thousand strong, was supposedly at the ready near Sambir, on the border of the Rus' palatinate.<sup>141</sup> And there were countless reports to the effect that the Transylvanians were to come out against the Poles with a large army to help the Swedish king: these were discussed in Polish, Ukrainian, Muscovite, English, Swedish, Ottoman, Crimean Tatar, and other circles. In fact, the agreement was not concluded until 6 December 1656 N.S. at Rákóczi's residence in Radnot, on the eve of his advance against John Casimir.<sup>142</sup>

Ukraine played an important role in this rapprochement between Charles X Gustavus and György Rákóczi II. Hrushevsky devoted almost all of his attention to the major development in Ukrainian-Transylvanian relations: the negotiation of the agreement of 7 September 1656 N.S. between Khmelnytsky and the Principality of Transylvania.<sup>143</sup> He also made a detailed analysis of the Swedish missions to Transylvania and Ukraine led by Heinrich-Celestin Sternbach and Gottard Veling, as well as Gustaf Lilliecrona's embassy to Chyhyryn in the spring and summer of 1657. Hrushevsky does not neglect the broad background of European diplomacy in this regard. For example, he makes constant reference to Sweden's relations with Brandenburg, stressing the importance of the agreements between Charles X and Frederick William at Malbork on 25 June N.S. and in Labiau on 20 November 1656 N.S. for developments in East Central Europe as a whole.<sup>144</sup>

138. Rypka, 'Další příspěvek,' pp. 210–12.

139. See Wibling, 'Carl X. Gustaf och Georg Rákóczi II,' pp. 15–19.

140. *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe*, 4: 414, 685.

141. AGAD, Archiwum Radziwiłłów, Dział II, Księga 21, fols. 65–66.

142. See p. 236 of the present volume. In recent years, this subject has been addressed by the Hungarian historian Sándor Gebei. See his *II. Rákóczi György erdélyi fejedelem küipolitikája (1648–1657)* (Eder, 1996); idem, *II. Rákóczi György szerepe a Rzeczpospolita felosztási kísérletében (1656–1657)*, vol. 4 (Századok, 2000), pp. 801–48; idem, 'Diplomaticeskíe peregovory Shvetsii i Transil'vanskogo kniazhestva po razdeleniiu Rechi Pospolitoi v 1656 godu,' in *Gosudarstvennost', diplomatiia, kul'tura v Tsentral'noi i Vostochnoi Evrope XI–XVIII vekov* (Moscow, 2005), pp. 88–99; idem, 'Odná diplomaticheskaia illiuziia: Sud'ba soiuzu Transil'vanskogo kniazhestva i Zaporozhskogo Voiska (1657–1658 gg.),' in *350-letie Unii Hadziackiej (1658–2008)*, ed. Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel et al. (Warsaw, 2008), pp. 507–30.

143. See pp. 227–32 of the present volume.

144. See pp. 203, n. 140; 363 of the present volume.

In making his military alliance with the Ukrainian hetman, the Transylvanian prince did not, of course, consider the Zaporozhian Host an equal partner. The events of 1657, to which Hrushevsky devoted a whole chapter, show this very clearly. Nor could it be otherwise, given that the main goal of Rákóczi's incursion into Poland was to gain its crown and royal title. Under these circumstances, it was quite natural that the partition of the Commonwealth between Transylvania, Sweden, and Ukraine, which mainly involved the territories of Galicia and Podilia, was the most sensitive problem in their mutual relations. The refusal of Charles X, expressed by Gottard Veling in the course of his mission, to concede the western Ukrainian territories to Khmelnytsky was the cause, as Hrushevsky correctly noted, of the breakdown of Ukrainian-Swedish negotiations.<sup>145</sup> This made it necessary for the Swedish king to send a new mission to Chyhyryn, headed by Gustaf Lilliecrona, in 1657.

