

*Hans-Joachim Torke*

## **The Unloved Alliance: Political Relations between Muscovy and Ukraine in the Seventeenth Century**

The manifold relations between Russia and Ukraine in the seventeenth century were played out on at least three levels: official relations on the political, diplomatic and military level; semi-official relations in the ecclesiastical-pedagogical and commercial sectors; and unofficial relations concerned with spiritual and cultural influences. Both the latter complexes are related to the first and cannot be disregarded here, although this article focuses on political events and on the way in which they were understood by decision-makers.

My purpose here is not to employ well-known and frequently consulted sources in order to elicit yet another interpretation of the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654 or the character of relations between Muscovy and the Hetmanate in the ensuing period. Concerning Pereiaslav, there exist at least seven different interpretations (temporary alliance, personal union, real union, vassalage, protectorate, autonomy and incorporation), and in regard to the second topic, there is also a range of interpretations from full independence to complete incorporation of the Cossack state. No Western scholar has yet written an account that goes beyond O'Brien's monograph to take in the whole century.<sup>1</sup>

The question remains whether the period from the first contacts of the Dnieper Cossacks with Muscovy in the sixteenth century to the end of the Great Northern War in 1721, examined as a whole, yields a perspective on Muscovite policy that can be reconciled with the formula "Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution."<sup>2</sup> It may be recalled that the historical roots of Russian imperialism were discussed in the *American Slavic and East European Review* in the early 1950s. At that time, in the wake of political statements about Soviet foreign policy and letters to the editor of the *New York Times* by Russian and Ukrainian émigrés, Oscar Halecki began a scholarly debate in which Nicholas V. Riasanovsky and Oswald P. Backus also took part.<sup>3</sup> Halecki interpreted the conquest of Novgorod by Ivan III as the first clear manifestation of Russian imperialism and, naturally, applied the same concept to the Ukrainian problem, although he touched on the latter only briefly. Riasanovsky did not deny the fact of Russia's expansion, but regarded it as a policy intended to counteract Polish expansion and wrote in this connection: "It is interesting to note that Moscow was at first reluctant to come to the aid of the Ukrainians, and that it took both the desperate appeals of the latter and the

decisions of its own *Zemskii sobor* to force the Moscow government to act.”<sup>4</sup>

Notwithstanding this discussion, the above-mentioned book on “Russian imperialism,” edited by Taras Hunczak, appeared two decades later. More than any other contributor to the volume, Henry R. Huttenbach applied the term “imperialism” to Muscovy, even though, in the strict historiographical sense, it should be reserved for the period prior to World War I. While W. Leitsch interpreted Moscow’s actions in the light of policy considerations *vis-à-vis* Poland and Sweden, Huttenbach’s remarks on Moscow’s policy toward Ukraine may serve to exemplify the way in which foreign policy is sometimes viewed with the hindsight afforded by developments in later centuries.<sup>5</sup> In contrast, this article will not maintain that Moscow deliberately planned from the beginning to defeat first the Poles, then the Swedes, and finally the Ottomans, or that the year 1654 was preconceived as a turning-point in East European affairs. No one would deny that, in the subsequent period, Muscovy tried more and more to gain a foothold in Ukraine, but it did so half-heartedly and hesitantly, and certainly not as part of a conscious effort at incorporation until the reign of Peter the Great. Whereas the aloofness of most of the Cossack leaders toward Moscow is a well-known fact, this article undertakes to show the hesitancy of the Muscovite government, whose motives have been of less interest to researchers than the often vacillating and “colourful” actions of the vanquished party. Accordingly, the thesis of this article is that the most conspicuous feature of Muscovite-Ukrainian relations during the seventeenth century was *mutual reserve*. Neither the desire for “fraternal union” on the Ukrainian side nor the drive toward “imperialism” on the Russian side was dominant, and this holds true not only for the relatively well-known period of 1648–54.

\*

Leaving aside the military expeditions of the administrator (*starosta*) of Cherkasy, Ostafii Dashkovych (1514–35), who marched with the Tatars on Novhorod Siversky in 1515 and on Muscovy in 1521,<sup>6</sup> it can be said that Ukraine came gradually into the Muscovite government’s field of vision in the second half of the sixteenth century. The urgent project of incorporating the central and northern Russian principalities, as well as the struggle against the Tatars in the east and south-east, postponed the overdue settlement with Lithuania for a long time. Only after the middle of the sixteenth century, when the completion of the defensive line (*zasechnaia cherta*) made possible an orderly defence of the southern frontier, and when the incorporation of Kazan (1552) and Astrakhan (1556) ensured peace in the East, could Ivan IV orient his policy toward the West. Moscow’s characteristic hesitation to move into the south-west was already apparent at the very beginning of this period: the tsar preferred to wage war against Livonia rather than to follow the advice of Adashev and other councillors to continue the Crimean campaign. The “wild steppe” (*dikoe pole*) in the Don region was not secured as a territory. Instead,

its inhabitants—the East Slavic provincial (*gorodovye*) and service (*sluzhilye*) Cossacks—were put to work. Territorial ambitions in the direction of Ukraine were even less significant, although some contacts had already been established with the Dnieper Cossacks.<sup>7</sup>

These contacts began after the conquest of Astrakhan, when Ivan IV sent the secretary (*diak*) Rzhevsky with Cossacks from Putyvl to reconnoitre the Tatars along the Dnieper. Rzhevsky was aided by the famous Dmytro Vyshnevetsky (Wiśniowiecki), who hoped to obtain Muscovy's support for his plans regarding the Zaporozhian Sich. Vyshnevetsky, who had to conceal his contacts with the tsar from the Polish king, travelled to Moscow in 1557–8 and, in return for his oath “to serve Ivan faithfully until death” (*pravdoiu i do svoei smerti*), was granted the town of Belev, many villages in the Moscow area, and the sum of 10,000 rubles.<sup>8</sup> No lasting relations developed from this episode, which ended in 1561, but occasionally the Dnieper Cossacks provided their services. In the spring of 1577, for example, the tsar asked them to undertake an expedition against the Crimea and Kozliv, for which they were compensated with saltpetre and other products.<sup>9</sup> In the years that followed, an increasing number of Cossacks entered Muscovite service.<sup>10</sup> The leader of the revolt of 1591–3, Hetman Kryshtof Kosynsky, was prepared to place the entire Zaporozhian army under Moscow's command, but Fedor Ivanovich (i.e., Boris Godunov) refused his offer in the spring of 1593.<sup>11</sup> After the Oprichnina and the loss of the Livonian War, the Tsardom of Muscovy was too weak to engage in such adventures. Even so, the power of military command seems to have existed, for the Tsar “ordered” the army to wage war against the Crimea.<sup>12</sup> During the disturbances of the second half of the 1590s, a good deal of money flowed from Moscow to Ukraine.<sup>13</sup> It must be noted that Muscovy did not take advantage of the revolts of the Dnieper Cossacks against Poland-Lithuania, which can be traced back to 1573.

This reserve is easily explained by Muscovy's respect for the might of the Rzeczpospolita, although the no less cautious Grand Dukes of earlier centuries had not shirked conflict with Lithuania during the “gathering of Russian lands.” The restoration of the old Rus' would have been justified in any case, especially as the election of the tsar in 1598 showed that the time of the appanage principalities (*udely*) had finally passed and that the principle of the unity of the tsardom prevailed even during a change of dynasty.<sup>14</sup> Whether it is a matter of loss of the historical memory of Kievan Rus' or of actual weakness is of no importance here: the Polish intervention during the Time of Troubles indicated the true balance of power. Incidentally, in this case the Cossacks fought on both sides, just as they did in the subsequent wars of the second decade of the seventeenth century. With the marauding Cossacks the Muscovites encountered for the first time the more troublesome characteristics of their southern neighbors, especially as the spirit of revolt began to make itself felt on their own territory. The Bolotnikov revolt broke out in the Chernihiv

region in the autumn of 1606 and spread as far as Riazan.<sup>15</sup>

This revolt was crushed in a year, but Muscovy continued to observe the Ukrainian revolts of the first half of the seventeenth century without taking any action.<sup>16</sup> It availed the Zaporozhians little that, referring to their earlier services, they offered assistance to Mikhail Fedorovich in the spring of 1620: Petro Sahaidachny's envoys were merely praised for the registered Cossacks' official appeal to the tsar and given 300 rubles. They had, after all, employed the title of tsar, which the Poles considered Władysław's exclusive possession. Equally fruitless was the communication from the voevodas of Putyvl in the summer of the following year to the effect that some 50,000 Cossacks wanted to liberate Kiev and other towns from Polish rule and place them, as well as themselves, under the tsar's authority.<sup>17</sup> In the following decades only a few Cossack battalions with their colonels or hetmans resettled along the Don, and a number of rebels fled from the Poles.<sup>18</sup> Since the Poles regularly demanded the return of the refugees, whom the Russians called *perebezhchiki*, and since their flight was clearly illegal under international law, Muscovy was intimidated. Its frontier voevodas were ordered to allow refugees to enter only in small groups so that they would not be noticed and thereby disturb the peace with the Rzeczpospolita. Officially it was argued that the Polianovka peace treaty (1634) contained no reference to this problem and that no one had asked the refugees to come(!).<sup>19</sup> But how could the emigrants disturb the peace if the treaty did not even refer to them? In any case, the newcomers were equipped quite well, as they were needed for the defence of the Belgorod line, a fortification 300 versts in length whose construction had been undertaken in the mid-1630s and was not completed until 1677.<sup>20</sup>

If, up to this point, it has been possible to interpret the Cossack refugee movement and the decision of some Cossack leaders to place themselves under Moscow's authority either as a response to the exigencies of practical politics or as opportunism, in the 1630s these two phenomena began to be based on an awakening political consciousness. In 1632 the Cossacks, led by their Hetman Kulaha-Petrazhytsky (1631–2), addressed a petition to the Sejm requesting that they be admitted to the King's election. This would have meant acceptance into the nobility, and therefore the senate rejected this proposed augmentation of the szlachta by 8,000 nobles.<sup>21</sup> It was a single step from this petition to the idea of a separate Cossack Ukrainian state, which materialized in 1648–54. This phase, too, is characterized by timid Muscovite policy.

Although Bohdan Khmelnytsky recognized the sovereignty of the Polish crown only during the few intervals of peace, Aleksei Mikhailovich took no advantage of Ukraine's six years of independence. What happened was simply that the refugees, now even more numerous, who saw no chance of being entered in the Rzeczpospolita's register, were readily welcomed in Slobodian Ukraine (*Slobidska Ukraina*). The welcome was extended in mid-1649, when the tsar ordered the voevodas of Putyvl not only to observe Khmelnytsky and

developments between the Cossacks and the Poles, but above all to protect the refugees—from nobles down to boyars' servants—from any harm.<sup>22</sup> However, Muscovy's responses to Khmelnytsky's appeals for help ranged from dilatory to negative. The future hetman had anticipated one reason for this attitude in the autumn of 1647, when he declared at the meeting of the *starshyna* in the "Grove of Chyhyryn" that he saw no other solution than co-operation with Muscovy and proposed to appeal to the tsar because they shared the same faith. Khmelnytsky acknowledged, however, that the Tsardom of Muscovy had been ravaged by the Poles in preceding years, had lost Smolensk and other towns to them, and had not regenerated its forces completely. "In such a condition it can hardly stand up for us."<sup>23</sup>

Nevertheless, between 8 June 1648 and 3 May 1649, Khmelnytsky addressed seven letters to Muscovy and to the frontier voevodas asking for military assistance and offering the Cossacks' services to the tsar, i.e., to attach them to his forces.<sup>24</sup> Aleksei Mikhailovich agreed only to the provision of grain and possibly weapons,<sup>25</sup> as well as to a more frequent exchange of envoys. He rejected any direct involvement in Ukraine or even the attachment of Cossack forces to his army. The tsar merely notified the Hetman on 7 August 1648 that he was not his enemy and that, contrary to rumours, he did not intend to ally himself with Poland against the Hetman.<sup>26</sup> Khmelnytsky attempted in vain to arrange interventions on his behalf by a number of individuals, including Patriarch Paisios of Jerusalem, who spent the first half of 1649 in Moscow.<sup>27</sup> In a letter of 13 June 1649 to the Hetman, the tsar finally mentioned the peace treaty with Poland as a reason for his attitude. He declared his willingness to accept the Cossacks if the king would release them, thereby placing the responsibility for a decision on the Poles.<sup>28</sup> The Treaty of Zboriv of 8 August 1649<sup>29</sup> gave the Cossacks a breathing space, but Aleksei Mikhailovich then became even more explicit in his instructions of 16 August 1650, which he sent with his envoy, Vasiliï Unkovsky, who was travelling to Ukraine. The peace could not be broken "without reason" (*bezo vsiakie prichiny*).<sup>30</sup>

The maintenance of peace with Poland was certainly a welcome, if not an entirely feigned, pretext for Muscovy to keep out of Ukrainian affairs. It is more likely that, as Khmelnytsky had assumed, the decisive factor was the tsardom's military weakness, which was consciously recognized when the Smolensk campaign of 1632–4 failed to bring the expected victory over the Rzeczpospolita. Nevertheless, almost two decades had passed since that time, and the Muscovite army had already been partially modernized along Western lines with the formation of the regiments of the new order (*polki novogo stroia*). That Muscovy was now indeed in a position to defeat Poland and even to wage a two-front campaign for a time was soon to be demonstrated by the thirteen-year (second) Northern War. The reason for Muscovy's hesitation is therefore to be sought primarily in the domestic situation. During the century of revolts, two major urban upheavals shook the country: the first took place in

the capital city in 1648, the second in Novgorod and Pskov in 1650. Between 3 June and mid-October 1648 the government was virtually incapable of action, and the effects of the revolt were felt well into the following year. The fear that state servitors (*sluzhilye liudi*) and townspeople (*posadskie liudi*) would make common cause paralyzed the autocracy and influenced its actions in subsequent years. This was also true of its policies with regard to Novgorod and Pskov, whose location on the western border made war an imponderable risk.

The tsar's personality and the situation of the new dynasty may also have played a certain role. Aleksei Mikhailovich was relatively young (born 1629) and his position decidedly weak, especially because of the affair involving his fatherly advisor, B. I. Morozov. Furthermore, another false pretender to the throne had laid his claim, the eleventh since the appearance of the first False Dimitrii and the most dangerous since the Time of Troubles. In reality an escaped clerk (*podiachii*) from a Moscow central office (*prikaz*) called Timofei Akundinov (variously spelled Akindinov, Ankudinov, Ankidinov), he pretended to be the grandson of Vasili Shuisky and was kept in circulation by Moscow's enemies. In 1646 the Poles sent him across the Moldau to the Sultan, from where he reached the Cossacks by way of Italy, Germany and Poland. It certainly did not help Khmelnytsky in pleading to the tsar for assistance that in 1650 the Hetman refused the impostor's extradition and evidently attempted to use him as a means of putting pressure on the tsar. In November Khmelnytsky banished him to Wallachia.<sup>31</sup> The importance of this episode should not be underestimated, for the Romanovs' claim to the throne was not yet entirely uncontested. Still, it has been assumed that Ukraine was not annexed as early as 1651 because of the disturbing news about "Timoshka."<sup>32</sup>

Early that year it seemed as if Aleksei Mikhailovich would venture to take the long-deferred step. A meeting of the so-called Assembly of the State (*Zemskii sobor*) was held at the end of January 1651. Its agenda included the Cossack appeal, but this item was preceded by a discussion of Poland's treaty violations and of her abuse of the tsar's title.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, these latter points constituted the main issue; it was not for nothing that Muscovy's envoy in Warsaw had threatened the king a year previously that such an assembly would be convoked. This does not mean that the assembly had gained decision-making power. Like most assemblies of the state in the seventeenth century, it served only as a source of information for the government, but it could also be used very readily as an instrument of foreign policy. Unfortunately, only the vote of the clergy on 27 February 1651 has been preserved, but it may be assumed that the other groups expressed themselves with similar caution. In accordance with the government's wishes, the admission of the Cossacks was made almost completely dependent on the attitude of the Poles.<sup>34</sup> This changed nothing in Muscovy's relations with Ukraine. On 11 March 1651, Khmelnytsky addressed B. I. Morozov with a request for intercession—a futile gesture, as the latter had not regained the influence he exercised before the revolt of 1648.<sup>35</sup>

Because of the deteriorating military situation, the Cossacks, who were hoping for a joint campaign against the Porte, made ever more urgent appeals through a whole series of envoys in 1651–2. Nevertheless, the Hetman, conscious of his equal status, remained self-confident. On 20 September 1651 he gave assurances that the truce of Bila Tserkva, concluded two days previously, had changed nothing in his attitude to Muscovy.<sup>36</sup>

Although Kapterev has emphasized that the major role in bringing about union with Muscovy was played by the Greeks, who were also interested in a war against the Ottoman Turks, and especially by Patriarch Paisios of Jerusalem,<sup>37</sup> it seems that the tsar's hesitant attitude toward Ukraine was actually changed by the direct influence of the new Muscovite Patriarch, the tsar's paternal friend Nikon. There is no direct evidence for this, as Nikon's first friendly letter to Khmelnytsky is dated 14 May 1653, when the government's positive decision was already two months old.<sup>38</sup> But the more forceful demeanour toward Poland, especially with regard to the unresolved question of the Kiev metropolitanate (see below), corresponds directly to the energetic policies of Nikon. As a promoter of rehellenization, he naturally listened to the Greek clergy. Characteristically enough, the whole problem was subsumed under the rubric of Muscovy's concern for the protection of Orthodoxy. The talks which Khmelnytsky's envoy Ivan Iskra conducted in Moscow in the spring of 1652 resulted in a mere reaffirmation of the pledge that, if oppressed by the Poles, the Cossacks could resettle on Muscovite territory along the Donets or Medveditsa rivers, the farther from the border the better.<sup>39</sup> Muscovy was still very far from wanting to expand its territory. But after the failure to reach agreement between the Cossacks and the Poles on the religious issue, Khmelnytsky once again posed his oft-repeated question at the end of the year through his envoy, Samiilo Bohdanovych.<sup>40</sup> This time he did not immediately receive a negative answer: Nikon had taken up his appointment in mid-year. The decision was finally made during the tsar's long consultation with the boyar *duma*, which lasted from 22 February to 14 March 1653.<sup>41</sup>

Obviously, Moscow did not feel rushed, and it was certainly in keeping with its traditional reserve in this matter that the decision was not communicated to the Hetman until 22 June 1653, after he had threatened union with the Ottoman Empire.<sup>42</sup> Previously, agreement had been reached on the convocation of another Assembly of the State and, for the time being, of a meeting restricted to members of the service class, who gathered on 25 May and earlier.<sup>43</sup> The townspeople were not invited until much later, on 1 October, as the financing of the war had to be debated. This time the votes were affirmative, for once again the government's decision had already been made, and the assembly was only required to sanction it.<sup>44</sup> Again, the government made no haste. The envoys who had left for Poland on 30 April were expected to return in time for the meeting on 1 October, and actually returned on 25 September. V. V. Buturlin departed for Ukraine with the news on 9 October,<sup>45</sup> and war was not

declared on the Rzeczpospolita until 23 October.<sup>46</sup> It is well known that the actual annexation of Ukraine was not carried out until January of the following year. These facts give rise to the strong impression that the question of the tsar's title was much more important to the Muscovites than the Ukrainian problem, which was handled in such dilatory fashion. In the autumn of 1654, a Muscovite delegation in Vienna cited the question of the title as the sole reason for declaring war.<sup>47</sup> In any case, Muscovy would have preferred the simple resettlement of the Cossacks in Slobodian Ukraine to the incorporation of the Dnieper region. As late as the summer of 1653, the above-mentioned delegation visited Lviv to reconcile Poland with the Cossacks on the basis of the Treaty of Zboriv!<sup>48</sup> Even after the fact, Muscovy preferred to justify its action by citing the persecution of the Orthodox Church. No territorial claims were made with reference to the possessions of Kievan Rus'.