An excellent source on Veling's mission to Khmelnytsky is the diary of one of its members, the Swedish diplomat Conrad Jacob Hildebrandt. Hrushevsky was unable to make use of it, as the text was published by Franz Babinger from the manuscript in the Prussian State Archive in Stettin (Szczecin) six years after the appearance of the present volume of the *History*. Hildebrandt gives a detailed account of his journey to Ukraine, which began in Transylvania, of Veling's audience with Khmelnytsky, and of his return to the camp of the Swedish king on 3 April 1657 N.S.<sup>146</sup> For Hrushevsky, who based his research mainly on Veling's own reports to Charles X, this diary would have been a rich source for the analysis of diplomatic developments in the crucial year of 1657. For example, Hrushevsky questions the data given by Ludwik Kubala, who believed that Veling had reached Chyhyryn on 26 January N.S., and corrects that date to the period between 22 and 24 January.<sup>147</sup> But Hildebrandt notes in his diary that they reached the hetman's capital on 17 January O.S., which makes Kubala closer to the truth.<sup>148</sup> Hrushevsky, whose research was characterized by painstaking attention to chronology, considered such details of the first importance. He was quite right to do so, given that confusion in details (as we have seen in the case of Khmelnytsky's submission to the Porte) sometimes impeded the formulation of more general conclusions.

The opening of new prospects for Ukrainian policy in connection with the negotiations with Transylvania was bound to give rise to extensive discussions in the hetman's government. There is a fairly widespread view in Ukrainian historiography that Khmelnytsky was seeking allies against Poland but attempting to avoid spoiling relations with Aleksei Mikhailovich. Historians explain this by stressing the tentative nature of negotiations between Ukraine and Transylvania, in which the question of boundaries after the partition of Poland was put off until a more propitious time; Rákóczi's superior attitude in the course of the talks; and other negative factors that did not allow the hetman to make a definitive break with Muscovy.<sup>149</sup> But one is probably justified in assuming that Ukrainian politicians held out some faint hope that this new war between Ukraine and Poland would lead the tsar to abandon his intention to make peace with the Commonwealth and turn his armies against John Casimir. For example, Khmelnytsky explained his dispatch of a corps headed by Antin Zhdanovych

---

145. See pp. 251–54 of the present volume.

146. Conrad Jacob Hildebrandts *dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise nach Siebenbürgen, der Ukraine und Constantinopel (1656–1658)*, ed. Franz Babinger (Leiden, 1937), pp. 60–106.

147. See p. 252, n. 313 of the present volume.

148. Conrad Jacob Hildebrandts *dreifache schwedische Gesandtschaftsreise*, p. 90.

149. See, e.g., Andrii Hurbyk, 'Ukraïns'ko-rosiïis'ki viis'kovo-politychni vidnosyny v period Radnots'koï systemy (1656–1657 rr.),' in *‘Istynu vstanovliuie sud istorii,’* 2: 207, 209.

to Poland by telling the Muscovite government that the Crown Army had initiated skirmishes along the Ukrainian-Polish border. His decision to dispatch the corps was an implicit challenge to Aleksei Mikhailovich to take part in the action against Poland.

Hrushevsky devoted the last section of his exposition to the Ukrainian-Transylvanian campaign against Poland in the first half of 1657. The hope of changing the situation that had been so strong among Ukrainian politicians in the autumn of 1656 was now shattered by the misunderstandings that arose between the Transylvanian prince and the Ukrainian leadership. The Commonwealth, faced with the ruinous prospect of a new war, exerted itself to the utmost in foreign policy. As a result of the Vilnius agreement of November 1656 with Muscovy, as well as John Casimir's two agreements with Austria (December 1656 and May 1657), the forces of the Swedish king were attacked in Livonia and near Cracow. The accession of Denmark to that coalition and its entry into the war in June 1657 forced Charles X to abandon Rákóczi and withdraw his armies from Poland. The retreat of Zhdanovych's corps from Poland, the mobilization of the Cossacks against the threat of Tatar invasion, and the Host's revolt against Iurii Khmelnychenko were the final blows that broke the old hetman. Hrushevsky concludes the expository chapters of this volume with numerous reports about the death of Bohdan Khmelnytsky on 27 July 1657 O.S. in historical sources and reactions to it in popular folklore.