The tsar now took "Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the entire Zaporozhian Army with the towns and lands...under his sovereign high hand," according to the resolution of the Assembly of the State<sup>49</sup> which was ratified on 8 (18 N.S.) January 1654 in Pereiaslav.<sup>50</sup> Two and one-half months later the "Articles of Petition of Bohdan Khmelnytsky," which had been prepared by the Hetman(!), were approved in Moscow (21 March).<sup>51</sup> Despite the controversy aroused by research on this "treaty," there is at least general agreement that it was not formulated perfectly and that the future points of dispute were therefore built in, so to speak. Yet it does appear extremely odd: here was a state that in previous centuries had incorporated principality after principality; whose rulers, from generation to generation, had refined their well-known treaties with principalities as instruments to promote the rise of Moscow, applying especially strict criteria for foreign relations and the collection of tribute with reference to the sovereigns who were to be bound by these treaties. Yet this very state refused until the last minute to take over the Kievan core area of old Rus', and then, in 1654, acted with extreme negligence and clumsiness when the questions of the hetman's foreign relations and the stationing of Muscovite voevodas in Ukrainian towns (i.e., tax collection) were at issue. Neither at Zboriv nor at Bila Tserkva had Khmelnytsky negotiated such extensive privileges for the Cossacks as in "his" articles. The explanation that Muscovy was weakened by the Cossacks' flirtation with the Sultan is convincing only at first glance. It would hold true if Muscovy had had an overwhelming interest in the incorporation of Ukraine. As has been shown, however, this interest was weak, whether because of inertia or fear of Poland-Lithuania. One could more readily conclude that Muscovy was not susceptible to extortion and that, as a further consequence, the "treaty" was not negotiated skillfully enough because of ignorance or lack of interest. Not even the poor military situation in which the Cossacks often found themselves was exploited at the right time.



In practice this meant that during the Khmelnytsky period Ukraine was only nominally under Moscow's control; it was in fact independent. Unfortunately, this difference between the document and the actual force of law has often been overlooked. The full text of the "articles" was never made public in Ukraine during Khmelnytsky's lifetime; they were known only in the form of Khmelnytsky's first draft.<sup>52</sup> Thus the Hetman was able to sign treaties with the Sultan, with Transylvania, and even with Sweden, which later found itself at war with Muscovy.<sup>53</sup> Compared with Khmelnytsky's excellent connections in the West, Muscovy seemed isolated. Kiev was the only place where a Muscovite voevoda was stationed, for the Hetman, who did not want to accept even a single voevoda "because of the turbulent times," stated in 1657 that only this one had been agreed with Buturlin and that the income, which was not very great in any case, had to be used for the upkeep of the army and the foreign legations.<sup>54</sup> Instead, the tsar guaranteed the Zaporozhians their traditional forms of administration, including even the Magdeburg Law for Ukrainian towns.

Khmelnytsky's defensiveness is characteristic of his new attitude after 1654. Previously he had insisted on an alliance with Muscovy, apparently thinking in terms of a federation defined by the concept of ancient Rus' in a pan-Orthodox framework<sup>55</sup> and regarding his relationship with the tsar as one of service. Now, however, Khmelnytsky and most of his successors devoted their energies to maintaining their autonomy, even to the point of separation. Conversely, a greater interest in Ukraine can be detected from this point on the part of Muscovy. A commitment to maintain property and to establish a religious protectorate is particularly apparent in the policies of Aleksei Mikhailovich, although the previous reserve did not disappear entirely. Even when considering the second half of the seventeenth century, one cannot speak of a fundamentally new Muscovite policy. The following one and one-half decades demonstrate very clearly that the idea of "eternal subjection" (*vechnoe poddanstvo*), on which Soviet historiography puts so much emphasis, was not taken literally even by Muscovy.<sup>56</sup>

Nevertheless, Aleksei Mikhailovich styled himself "Autocrat of all Great and Little Russia" (*vseia Velikiia i Malye Rusii samoderzhets*) as early as 5 February 1654.<sup>57</sup> When a truce was negotiated with Poland in Vilnius in 1656, it was explicitly stated that in the event of the tsar's participation in a personal union following the death of Jan Kazimierz, Ukraine would not be considered part of the Rzeczpospolita, for it had become subject to the tsar.<sup>58</sup> Muscovy held to this agreement and subsequently denied the rumour spread by the Poles that it intended to sacrifice Ukraine and return it to Poland for the sake of a lasting peace.<sup>59</sup> The tsar's assumption of the role of sovereign followed rather automatically from the superiority of the traditional concept of autocratic dominion to the newly arisen Cossack statehood. It was by no means recognized at the time that, by incorporating Ukraine, the Tsardom of Muscovy had become Russia (*Rossiiia*) and had laid the foundation for its later status as a

great East European power. Desire for such status was not at all evident.

Financially, the new situation was a great burden to Muscovy, which had to provide Ukraine with a good deal of money, arms and grain. In 1654 the register was increased from 20,000 to 60,000 men because of the impending war with Poland, without the required list of names being made available to Moscow. Such a list would have made it possible to limit entry into the Cossack host once and for all. But Khmelnytsky, who did not intend any limitation, promoted the recruitment of peasants and of the petty bourgeoisie (*meshchane*), so that the number of Cossacks shot up to more than 100,000.<sup>60</sup> The tsar could do nothing about it, just as he was unable to guarantee his generous gifts of land in Ukraine. The members of the starshyna who received land in Ukraine from Aleksei Mikhailovich had to conceal their property rights at home; otherwise they would have had to fear for their lives.<sup>61</sup> The peasant masses had already shown a preference for Muscovy, seeing it as a haven from oppression by the Polish nobility. Because the tsar, unlike the king, could not guarantee property in land or peasants to the nobility, and thus could not even carry out his function as legislator, the Ukrainian peasants were saved from complete serfdom, which had just been introduced in Russia, for well over a century.<sup>62</sup> This fact also demonstrates the true effectiveness of the tsar's sovereignty. From the beginning, Muscovy had failed to consolidate its position, so that the alliance with the Cossacks virtually broke down when the interests of the two sides proved incompatible. In 1656 Aleksei Mikhailovich declared war on Sweden, with which Khmelnytsky had been allied for six years, and shortly before his death the Hetman was again preparing to turn to the Ottomans.<sup>63</sup>

All these tendencies became stronger after the Hetman's death. The tsar's land grants in Ukraine were recognized only if they constituted an additional confirmation of the Hetman's universals, while the actual awards of land were made even by regimental colonels. Muscovy tacitly recognized the 300,000 Cossacks on the register<sup>64</sup> and completely lost control of the Zaporozhian Sich, which was only loosely bound to the Hetmanate. It allowed the new hetman, Ivan Vyhovsky, to be elected without previous consultation, and did nothing to prevent his negotiations with Poland and the Crimea. In May 1658, Buturlin, now voevoda in Kiev, reported this to Moscow and found it noteworthy "that nowhere in Ukraine are there any voevodas or soldiers of Your Majesty (the Tsar)." <sup>65</sup> Vyhovsky even intended to send all official Muscovite delegates home for the summer. Muscovy, for its part, attempted to station voevodas in some of the larger towns, and the autocratic tsar vested his hopes in groups of rebellious Cossacks. He could not prevent the Hetman's defection (i.e., the Treaty of Hadiach with Poland). The Muscovite government cannot be said to have reacted with particular dispatch in this situation. Not until November 1658 did G. G. Romodanovsky cross the Ukrainian border with 20,000 men, while A. N. Trubetskoi marched from Sevsk as late as March 1659. In June,

Muscovy's 100,000-man army suffered a crushing defeat at Konotop. What later saved the Russian presence in Ukraine was by no means a more energetic policy, but dissension among the Cossacks themselves, who paid the price of Ukraine's partition into Polish and Muscovite spheres of influence.

Afterwards, Muscovy tried to regain a foothold in Left-Bank Ukraine by trickery: in 1659 Trubetskoi presented the new Hetman, Iurii Khmelnytsky (1659–62), with articles which he identified as those of the old "Khmel" of 1654. Point five, however, which concerned the Cossacks' independence in foreign policy, was missing.<sup>66</sup> This was the first important step toward actual incorporation, but it was only *one* step. Moreover, it remained only theoretical, for the "articles," which had been accepted because of Muscovy's military pressure, created so much discontent that Iurii Khmelnytsky allied himself with Poland and the Muscovite army was once again defeated (at Chudniv).<sup>67</sup> At the end of 1662, when he was about to conclude his reign and enter a monastery, this hetman, too, warned against an alliance with either Muscovy or Poland and advised one with the Ottoman Empire.<sup>68</sup> It may have been a consolation to Muscovy that Poland, too, had its difficulties with the Right Bank (e.g., under Hetman Pavlo Teteria [1663–5]). Not until the *de facto* partition of 1663 did the tsar find a loyal follower in Hetman Ivan Briukhovetsky (1663–8), who slavishly called himself "the most servile Hetman-footstool of the throne of His Most Noble Tsarist Majesty" (*ego presvetlogo tsarskogo velichestva prestola nizhaishaia podnozhka-getman*), and whose rule brought administrative and fiscal benefits for Muscovy. But even at this time one cannot yet speak of the establishment of the voevoda system. The appearance of voevodas triggered rebellions in Chernihiv, Pereiaslav, Nizhyn, Poltava, Novhorod Siverskyi, Kremenchuk, Kodak and Oster; the Cossack authorities therefore continued to function as an administration. On the other hand, Muscovy refused to invest any more money: the Cossacks, whose distinction from the rest of the population continued to fluctuate, no longer received monetary salaries, but had to live off their land. In order to strengthen his position, Briukhovetsky had to go to Moscow in 1665 and personally request military and financial assistance. The fact that the first Hetman who travelled to the capital city was promoted to the rank of boiar and married a Dolgorukova on this occasion, and that the members of his General Staff (*heneralna starshyna*) were declared nobles (*dvoriane*), did not increase his popularity at home.<sup>69</sup> The rebellion against him, which broke out in the following year, spread over almost the whole Left Bank by the beginning of 1668 and was also fueled by discontent with the Treaty of Andrusovo (1667), which was interpreted as a betrayal of the Cossacks. Nor did it help Briukhovetsky that, in the end, he turned against Muscovy.

It is more than astonishing that the tsar did not succeed in establishing his authority more strongly in Ukraine with the assistance of a hetman who was initially loyal to Moscow. Or did the government continue to regard this area as negligible? Those in power certainly stood aloof from Ukraine at this time. The

voevoda of Rzhevsk, B. M. Khitrovo, who was favourably disposed to Poland, was the first to regard the annexation of Ukraine as superfluous.<sup>70</sup> It was even more important that the guidelines for foreign policy were determined by A. L. Ordin-Nashchokin, who was convinced that the Cossacks were detrimental to the state. As Platonov showed, Ordin-Nashchokin was the first statesman of old Russia who shared responsibility for decisions with the tsar.<sup>71</sup> Since Muscovy's relations with Ukraine resembled foreign relations even after 1654 (legations with instructions, letters and relations), they came initially under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Office (*posolskii prikaz*) and, after 31 December 1662, under that of the Office for Little Russia (*prikaz Maloi Rossii, Malorossiiskii prikaz*), which oversaw everything from the import of religious books to trials of tobacco smugglers.<sup>72</sup> On 17 June 1667, relations with Ukraine were again transferred to the Foreign Office, which was responsible for Right-Bank Ukraine in any case. Thus Ordin-Nashchokin, who had become head of the Foreign Office four months previously, took charge of Ukrainian affairs as well. This turn of events can only be explained by the bureaucratic reorganization, for Ordin-Nashchokin's pro-Polish attitude and opposition to "Muscovite Ukraine" were well known. He had been prepared to break all ties with the Cossacks as early as 1658. "Unless we abandon the Cossacks," he wrote in a report of 1667, "no lasting peace with Poland can be achieved, and the Cossack towns taken from the Poles bring us no gains, but only great losses."<sup>73</sup>

If the Left Bank remained with Muscovy (while the Right Bank was prematurely abandoned) in the Treaty of Andrusovo, which was negotiated by Ordin-Nashchokin, and if Kiev was added, then this was certainly due to Aleksei Mikhailovich himself. There was some foundation to the rumours circulating among the Cossacks, which Briukhovetsky believed as well, to the effect that Ordin-Nashchokin had bartered them away to Poland. Thus, at the official announcement of the treaty, the Muscovite government prudently concealed the fact that Kiev was to be returned to Poland in two years. Nevertheless, the Hetman came to know of this and became even more distrustful when, in the autumn of 1667, Ordin-Nashchokin prevented his envoys from obtaining an audience with the tsar.<sup>74</sup> This explains Briukhovetsky's about-face, which he executed by means of secret negotiations with the Right-Bank Hetman, Petro Doroshenko (1665–76).

It does not speak well for Ordin-Nashchokin's knowledge of Ukraine that the crisis which began in February 1668 took him completely by surprise. Neither does the fact that the mediators and messengers whom he selected for his communications with the Cossacks were basically opposed to him: Bishop Metodii Fylymonovych of Mstislav, Metropolitan Iosyf Neliubovych-Tukalsky of Kiev, and the archimandrite of the Kiev Cave Monastery, Inokentii Gizel. All three were afraid of being subordinated to the Patriarch of Moscow. It was already too late to avert the rebellion when Moscow offered to revise the decree

concerning the voevodas in Ukraine, more or less as compensation for the Kiev clause.<sup>75</sup> This willingness to reduce the degree of its administrative sovereignty demonstrates once again how little the government cared to bring about a true integration of Ukraine when there was a conflict of interest with Poland. At that time, Aleksei Mikhailovich was eagerly pursuing a plan to make his son Aleksei a candidate for the Polish throne and to bring about a Russo-Polish union. If Moscow had given in on the religious question, Right-Bank Ukraine would have become part of the Russian Empire then and there, one hundred years before the first partition of Poland. But there was no overwhelming desire to possess all of Ukraine: the difficulties on the Left Bank alone were formidable enough. Muscovy's voevodas and garrisons remained only in Kiev, Chernihiv and Nizhyn, not even retaining authority over local justice and administration. This situation prevailed after the rebellion until the end of the century.

Ordin-Nashchokin's incompetence in Ukrainian affairs had become clearly apparent. As early as January 1667, Aleksei Mikhailovich began partially to ignore his "chancellor" in these matters, and in March, upon the election in Hlukhiv of Demian Mnohohrishny (1669–72) as Hetman by the grace of Muscovy, the tsar let the Cossacks know that Kiev definitely would not be returned to Poland after the agreed two years.<sup>76</sup> At the same time, on 9 April 1669, A. S. Matveev took over the Office for Little Russia, which was completely incorporated into the Foreign Office on 22 February 1671, and thus continued to be headed by the new "chancellor," Matveev, after Ordin-Nashchokin's complete retirement at the beginning of 1671. Matveev had participated in several missions to Ukraine and had an excellent knowledge of conditions there. This was important to Moscow during the troublesome period that witnessed the Razin revolt, the independent policies of Doroshenko, and Mnohohrishny's decision to oppose the tsar, who had him sentenced to death for this in 1672 and then banished him to Siberia immediately before the planned execution. Mnohohrishny was betrayed by his own *starshyna*—an indication of the tensions that would develop in later decades between the Hetmans and the growing upper stratum of landowners that still lacked the legal documents required for noble status. The increasing importance of the *starshyna* corresponded to the waning of internal Ukrainian autonomy, much to Moscow's advantage.<sup>77</sup> Matveev's takeover of the Office for Little Russia marked the inauguration of a more energetic policy toward Ukraine—the second step toward the consolidation of the relationship between the two countries.

As part of this policy, the new Hetman, Ivan Samoilovych (1672–87), was elected, for the sake of security, on Muscovite territory (between Konotop and Putyvl) at the end of May 1672, once again with the aid of Romodanovsky, and his powers were further limited. He was the first to stay at the top for a longer period of time—one and one-half decades. Most importantly, Muscovy began

an active struggle for Right-Bank Ukraine two years later, thereby becoming involved in its first war with the Turks (1677–9), after having stayed clear of Western alliances for centuries. However, this first twinge of expansionist ambition was transitory. The new tsar, the sickly Fedor Alekseevich, did not hold out very long. He pulled back to the Left Bank in 1679 and arranged a settlement with the Sultan two years later in Bakhchysarai. It could be said that the earlier reservations with regard to the Left Bank were now applied to the Right Bank, for there is no doubt that this sparsely populated and partly desolate area could easily have been taken from the Ottomans or, later, from the Poles.

In any event, for Left-Bank Ukraine Samoilovych's hetmancy was a time of consolidation, with a simultaneous acceptance of Moscow's sovereignty. This was all the easier because there were no remaining difficulties with the Rzeczpospolita. In 1685, the hetman failed to persuade Moscow to annex the Right Bank, just as he had already been refused permission in 1679 to extend the borders of the Hetmanate to Slobodian Ukraine, to which many refugees had come from the Right Bank during the 1660s and 70s. On the other hand, his suggestion of the same year to subordinate the Kiev Metropolitanate to the Moscow Patriarchate was carried out with alacrity. Samoilovych thus enabled his relative, the bishop of Lutsk, Count G. Sviatopolk-Chetvertynsky (1685–90), to occupy the metropolitan's chair.<sup>78</sup> In 1686, the Treaty of Moscow brought the final incorporation of Kiev and the Zaporozhian Sich, but also the renunciation of the Right Bank of the Dnieper, thus setting the capstone on Polish-Muscovite relations. Samoilovych, too, ended his days in Siberia, also delivered up by his officers, because Moscow needed a scapegoat for the failure of its first expedition to the Crimea (1687).

During the return of this expedition, V. V. Golitsyn had I. Mazepa (1687–1709) elected as the new hetman at the Kolomak council in mid-1687. The "articles" ratified on this occasion, which, in contrast to the earlier "articles," scarcely retained the character of a treaty, further limited the rights of the hetman in favour of Moscow and the *starshyna*.<sup>79</sup> At the same time, the customs barriers between Muscovy and Ukraine were lifted. Mazepa came from the Polish service, was a stranger on the Left Bank, and had ingratiated himself with Moscow by his reports on Doroshenko and Samoilovych in 1674.<sup>80</sup> Residing in Moscow in 1689, he managed the transition from Sofia to Peter the Great superbly, but he was just as consistent—and this was due to an honest concern for the fate of Ukraine—in turning from the latter to Stanisław Leszczyński after 1705, and subsequently to Charles XII. The motives for Ukraine's secession are to be found in Peter's stricter policies, which were manifested—to give one example—by the fact that now, for the first time, money flowed from Ukraine to Moscow, once the tsar had separated the hetman's income and expenditures from those of the army. Peter had no more interest in the Right Bank than his predecessors.<sup>81</sup> The actual incorporation of

Ukraine followed the conclusion of the Great Northern War. Even by the time of Ivan Skoropadsky (1708–22), “articles” were no longer ratified, and with the decree of 29 April 1722—the third step toward the limitation of Cossack autonomy—General S. Veliaminov was sent to Hlukhiv as head of a board of control, over the Hetman’s protests. Out of this board developed the Little Russian College (*Malorossiiskaia kolegiia*), patterned after the former Central Office,<sup>82</sup> but without the tardiness of response and allowances for the freedom-loving Cossacks that had marked the whole second half of the seventeenth century.