\*\*\*

This volume concludes with chapter 13, which is titled 'Some General Observations.' Immediately after the appearance of the volume in 1931, it aroused a great deal of discussion because of Hrushevsky's unusual assessment of Bohdan Khmelnytsky as a historical figure and of the Khmelnytsky era as a whole. The emotional tone and theoretical generalizations of this chapter sharply differentiate it from the preceding ones. Historians studying Hrushevsky's work often attribute this sudden stylistic shift to his political convictions, which were severely tested by the Revolution of 1917–20. 'The figure of the great hetman clearly eluded Mykhailo Hrushevsky, and it needs to be stated frankly that the conclusions drawn by the greatest Ukrainian historian bore the negative imprint of his personal experience as a politician: the hetmanite coup of 1918 found its reflection in Hrushevsky's treatment of Khmelnytsky,' wrote Iaroslav Dashkevych in one of his articles.<sup>150</sup>

What strikes one immediately about this chapter is its unusual sharpness of tone: one might even say that it shows signs of having been written hastily, in the heat of the moment. It lacks Hrushevsky's characteristic scholarly balance. What comes to the fore here is the acute emotion that one associates with Hrushevsky the publicist, who polemicized implacably against the expansionist policies of the Russian Empire, Austria-Hungary, and Poland in the Ukrainian lands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Although Hrushevsky was educated in the solid documentary tradition of Volodymyr Antonovych's Kyiv school, the growing influence of sociology and other new currents in historical studies led him to a growing awareness of the need for more sweeping generalizations. More broadly, what one feels in reading this chapter is the author's inner struggle; his desire to offset the purely narrative style of the preceding chapters with a measure of theorizing. So striking is the contrast between the emotional tone of chapter 13 and the narrative chapters preceding it that later historians

---

150. Iaroslav Dashkevych, 'Klan Khmel'nyts'koho—lehenda chy diisnist'?' *Ukraina v mynulomu* (Kyiv and Lviv), vyp. 2 (1992): 79–80.

generally came to regard it as representing Hrushevsky's definitive assessment of the Khmelnytsky era, almost ignoring the basic exposition of the period set forth in his *History*.<sup>151</sup>

Despite the controversial nature of this chapter, several of Hrushevsky's principal observations that influenced subsequent historiography of the Khmelnytsky era deserve particular attention. One of them is that Khmelnytsky's milieu included a number of eminent political figures. In this regard, Hrushevsky drew attention to the manifest need for biographical research on Khmelnytsky's advisors. As of 1931, only two of them had been studied in any depth: Ivan Vyhovsky (by Vasyl Herasymchuk) and Stanislav Mykhailo Krychevsky (by Viacheslav Lypynsky).<sup>152</sup> Hrushevsky therefore found himself obliged to insist on this point with some vehemence, noting the successful progress of such research in Polish historical writing, to take the most relevant example.

In his review of the volume, Vasyl Herasymchuk, defending the author against numerous scholarly attacks in view of his controversial conclusions, wrote of this chapter as 'the most sensational': according to the review, Hrushevsky had been bold enough to take on an 'ideal hallowed by centuries'.<sup>153</sup> Herasymchuk was one of the few scholars, if not the only one, to award high praise to chapter 13 of the volume. The reason for this, in my opinion, is that Hrushevsky's view of Khmelnytsky and his milieu reflected Herasymchuk's own assessment as set forth in a series of articles published in the second and third decades of the twentieth century. Comparing Khmelnytsky with Vyhovsky in those articles, Herasymchuk often stressed the latter's capabilities as a military leader and politician. This was accompanied by sharp criticism of Khmelnytsky, undermining the myth of the Great Hetman.<sup>154</sup> The ideas expressed by Hrushevsky's former student did not escape his teacher's attention. He took them as the basis of his own assessment and developed them further: 'Herasymchuk, who is studying the Vyhovsky era, has shown a willingness to contrast Bohdan, with his "gigantic egoism" and unscrupulous activity, with Vyhovsky, an individual with a more refined sense of politics, more consistent and principled—a superior politician, patriot, and statesman, as well as a theoretician, as opposed to the "fantastic hero of the deed." That is possible—indeed, probable.'<sup>155</sup> But instead of developing sound scholarly arguments on the basis of this rational observation, Hrushevsky launched into a bitter polemic against Lypynsky, the greatest exponent of the Khmelnytsky cult in the historical writing of that day, who also cultivated the notion that the hetman had begun to develop monarchist ambitions in the mid-seventeenth century. The boundary between scholarship and publicism almost disappears in this critical outburst, which is also colored by the political bias noted above.

Another important idea put forward by Hrushevsky is that the era of the Ruin did not begin with the death of Khmelnytsky, as prevailing opinion (influenced by Mykola Kostomarov) had it, but during his lifetime. In Hrushevsky's view, 'the trajectory of the revolution was

---

151. Dashkevych, 'Klan Khmel'nyts'koho'; Frank E. Sysyn, 'Grappling with the Hero: Hrushevs'kyi Confronts Khmel'nyts'kyi,' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 22 (1998): 598–603. Fifteen years ago, I wrote about the historiography of the Khmelnytsky era in a similar vein: see Iaroslav Fedoruk, 'Natsional'na ideia Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho v ukrains'kii istoriografii XIX — 30-kh rr. XX stolittia,' *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* (Lviv) 228 (1995): 169–70.

152. See p. 419, n. 11 of the present volume.

153. Vasyl' Herasymchuk, 'Z nahody poiavy IX tomu "Istorii Ukraïny-Rusy" M. Hrushevs'koho,' *Ukrains'kyi arkhieohrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, n.s., vyp. 3–4 (1999): 537–38.

154. See Iurii Zozuliak, 'Vasyl' Harasymchuk — doslidnyk ukrains'koï kozachchyny,' in Vasyl' Harasymchuk, *Materialy do istorii kozachchyny* (Lviv, 1994), pp. 116–17.

155. See p. 431 of the present volume.



broken' at Zboriv in 1649, and Khmelnytsky's last political combination ended in failure after the Danish attack on Sweden in June 1657 and the retreat of Charles X Gustavus from Poland. The devastation of the Ukrainian lands by unceasing conflict and Tatar aggression, the revolts at the Zaporozhian Sich and in the Host—all this and much else served to undermine the country's human and natural resources, causing its acute decline after 1657.<sup>156</sup> The accuracy of this view became apparent only from a further historical distance. Thus, in the 1990s, the Russian scholar Tatiana Tairova-Yakovleva made it the basis of her monograph on the Ruin, beginning her account with the Khmelnytsky era.<sup>157</sup> This assessment is now generally accepted in historical writing.

Another of Hrushevsky's assertions, emphasized several times in this chapter, concerns Khmelnytsky's efforts to bring the western Ukrainian lands under the administration of the Zaporozhian Host. In his opinion, Khmelnytsky had lost the opportunity to do so by 1648, and the desperate efforts to carry out the task in 1655–57 proved fruitless.<sup>158</sup> In the 1990s, Valerii Stepankov and Valerii Smolii argued along similar lines in several of their works, asserting that Khmelnytsky erred in 1648 by failing to establish his rule in Galicia.<sup>159</sup>