This response to Mazepa’s “betrayal” was unquestionably more appropriate to an absolutist state; indeed, Moscow’s steadily harsher policy toward Ukraine can even be seen as a measure of the development of Russian absolutism, whose provenance was Western.

Perhaps the tsars’ attitude can be made more comprehensible by examining Moscow’s seventeenth-century image of Ukraine and the Cossacks, i.e., Ukraine’s significance for the Tsardom of Muscovy.

\*

When a seventeenth-century Muscovite thought of Ukraine, two associations probably came to mind. Ukraine was the home of a few, mostly clerical, educators, the source of certain innovations, and thus a gateway to the West, i.e., a place of intellectual unrest. It was also one of the homelands of the Cossacks, the starting point of many rebellions and the refuge of escaped peasants, i.e., a place of social unrest.

To begin with the second point: the Muscovite government generally ignored the fact that Ukraine also had a non-Cossack population, especially as the tsar only negotiated with the hetman. Thus, the Dnieper Cossacks represented Ukraine, and its growth during the second half of the sixteenth century was essentially due to the slowly increasing wave of emigration from the core territories of Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy—a consequence of economic change. Once the colonization of the interior had been completed and a service nobility created, the governments of both states wanted to gain control of the peasant serfs—Zygmunt August by means of the land reform of 1557 and Ivan IV by his state reforms of the 1550s, as well as the land survey. But the increasing bondage only helped provoke a mass peasant exodus, which began toward the end of the century.<sup>83</sup> From Podolia to the Volga, Cossackdom stood for a revolutionary social program,<sup>84</sup> especially when discontent began to manifest itself in rebellions, first in Poland and then, beginning with Bolotnikov’s revolt, also in the Tsardom of Muscovy. However much Moscow took advantage of an army that served almost free of charge for the defence of its frontiers, it regarded the “wild steppes” (*dikoe pole*), especially Ukraine, with great concern, especially after the Time of Troubles, a traumatic experience whose effects were felt throughout the seventeenth century. This ambivalent

attitude can be detected in the decrees on runaways and seems to have been inherent in the peasant legislation, for the government's hesitation in ratifying the extended time limit for the recovery of fugitive serfs (*urochnye leta*) before 1649, which had been requested by the nobility, was certainly related to the fact that an expansion of the army in the south was not unwelcome.

After the enactment of the *Ulozhenie*, the peasants did not cease their exodus, even though they were legally bound to the soil. In fact, the exodus increased during the war of 1654–67. The ambivalence noted previously reappeared in the decrees on the return of runaways, especially with respect to Ukraine, for the “wild steppes” were now more nearly in Moscow's grasp. Accordingly, the “articles” contained demands for the return of runaways, and at the beginning of the war Aleksei Mikhailovich even had ten runaways hanged to set an example.<sup>85</sup> However, the more the significance of the old noble levy (*opolchenie*) decreased because of the introduction of the “regiments of the new order,” and the less attention had to be paid to the service nobility, the more lenient the peasant legislation could become. The deadlines for the return of runaways were continually extended. On 5 March 1653, the due date was that decreed in the *Ulozhenie*, but in 1656 it was that decreed in 1653; in 1683, for example, it was that decreed in 1675, and between 1684 and 1698 the punishment of runaways was suspended and cancelled four times.<sup>86</sup> Thus, in practice the government reintroduced deadlines to serve its own interests.

If the Muscovite authorities were ambivalent, to say the least, about the problem of peasants and Ukraine, it is easy to imagine the desperate rage that the rebellions aroused in them. Their determination to combat the rebellions originating in the south is so self-evident that any elaboration on it would be superfluous. The Cossacks, with their anarchic conception of freedom, were an example to peasants and townsmen alike. It is no accident that the century of the Ukrainian problem was also a century of revolt, termed a “rebellious time” (*buntashnoe vremia*) by contemporaries.

But perhaps Cossack ideals also had a less radical influence on the Tsardom of Muscovy. Apart from rebellions, the period after 1598 was generally marked by an awakening social consciousness. Beginning in the 1620s, collective petitions were presented on behalf of whole social groups or regions, and during the rebellion of 1648 there were even joint petitions from two social groups, the nobility and the townsmen. Also, the traditional Assemblies of the State assumed a new political character during the Time of Troubles and in 1648–9.<sup>87</sup> It is not noted in the sources that the social unrest stirred up by the Cossacks served as an incentive, but this can be assumed. A little of this is apparent in the volatile polemics published by eyewitnesses to the Time of Troubles during the second and third decades of the century. What could have been the most subversive, if not contagious, influence was the Cossack practice of holding elections. It is true that elections had been an old legal institution on Russian territory as well, and that by the mid-sixteenth century Ivan IV had



established locally elected administrations by fiat, but never had there been as many governing bodies elected as during the Time of Troubles, and it is well known that at times the army's Grand Council of War functioned as the government. Never before had a tsar been elected. The matter-of-fact (though not, of course, "democratic") fashion in which the first election was conducted in 1598, and most particularly the election of 1613, which was carried out with greater participation of provincial delegates, cannot be explained solely by the example of other states. Although this is pure speculation, there do exist several slight indications of the impression made by the Cossack administration.

During the Bolotnikov revolt, a contemporary described the territory affected by it as follows: "in every town the Cossacks, who emerged from the slaves (*kholopy*) and peasants, have again increased in numbers, and in every town they make [i.e., elect] their otamans."<sup>88</sup> Awareness of Cossack freedoms certainly spread in other ways as well. Their attractiveness is very clearly expressed in a document that dates from the end of the era under consideration. During their rebellion of 1682, the Muscovite Streltsy made a demand in their political programme of 6 June for the establishment of self-governing bodies to be known as *krugi* (circles), whose elected delegates were to be responsible to the Streltsy. These functionaries were then to present the wishes of the Streltsy to "their tsar," who would be obliged to heed them.<sup>89</sup> The explicit reference to Cossack models is further illuminated by the fact that at the end of 1682 and the beginning of 1683 the service registry (*razriad*) explicitly prohibited the Streltsy, who had been banished to various towns after the rebellion, from conducting meetings in the fashion of the Cossack organs of self-government.<sup>90</sup> If elections and self-government are indicators of heightened political awareness, then the Tsardom of Muscovy is indebted to Ukraine, among other sources, for a century of stimuli to social activity, which was then stifled by the development of absolutism. In any case, the government had long had good reason to regard Ukraine as a trouble spot to be treated with suspicion and kept at arm's length.

This was also the case with other imports from Ukraine, not only goods such as tobacco and vodka, which were smuggled across the border despite a prohibition (as was salt in the opposite direction),<sup>91</sup> but also intellectual and cultural influences. The origins of this chapter in Russo-Ukrainian relations date back to the year 1572, when the first Russian printer, Ivan Fedorov of Moscow, settled in Lviv, and the products of his print-shop began to find their way back to Muscovy. Soviet researchers have documented in considerable detail the travels of individual monks, artists, teachers and others between Muscovy and Ukraine. However, this provides no grounds for considering the "reunification" (*vossoedinenie*) of 1654 particularly predestined, and the cultural exchange was by no means equal: rather, the influence proceeded from south-west to north-east,<sup>92</sup> especially when the customs duty on Ukrainian publications was lifted soon after 1654. In reality, this initial appearance turned

out to be a Trojan horse.

In this connection, relations within the Orthodox church, which had been restored in 1622, are of great significance.<sup>93</sup> They consisted mainly of requests for Moscow's assistance against the church union, as well as of the influence of Ukrainian brotherhoods and their schools. However, it was a large step from the suggestion made by Metropolitan Iov Boretsky (1620–31) in 1624 that Ukraine be united with Muscovy<sup>94</sup> to its actual realization, which was welcomed especially by the lower clergy after 1654, while the upper clergy feared the threat of subordination to the Moscow patriarchate, which became a reality after 1685. Metropolitan Silvestr Kossov (Sylvestr Kosiv) (1647–57) objected with particular vehemence to the union of churches. However, quite independently of the political act of 1654, the church was overwhelmed by an intellectual shock that signified the end of the Old Russian era. The Kiev brotherhood, modelled upon the Western Ukrainian brotherhoods which had been in existence since the fifteenth century, was established in 1615. Under the leadership of Metropolitan Peter Mohyla (1633–46), the "Ukrainian school" developed an original interpretation of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. Its influence penetrated Moscow, the center of Orthodoxy, producing a crisis there. However much Patriarch Nikon may have desired the incorporation of Kiev, his successors, who were opposed to Latinizing tendencies, could not have been pleased by the fact that the Ukrainian theologians, who now came to Muscovy in increasing numbers, clashed with the "Greek tendency" promoted by Nikon. The Kievan influence became equivalent to that of the West in the spheres of religion, education, literature, art and crafts.<sup>95</sup> Although there was scarcely any more opposition to secular Western culture in the second half of the century, the clergy had to defend itself for a long time against charges of "heresy," as the indictments and sentences of the 1690s demonstrate. Patriarch Ioakhim demanded that the Kiev Metropolitan Varlaam Iasynsky (1690–1707) formally declare his acceptance of the doctrines of the Russian church, going so far as to threaten the reluctant Iasynsky with an ecclesiastical tribunal.<sup>96</sup> The rise of absolutism did not suppress this conflict. Instead, the problem was solved by Peter the Great's radical Westernization, whose scope was far greater than that of the earlier Ukrainian influences, as well as by the neglect of religion during the early Enlightenment.

\*

Thus, there were sufficient political and ideological grounds for reservations about establishing too close a bond between Ukraine and the Tsardom of Muscovy. Ordin-Nashchokin's objections, to which reference was made earlier, become even more understandable in retrospect. His example shows that reservations concerning Ukraine could be expressed even by one who was otherwise open-minded about the West. In this respect, as in many others, he turned out to be a forerunner of Peter the Great, whose attention was also

directed more toward the north-west. Even greater reservations were held by the conservative Muscovites, whose static thinking had no place for Cossack freedoms or the Magdeburg Law, for Silvestr Medvedev's conception of transubstantiation or for free-flowing architectural forms (the so-called Cossack Baroque). The history of Russo-Ukrainian relations has been called "essentially a chain of misunderstandings," because the law and freedom of the Cossacks constituted a breach of faith and betrayal for the Muscovites.<sup>97</sup> The term "chain of mutual distrust" probably fits the situation even better. A characteristic expression of this view is Peter the Great's opinion that all Hetmans from Khmelnytsky to Mazepa had been traitors.<sup>98</sup> So is a statement made in 1658 by Aleksei Mikhailovich, who wrote to his friend Ordin-Nashchokin under the impact of Vyhovsky's actions: "It is impossible to trust the Cossacks. They cannot be believed, for they sway like a reed in the wind, and, if necessary, the Russians should immediately sign a peace treaty with the Poles and Tatars."<sup>99</sup>

It was this mutual distrust that made the act of 1654 an alliance unloved by both parties. In contrast to "misunderstanding," the term "distrust" implies an active element. Until 1648 at the latest, Moscow's behaviour was indeed more instinctive than consciously reserved. In the following period, only aversion can explain the fact that the Tsardom of Muscovy, which overcame even the Rzeczpospolita, did not enforce its rights in Ukraine with greater determination. Incorporation in the true sense of the word occurred only in the eighteenth century. It is true that the act of 1654 did not remain quite so nominal as that of 1656 concerning Moldavia, which used very similar terminology, but Moscow achieved true "reunion" (Kostomarov's term) only gradually, by the steps taken in 1659 (limitation of Ukraine's independence in foreign affairs) and 1672 (Matveev's takeover of the Foreign Office), as well as the events of the Great Northern War of 1700–21. Until 1672, there was a latent willingness on Moscow's part to release the Cossacks from "eternal servitude," and the annexation of Ukraine was by no means perceived as an epoch-making event. After slipping into its new role rather unwillingly, the Tsardom of Muscovy became the Russian Empire without at first intending to do so, for essentially it had only concluded a military and defensive alliance with the Cossacks, not even with Ukraine, which existed only as a territory in the environs of Kiev, but with Little Russia. Even after 1672, the eminently feasible conquest of the Right Bank of the Dnieper was contemplated only in passing. Ideologically speaking, this general reservation about conquest corresponded to the status inherent in the doctrine of the "Third Rome," to which any idea of expansionism and "imperialism," even of mission, was alien.<sup>100</sup>

The change of attitude toward Ukraine began with the fall of the "Third Rome" caused by the schism of 1667 and with the slow acceptance of Western rationalism. Moscow's grip became stronger under the influence of the absolutist doctrine of the sovereign's exclusive power in the state. There was no longer a place for autonomous forces, and this meant the end not only of

Ukraine's political autonomy, but also of her domineering intellectual influence on central Russia, which was yielding pride of place to St. Petersburg in any event. However, before Ukraine was absorbed by Russian state centralism, it played an important role for the Tsardom of Muscovy for almost seven decades, accelerating the latter's initiation into the modern era. In so doing, Ukraine tragically lost her significance. Her actual *ruina* occurred not after Khmelnytsky's death, but in the eighteenth century.

Translated by Gisela Forchner  
and Myroslav Yurkevich

### Notes

1. C. B. O'Brien, *Muscovy and the Ukraine. From the Pereiaslav Agreement to the Truce of Andrusovo, 1654–1667* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963).
2. See Taras Hunczak, ed., *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1974).
3. O. Halecki, "Imperialism in Slavic and East European History," *American Slavic and East European Review* (ASEER) XI (1952):1–26; N. V. Riasanovsky, "Old Russia, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe," ASEER XI (1952):171–88; O. P. Backus, "Was Muscovite Russia Imperialistic?" ASEER XIII (1954):522–34. For reprints of the three articles, see *Die Anfänge des Moskauer Staates*, ed. P. Nitsche (Darmstadt, 1977), 272–339.
4. N. V. Riasanovsky, op. cit., 313. Backus, in his article, was mainly concerned with the fifteenth century, but generally criticized Halecki for not defining imperialism, which Backus considered an inappropriate term for the period in question.
5. H. R. Huttenbach, "The Origins of Russian Imperialism" in Hunczak, ed., *Russian Imperialism*, 18–44; idem, "The Ukraine and Muscovite Expansion," *ibid.*, 167–97. Cf. W. Leitsch, "Russo-Polish Confrontation," *ibid.*, 131–66. It is also O'Brien's view that the tsar wanted to "encroach upon Ukrainian sovereignty" from the very beginning. O'Brien alleges *raison d'état* (which was completely alien to Muscovite ideology) and a desire for territorial gain (which cannot be derived from the sources) (*Muscovy and the Ukraine*, 127ff.).
6. N. Karamsin, *Geschichte des russischen Reiches* (Riga, 1825), 7:57, 86.
7. The first reports about Cossacks in the Dnieper region date back to 1492. See K. Pułaski, *Stosunki Polski z Tatarszczyzną od połowy XV w.*, vol. 1 (Warsaw, 1881), no. 24. At first the Cossacks were a mixture of Tatars and Slavs, with the latter gaining the upper hand during the first half of the sixteenth century. See G. Stöckl, *Die Entstehung des Kosakentums* (Munich, 1953), 152.
8. *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei* (PSRL) (St. Petersburg, 1904), 13, 1:286. Vyshnevetsky's expedition to the Crimea was a failure; in order to escape

- Moscow's retribution, he fled to Lithuania. Cf. Zygmunt August's commendation of 5 September 1561 (*Akty Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rosii* [AluZR], 2, no. 142).
9. S. M. Solovev, *Istoriia Rosii s drevneishikh vremen* (Moscow, 1960), 4:28.
  10. In 1578 Stefan Batory notified the Crimean Khan that the Sich would be very difficult to take, for he had no fortifications there and the Cossacks would always find protection in Muscovy (*Acta St. Batorei*, no. 23). Marcin Bielski also reported that many Cossacks went to the Don (*Kronika Marcina Bielskiego* (Warsaw, 1829), 3:13ff.). In the 1580s there were whole regiments under the Hetmans M. Fedoriv, T. Slipetsky and S. Vysotsky. See E. M. Apanovich, "Pereselenie ukraintsev v Rossiiu nakanune osvoboditelnoi voiny 1648–1654 gg." in *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei 1654–1954: Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1954), 79. Fletcher wrote of 4,000 Cossack mercenaries (G. Fletcher, *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, ed. A. J. Schmidt (Ithaca, N. Y., 1966), 78), and Margeret also counted 4,000 Cossacks at the beginning of the seventeenth century (*Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dm. Samozvantse* (St. Petersburg, 1859), 1:281).
  11. St. Żółkiewski, *Listy 1584–1620* (Cracow, 1868), no. 17. In 1596 Żółkiewski threatened Chancellor Zamoyski with the prospect of the rebels' emigration to Muscovy if the Sejm did not approve funds to fight them.
  12. "...po ukazu gosudarevu...veleno" (*Sobranie Gosudarstvennykh Gramot i Dogovorov* (SGGD), 2, no. 62). The Austrian envoy confirmed this in his diary (*Menuary odnosiaschiesia k istorii Iuzhnoi Rossii* (Kiev, 1890), 1: 163, 178. Hetman Nalyvaiko probably also intended to ally himself with the tsar in 1596, but the Poles anticipated this, as can be seen from the report of an imperial courier (*Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshenii drevnei Rossii s derzhavami inostrannymi* [St. Petersburg, 1852], 2, col. 294).
  13. There is a reference to this in a letter by the Zaporozhian Hetman T. Baibuza dated 1598 (St. Żółkiewski, *op. cit.* (n. 10), no. 60).
  14. O. Hoetzsch, "Föderation und fürstliche Gewalt (Absolutismus) in der Geschichte Osteuropas im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* (ZOG) 8 (1934): 24.
  15. See I. I. Smirnov, *Vosstanie Bolotnikova, 1606–1607* (Moscow, 1951).
  16. At the beginning of the century and in 1615 in Oster; in 1605 in Korsun; in 1615 in the Dnieper region; in 1616 and 1622 in the Kiev area; in 1625, 1630–31 and 1637–8 in various places; in 1640 in Korostyshiv; in 1644 and 1648 in Sniatyn; in 1646 in Cherkasy, Korsun and Stebliv. See A. I. Baranovich, *Ukraina nakanune osvoboditelnoi voiny serediny XVII v. (Sotsialno- ekonomicheskie predposylki voiny)* (Moscow, 1959), 188ff.
  17. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: Dokumenty i materialy v trekh tomakh* (henceforth *Vossoedinenie*), v. 1 (1620–47) (Moscow, 1954), nos. 1–3 and 7. In 1625 the Poles reprimanded the Zaporozhians for this relationship and especially for the use of the title. See K. G. Guslisty, "Istoricheskie sviazi ukraintsev s Rossiei do osvoboditelnoi voiny 1648–1654 gg." in *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei 1654–1954: Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1954), 37. For 1621, see *Vossoedinenie*, 1, no. 8.
  18. For example, after the rebellions of 1630–31 (*ibid.*, no. 63) and 1637–8 (*ibid.*,