At this point, Hrushevsky's account of the era shifts quite naturally into an assessment of Khmelnytsky's political program. Since Hrushevsky specifies the hetman's sojourn in Kyiv at the beginning of 1649 as crucial for the formation of his new outlook, it would hardly be appropriate to expect the same level of political consciousness of him in 1648. Such a political program was too radical for the first stage of the uprising, and it emerged only after a full year's campaigning. From that time on, however, as Hrushevsky clearly stresses, Khmelnytsky never abandoned his intention of bringing western Ukraine under his rule, legitimizing his claim to it by right of a historical tradition going back to ancient Rus'. True, one cannot accept Hrushevsky's assertion that after the Battle of Zboriv (1649) the hetman did not return to that intention until 1655, supposedly under the stimulus of the Swedish king's incursion into the Commonwealth. It is well known, for example, that in July 1654, following the alliance with Muscovy, Khmelnytsky was making preparations for a large-scale Galician campaign quite independently of Swedish policy.<sup>160</sup> He could not carry it out at the time because Muscovy established different priorities in connection with its war against the Commonwealth—occupation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and other northern lands. The same may be said of the period between 1649 and 1653: Khmelnytsky regarded the Battle of Berestechko (1651), the Zhvanets campaign (1653), and other military operations as part of his plan to bring the lands 'up to Lviv, Kholm, and Halych' under his rule, as he himself expressed it in 1649.

Myron Korduba disagreed with Hrushevsky's assessment of Khmelnytsky's foreign policy as set forth in chapter 13 of this volume.<sup>161</sup> He particularly rejected the emotional and at times

156. See pp. 429–30 of the present volume.

157. Tetiana Iakovleva, *Het'manshchyna v druhii polovyni 50-kh rokiv XVII stolittia: Prychyny i pochatok Ruiny* (Kyiv, 1998).

158. See pp. 425, 431–32 of the present volume.

159. Valerii Stepankov, *Antyfeodal'na borot'ba v roky vyzvol'noï viiny ta її vplyv na formuvannia Ukraïns'koï derzhavy (1648–1654)* (Lviv, 1991), pp. 48–49; Valerii Smolii and Valerii Stepankov, *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi: Sotsial'no-politychnyi portret* (Kyiv, 1993), pp. 147–49.

160. *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, docs. 264, 271, 273. For Khmelnytsky's proclamations calling for an assault on Zboriv, see Johann Georgius Schlederus, *Theatrum Europaeum*, vol. 7 (Frankfurt am Main, 1685), p. 618.

161. Korduba, 'Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung,' pp. 378–80.

even despairing assertions about the hopelessness of the Ukrainian hetman's relations with the Crimean khan or the Muscovite tsar after 1654. Hrushevsky considered Khmelnytsky too hesitant in his planning and regarded his policy as vague and flexible to a fault. This is particularly apparent in his observation that Khmelnytsky should have devastated the Crimea after having been betrayed several times by the khan. Similarly, Hrushevsky thought that the hetman should have taken a firm position vis-à-vis Muscovy after the Vilnius negotiations.<sup>162</sup> Korduba, for his part, maintained that Hrushevsky underrepresented Khmelnytsky's role in international politics, drawing on the basic text of volumes 8 and 9 of the *History* to buttress his argument. By the same token, Korduba indirectly admitted that Hrushevsky's expository account was of high quality. Even today, almost eighty years after the publication of the original volume, it may be said without undue exaggeration that Hrushevsky's work remains essential to a thorough assessment of international relations in East Central Europe, with particular reference to Ukrainian foreign policy of the period, and thus represents a signal scholarly achievement.

In 1907, responding to the publication of the first volume of Hrushevsky's *History* in German translation, the eminent Romanian historian Nicolae Iorga wrote: 'The author now considered it feasible to make this most broadly conceived work known to the European public as well.'<sup>163</sup> Although this opinion was expressed a century ago, it remains timely and fully applicable to the present translation of Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*.

---

162. See pp. 428–29 of the present volume.

163. N. Iorga, review of Michael Hruševskij, *Geschichte des ukrainischen (ruthenischen) Volkes*, I Band, *Urgeschichte des Landes und des Volkes, Anfänge des Kijewer Staates*. Autorisierte Uebersetzung aus der zweiten ukrainischen Ausgabe. Leipzig, 1906. Teubner in Komm. (XVIII, 754 S. Gr. 8 mit 1 Karte), *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland* (Leipzig) 58, no. 17 (27 April 1907): 533.