- no. 114). In 1638 I. Ostrianyyn came with 3,000 and V. F. Ivankiev with 10,000 men (Apanovich, "Pereselenie ukraintsev...", 80ff). Cf. also a report dated April 1638 by the Don Ataman Tatarinov (*Vossoedinenie*, 1, no. 121).
19. In 1637–8 it was stated: "There is nothing in the treaty which says that the deserters have to be returned; nobody has called them, and how can you return someone who came voluntarily?" (Apanovich, "Pereselenie ukraintsev...", 88). The border voevodas argued in the same fashion with the Polish-Lithuanian starostas, e.g., in a letter of 6 September 1638 from the voevoda N. Pleshcheev of Putyvl to the elder M. Dłucki of Hadiach (*Vossoedinenie*, 1, no. 147).
  20. After having sworn an oath in Putyvl, the port of entry, most of the refugees were sent to live as far away from the borders as possible in special settlements (*slobody*). They were given money (five to eight rubles for the men, one and one-half rubles for other family members over 15 years of age, one ruble for children between 11 and 15 years of age, and one-half ruble for younger children); grain (from 8 quarters of rye for a large family to 3 quarters for a single person); seed (5 quarters of grain per family, 3 quarters for a single person); salt (2 puds per family, 1 pud for a single person); and, of course, land, i.e., virgin or state-owned land as service estates (20 quarters for a peasant, 40 quarters for a leader of a hundred men). Furthermore, if they were Cossacks, they received an annual salary, arms and ammunition (Apanovich, "Pereselenie ukraintsev," 89 ff).
  21. S. Velychenko, "The Origins of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1648," *Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies* 1 (1976):23ff.
  22. *Vossoedinenie*, v. 2 (1648–51) (Moscow, 1954), no. 101. While Polish nobles were sent back (*ibid.*, no. 196), the Cossacks now received an average of 4 to 10 rubles per family. In February 1652, for example, almost the whole town of Konstantyniv came to Muscovy, as did the Cossacks of the Hlukhiv battalion and many inhabitants of Konotop; in March of the same year, Colonel I. Dzikovsky came from Chernihiv with more than 2,000 families. See I. D. Boiko, "Osvoboditelnaia voina ukrainskogo naroda 1648–1654 gg. i vossoedineie Ukrainy s Rossiei" in *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei 1654–1954: Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1954), 132.
  23. This comment was handed down by the later Hetman I. Vyhovsky (1657–9). See S. Grondski, *Historia belli cosacco-polonici* (Pestini, 1789), 49.
  24. *Vossoedinenie*, 2, nos. 12, 20, 25, 34, 52, 68, 74. Colonel S. Muzhylovsky also delivered a petition on this matter to Moscow on 4 February 1649 (*ibid.*, no. 50).
  25. On 22 November 1649 Khmelnytsky thanked the Muscovite envoy G. Neronov for the deliveries of grain (*ibid.*, no. 118). In January 1651 the Polish king's secretary complained to the Muscovite envoy V. Starogo about Muscovy's delivery of arms. See V. A. Golobutskii, *Zaporozhskoe kazachestvo* (Kiev, 1957), 279.
  26. *Vossoedinenie*, 2, no. 39. On 13 March 1649 the tsar praised Khmelnytsky for the Cossacks' desire to become Muscovite subjects (*ibid.*, no. 58).
  27. *Ibid.*, no. 46. Later, Metropolitan Gabriel of Nazareth (on behalf of Paisios), Metropolitan Joasaph of Corinth, and Metropolitan Galaktion of Macedonia attempted in vain to serve as mediators. Paisios himself and even the ecumenical

- patriarch became involved once again in 1651. See R. Stupperich, "Der Anteil der Kirche beim Anschluss der Ukraine an Moskau (1654)," *Kirche im Osten* 14 (1971):68ff.
28. *Vossoedinenie*, 2, no. 90. Kliuchevskii called this argument "a cruel, malicious joke" (*zhestokaia nasmeshka*). See V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Kurs russkoi istorii* in his *Sochineniia* (Moscow, 1957), 3:118.
  29. AIuZR 3, no. 303.
  30. *Vossoedinenie*, 2, no. 173. Khmelnytsky mentioned his discontent with the tsar on 8 November 1650 in a conversation with Prior Arsenii Sukhanov of Moldavia, who was on his way from Moscow to Jerusalem, where he was to collect Greek sources for the Muscovite dispute about the correction of books. He accompanied Paisios (cf. n. 27) and was also to mediate in Ukrainian affairs, e.g., in the case of the false pretender to the throne, Akundinov (see below). Khmelnytsky complained that the tsar was unreliable. The Ukrainian envoys had been told good things and welcomed in friendly fashion, "but the next time he said something different, namely that he was at eternal peace with the king" (*Vossoedinenie*, 2, no. 76).
  31. Cf. Khmelnytsky's letter of 11 November 1650 to the tsar (*ibid.*, no. 190). The clergyman Arsenii Sukhanov had acted as a mediator on this issue (cf. n. 30; also S. A. Belokurov, *Arsenii Sukhanov (1632–1668 gg.)*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1891–3). Akundinov continued his flight to Sweden, through Livonia, Holland and several German principalities to Holstein, from where he was extradited to Moscow only in August 1653. There he was executed in the presence of the Polish envoy. For further information see H. J. Torke, *Die staatsbedingte Gesellschaft im Moskauer Reich. Zar und Zemlja in der altrussischen Herrschafts-verfassung, 1613–1689* (Leiden, 1974), 23ff.
  32. H. Neubauer, *Car und Selbstherrscher. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Autokratie in Russland* (Wiesbaden, 1964), 119.
  33. *Vossoedinenie*, v. 3 (1651–4) (Moscow, 1954), no. 1; V. N. Latkin, *Materialy dlia istorii Zemskikh soborov XVII stoletiiia (1619–20, 1648–49 i 1651 godov)* (St. Petersburg, 1884), 77ff.
  34. *Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 2.
  35. *Ibid.*, no. 11. Later on Khmelnytsky also wrote to Morozov (cf. n. 41).
  36. *Ibid.*, no. 60. Additional letters to the border voevodas confirm this attitude.
  37. N. F. Kapterev, *Kharakter otnoshenii Rossii k pravoslavnomu vostoku v XVI i XVII stoletiiakh* (Moscow, 1885), 353. Cf. n. 27.
  38. *Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 165. This letter is a response to a communication that was not received from the Hetman. For the period from 9 to 13 May, there exists only one letter from the Hetman's envoys to the Patriarch requesting intercession with the tsar (*ibid.*, no. 162). On 23 April, K. Burliai and S. Muzhylovsky had been received by Nikon (*ibid.*, no. 154). Later, on 9 and 12 August 1653, Khmelnytsky asked the Patriarch to request speedier assistance (*ibid.*, nos. 183 and 186). On Nikon's attitude, see also K. Zernack, "Die Expansion des Moskauer Reiches nach Westen, Süden und Osten von 1648 bis 1689" in *Handbuch der Geschichte Russlands* 2, no. 2 (Stuttgart, 1986), 129.

39. *Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 101.
40. *Ibid.*, no. 133 (letter of 12 November) and no. 138 (minutes of the negotiations in Moscow).
41. A. I. Kozachenko, "Zemskii sobor 1653 goda," *Voprosy istorii*, no. 5 (1957): 152. Just at this time, on 23 March, Khmelnytsky wrote four more letters to Moscow addressed to Aleksei Mikhailovich, B. Morozov, I. Miloslavsky and G. Pushkin in order to present his request (*Vossoedinenie* 3, nos. 147–50).
42. *Ibid.*, no. 169. The Hetman received notice of the decision at an audience with the Muscovite envoys A. S. Matveev and I. Fomin on 4 July. His letter to the voevoda of Putyvl, Count Khilkov, testifies to his threat concerning the Ottomans: "...if the grace of His Majesty is not granted, I will become the servant and slave of the Turks." See P. A. Matveev, "Moskva i Malorossiiia v upravlenie Ordina-Nashchokina Malorossiiskim Prikazom," *Russkii arkhiv* 39 (1901):221.
43. On the dates of the meetings in 1653, see Torke, *Die staatsbedingte Gesellschaft*, 199ff.
44. *Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 197; SGGD 3, no. 157; V. N. Latkin, *Zemskie sobory drevnei Rusi, ikh istoriia i organizatsiia sravnitelno s zapadno-evropeiskimi predstavitelnyimi uchrezhdeniiami: Istoriko-iuridicheskoe issledovanie* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 434ff.
45. *Vossoedinenie*, 3, nos. 203–6. R. Streshnev had already departed on 6 September with the preliminary decision (*ibid.*, 191ff). Meanwhile the Akundinov affair had also been concluded satisfactorily (cf. n. 31).
46. *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii* (PSZ), Series 1 (St. Petersburg, 1830), 1, nos. 106, 111.
47. W. Leitsch, *Moskau und die Politik des Kaiserhofes im XVII. Jahrhundert* (Graz and Cologne, 1960), 1:27.
48. V. A. Miakotin, "Die Vereinigung der Ukraine mit dem Moskauer Staat," *ZOG* 7 (1933):326. The Muscovite envoy R. Streshnev (cf. n. 45) was instructed to confirm the Russian guarantee only if Khmelnytsky insisted obstinately or if his war with Poland had already commenced (*Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 194). Even when the Muscovite envoys had already reached Viazma on their way back from Poland, a special courier was sent from Moscow to Streshnev as late as 20 September in order to ensure that the latter would only guarantee Muscovy's support if war had already broken out (*ibid.*, no. 196).
49. "Getmana Bogdana Khmelnitskogo i vse Voisko Zaporozhskoe z gorodami i z zemliami...pod svoiu (gosudarevu) vysokuiu ruku" (*ibid.*, no. 197).
50. Cf. Buturlin's account of this (*ibid.*, no. 205). Cf. also Khmelnytsky's letter of thanks to the tsar, dated 8 January (*ibid.*, no. 225).
51. *Ibid.*, no. 245.
52. Miakotin, *Die Vereinigung*, 329.
53. Hoetzsch's observation that the tsar's original patent made no mention of foreign relations, indicating that Moscow had decided to reserve foreign policy entirely to itself ("Föderation und fürstliche Gewalt," 27), can also be interpreted in the opposite sense: foreign relations were not mentioned because the Hetman had



been granted complete liberty in this sphere.

54. AluZR, 3, no. 369. However, Khmelnytsky's envoy P. Teteria, who was in Moscow in 1657, admitted the opposite: a larger sum was at issue, sufficient to cover the upkeep of the whole army. For the time being, however, the army was not paid out of this fund, part of which the colonels kept for themselves (*ibid.*, 2, Appendix, no. 2).
55. O. E. Günther, "Der Vertrag von Perejaslav im Widerstreit der Meinungen," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (JGO), New Series 2 (1954):243. However, what Khmelnytsky really thought and wanted is strongly disputed in the literature. See also H. Fleischhacker, "Die politischen Begriffe der Partner von Perejaslav," *ibid.*, 222ff.
56. Evidently the expression *vechnoe poddanstvo*, used by Aleksei Mikhailovich in a letter to Khmelnytsky on 27 March 1654 (*Vossoedinenie*, 3, no. 248), belongs to the same category of fine political phrases as "eternal peace." V. Prokopovych suggests that "eternal" should not be interpreted to mean "aeternus," but rather "perpetuus" in the meaning of "unlimited" or "permanent." See V. Prokopovych, "The Problem of the Juridical Nature of the Ukraine's Union with Muscovy," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 4 (1955):926ff. and 946.
57. On the occasion of the birth of his first son, Aleksei, Khmelnytsky had addressed the tsar in this fashion as early as 8 January (cf. n. 50), but this letter exists only in Russian translation. In 1656 the tsar even called himself "sovereign of Kiev" *vis-à-vis* Poland (PSZ, Series 1, 1, no. 192). Such changes of title occurred rapidly and were sometimes temporary, as is shown by the titles assumed with respect to Georgia and Moldavia (Prokopovych, "The Problem of the Juridical Nature," 970ff.).
58. SGGD 4, 4. The same was true of the newly acquired Belorussian regions. See I. B. Grekov, "Iz istorii sovместnoi borby Ukrainy i Rossii za osushchestvlenie reshenii Pereiaslavskoi rady (1657–1659 gg.)," in *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1954), 311.
59. In early 1657 A. Lopukhin was delegated to inform Khmelnytsky that, *inter alia*, a treaty between Muscovy and Poland would not affect Ukrainian interests. See AIuZR 8, 386 ff. See also *ibid.*, 7, 191.
60. Cf. the report by Protasev (*ibid.*, 11, Appendix, no. 2).
61. A typical case is that of P. Teteria, who, as Khmelnytsky's envoy, made mention of these conditions in August 1657 and presented himself and the brothers I. and K. Vyhovsky as examples. Not even the Hetman was to know of the gifts, and preference was given to grants of land in Lithuania and Belorussia (*ibid.*).
62. A kind of "bondage of mutual consent" was introduced only gradually by the Cossack upper stratum. This system involved personal freedom for the peasants in exchange for the assumption of social responsibilities, with service estates distributed to the officers. See K. Kononenko, *Ukraine and Russia: A History of the Economic Relations between Ukraine and Russia (1654–1917)* (Milwaukee, 1958), 1 ff.
63. Fleischhacker, "Die politischen Begriffe," 231.

64. This was communicated to the lord high steward (*stolnik*) Kikin (AIuZR 11, Appendix, no. 3).
65. "...a tvoikh de velikogo gosudaria...voevod i ratnykh liudei...na Ukraine nigde net" (ibid., 4, 116).
66. Günther, "Der Vertrag von Perejaslav," 232. For a long time, scholars took these articles to be the actual "treaty," which survived only as a concept.
67. The Cossacks delivered the Muscovite commander-in-chief, Sheremetev, to the Tatars. Because the tsar did not consider him worth the ransom, he had to spend 20 years in Bakhchysarai.
68. Z. Wójcik, "The Early Period of Pavlo Teteria's Hetmancy in the Right-Bank Ukraine (1661–1663)" in *Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students (Harvard Ukrainian Studies III/IV)*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1980), 2:965.
69. The Army Otaman Roh wrote to him: "The Army does not know what a boiar is; it knows only the Hetman." (Matveev, "Moskva i Malorossiiia," 235). A Colonel (D. Iermolenko) made this comment on the wave of ennoblement: "I do not need the nobility; I am a Cossack of the old school." (AIuZR 6, no. 41).
70. This was reported by the tsar's personal physician, an Englishman. See S. Collins, *The Present State of Russia, in a Letter to a Friend at London: Written by an Eminent Person Residing at the Great Tzars Court at Moscow for the space of nine years* (London, 1671), 107.
71. S. F. Platonov, *Moskva i zapad* (Berlin, 1926), 120ff.
72. K. A. Sofronenko, *Malorossiiskii prikaz russkogo gosudarstva vtoroi poloviny XVII i nachala XVIII veka* (Moscow 1960). The office employed up to four secretaries (*diaki*) and between 15 and 40 scribes (*podiachie*) (ibid., 43).
73. Matveev, *Moskva i Malorossiiia*, 226. As early as 1658 Ordin-Nashchokin had wanted to return Ukraine, as well as Vitebsk and Polotsk, to Poland so as to be able to negotiate peace with Sweden together with the Rzeczpospolita. However, Matveev goes much too far when he explains Briukhovetsky's secession of 1668 by Ordin-Nashchokin's anti-Ukrainian attitude alone (ibid., 227). On concepts of foreign policy in Muscovy, see Zernack, "Die Expansion des Moskauer Reiches," 123ff.
74. Matveev, *Moskva i Malorossiiia*, 235. Rumours of Ordin-Nashchokin's double-dealing were stirred up especially by the bishop of Mstislavl, Metodii (see below), who wanted to harm Briukhovetsky. See V. O. Eingorn, "Ocherki iz istorii Malorossii v XVII veke," *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia* (1899), 431.
75. Matveev, *Moskva i Malorossiiia*, 238ff. Ordin-Nashchokin made another mistake in February 1668, after the outbreak of the rebellion, because he did not know the individuals involved. Briukhovetsky thus obtained the letters directed against him (ibid., 239).
76. Ibid., 242ff.
77. The general quartermaster (*heneralnyi oboznyi*) P. Zabila, one of the main intriguers against Mnohohrishny, even suggested to the tsar that he appoint a

- boiar as Hetman, “for if the Hetman is a Little Russian, nothing good will come of it.” (AIuZR 9, no. 146). See also H. Schumann, “Der Hetmanstaat (1654–1764),” JGO 1 (1936):543ff.
78. B. Krupnyckyj, *Geschichte der Ukraine* (Leipzig, 1943), 131. Aleksei Mikhailovich and Nikon had made this suggestion for the first time after the conquest of Smolensk and Polotsk (Stupperich, “Der Anteil der Kirche,” 81).
  79. This was not accepted without resistance, as was shown by P. I. Petryk’s rebellion against Mazepa in 1692. On the reduced significance of the “articles” as a treaty, see B. E. Nolde, “Essays in Russian State Law,” *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 4 (1955), 880.
  80. D. Doroshenko, “Hetman Mazepa: Sein Leben und Wirken,” ZOG 7 (1933):56.
  81. The colonel of the Bila Tserkva regiment, Semen Palii, who led a rebellion against the Poles on the Right Bank from 1700 to 1703, wanted to place this part of the country under Mazepa’s control, but was arrested by Mazepa on the tsar’s orders. See O. Ohloblyn, *Hetman Ivan Mazepa ta ioho doba* (New York, 1960), 196ff.
  82. Nolde, “Essays,” 882ff. The whole process corresponded to the subordination of the Don Cossacks to the War College in 1721.
  83. As a recent study shows, at the beginning of the 1580s there were hardly any Cossacks—about eight per cent—of Muscovite origin among the Zaporozhians. See S. Luber and P. Rostankowski, “Die Herkunft der im Jahre 1581 registrierten Zaporoger Kosaken,” JGO 28 (1980):368ff.
  84. Stökl, *Die Entstehung des Kosakentums*, 172.
  85. Solovev, *Istoriia Rossii*, 5:643.
  86. Novoselsky, *Pobegi krestian i khlopov i ikh sysk v Moskovskom gosudarstve vtoroi poloviny XVII veka* (Moscow 1926).
  87. On the collective petitions and Assemblies of the Land, see Torke, *Die staatsbedingte Gesellschaft*, Chapters 3 and 4.
  88. Smirnov, *Vosstanie Bolotnikova*, 124.
  89. *Akty sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi Imperii Arkheograficheskoiu ekspeditsiei Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk* (AAE) 4, no. 255, 1. After the rebellion had been crushed, Sofia explicitly prohibited such self-government on 8 October 1682 (*ibid.*, no. 266).
  90. PSZ, Series 1, v. 2, no. 978; SGGD 4, no. 158.
  91. *Vossoedinenie*, 1, nos. 19, 107, 269.
  92. I. P. Eremin, “K istorii russko-ukrainskikh literaturnykh sviazei v XVII v.,” *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* 9 (1953), 291ff.; K. V. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikoruskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn*, v. 1 (Kazan, 1914).
  93. In that year, the discharged bishop of Przemyśl, Isaiia Kopynsky, who later became Metropolitan (1631–3), asked Filaret for permission to immigrate to Muscovy because of the persecution of Orthodoxy (*Vossoedinenie*, 1, no. 15ff).
  94. *Ibid.*, no. 22. On the same point, cf. V. O. Eingorn, “O snosheniakh Malorossiiskogo dukhovenstva s Moskovskim pravitelstvom v tsarstovanie Alekseia Mikhailovicha,” *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* (1893),

1–2, IV.

95. Names in E. N. Medynsky, *Bratskie shkoly Ukrainy i Belorussii v XVI-XVII vv. i ikh rol v vossoedinenii Ukrainy s Rossiei* (Moscow, 1954), 111ff. Nikon had Kievans and even a Pole on his personal staff, and evidently had a soft spot for the West. See L. R. Lewitter, "Poland, the Ukraine and Russia in the 17th Century," *Slavonic and East European Review* 27 (1948–9):165ff.
96. *Ibid.*, 425.
97. Schumann, "Der Hetmanstaat," 547.
98. D. Bantysh-Kamensky, *Istoria Maloi Rossii* (Moscow 1822), 222.
99. Matveev, *Moskva i Malorossiia*, 228. With respect to the treaty, it was of course the tsar's mood of the moment. For mistrust in the other direction—Khmelnysky's of Aleksei Mikhailovich—see n. 30.
100. W. Philipp, "Altrussland bis zum Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* (Berlin, 1963), 5:260.