

THE CULTURAL, SOCIAL AND  
POLITICAL CONTEXT OF UKRAINIAN  
HISTORY-WRITING: 1620-1690

---

FRANK E. SYSYN

---

*Z synov Vladymеровykh Rosiia upala,  
Z Khmelnytskykh, za Bohdana, na nohi povstala<sup>1</sup>.*

When the panegyrist who appended his work to the Zboriv register of 1649 praised the Cossack hetman, he turned to themes of the Kievan Rus' past and to the political revival in the Ukraine. His Ukrainian verses were written in accordance with the literary paradigms dictated by the new Latin-Polish learning that took hold in the Ukraine during the sixteenth century. In essence, the panegyric exemplifies the major trends of early-modern Ukrainian cultural development. It mentions the decline of political and cultural life in the core of the Kiev Rus' state, which meant that the past had to be rediscovered in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It demonstrates through its form the paramount influence of Western Renaissance and Baroque influences in shaping Ukrainian culture. Finally, it records the political revolution in the Ukraine that established a new polity and a new political elite.

Seventeenth-century Ukrainian culture stands out as a synthesis formed by the cultural influences of Western and Central Europe (Renaissance and Baroque), the revival of a long stagnant native tradition, and the birth of a new polity (the Cossack Hetmanate). Comparison with surrounding

---

<sup>1</sup> Rus' fell with the sons of Volodimer. It rose again under Bohdan with [those] of Khmel'nyts'kyi. The text is published in a Russian transcription in MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKYI, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, IX-1 rpt., New York, 1957, p. 1523-1526. It is corrected here in accordance with a Polish transcription in Biblioteka Raczyńskich, MS. 1558, unit 10.

societies defines the unique aspects of the Ukrainian situation<sup>2</sup>. In Poland, a polity and culture established in the Middle Ages underwent a florescence under Renaissance influences in the sixteenth century, before evolving into the Sarmatian Baroque culture of the multinational Commonwealth. In Muscovy, an indigenous, continuous, but relatively isolated political tradition and culture underwent a great crisis at the end of the sixteenth century. Subsequently it was inundated with influences of the Baroque culture of Poland and the Ukraine, and then by strong influences of Northwestern Europe in the Petrine period, culminating in a chasm between the old Muscovite and the new Imperial Russian culture. In Belorussia, new Latin cultural influences penetrated this Orthodox land in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, creating a cultural revival but ultimately resulting in an eclipse of the native culture in the seventeenth century within the framework of the Polish culture of the Commonwealth.

The Ukrainian territories initially followed patterns similar to those in the Belorussian lands (somewhat belated in the Dnieper basin). In the seventeenth century, however, the restoration of Kiev to its former cultural importance made the Ukrainian lands the center of adaptation of Western European and Polish influences to Slavonic and Ruthenian Orthodox culture. The Cossack revolts and the establishment of the Hetmanate halted assimilation into the Commonwealth's Polish culture in much of the Ukraine and provided new political and social structures in which new cultural models emerged. In fact, the division of a formerly united Ruthenian culture and consciousness for Belorussians and Ukrainians to a considerable degree came about because of their differing fate in the seventeenth century.

In the Ukrainian cultural revival of the early seventeenth century, study and comment on the past played a major role. Mohyla's excavations in Kiev, Kosov's reworking of the *Patericon*, and the Orthodox nobles' arguments for their interpretation of the Union of Lublin are but three examples of the rise of historical consciousness in seventeenth-century Ukraine. It has been maintained that the greatest literary achievement of Kievan Rus' was its history-writing. The breaking off of that tradition with the end of the Galician-Volhynian chronicle can be seen as an indication of the cultural and political decline of Kiev and the Ukraine in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries. When revival came, history-writing was again to stand out as an important accomplishment of Ukrainian culture.

From about 1600, numerous chronicles and historical works were compiled in the Ukrainian territories. By the end of the century the forms of Western European history-writing were fully assimilated. The early eighteenth-century histories of Hryhorii Hrabianka and Samuil Velychko

<sup>2</sup> For discussions of the Ukrainian cultural context, see DMYTRO ČYZEVS'KYI, *A History of Ukrainian Literature: From the 11th to the End of the 19th Century*, Littleton, Colorado, 1975, and MYKHAILO HRUSHEVS'KYI, *Kulturno-natsional'nyi rukh na Ukraini XVI-XVII st.*, n.p., 1919.

were among the major literary and intellectual achievements of the Cossack Hetmanate. This article discusses the cultural and political context of the revival in history-writing in the seventeenth century. It traces that development to the end of the century when laymen replaced clergymen as the writers of history and the fully developed history-writing of the Cossack Hetmanate emerged. It is based on the present state of research. Given the underdeveloped state of publication and dating of historical works as well as of source study, however, the conclusions may only be viewed as tentative<sup>3</sup>.

### *The Legacy: Kievan Rus' to the Sixteenth Century*

Great political and cultural discontinuities divide medieval from early-modern Ukraine. The Rurikids who made Kiev the center of a vast East European polity were in the fourteenth century supplanted by Polish- or Lithuanian-based dynasties. By the fifteenth century, remnants of local political tradition, including Ruthenian law in the former Halych or Galician principality and the office of prince of Kiev, had been abolished, and the Ukrainian lands entered a period of their history that lacked both indigenous dynasties and polities. With political change came cultural and intellectual transformations. Byzantine models were replaced by Western ones, transmitted via Hungarian, German, Polish and Lithuanian societies.

The Ukrainian territories had also lost their central role in church affairs among the Orthodox East Slavs by the end of the thirteenth century, when the metropolitans of Kiev moved to the Vladimir-Suzdal lands. The move enhanced the position of these territories by strengthening their position as the center for a Russian culture and state. Although the Orthodox rulers of Galicia-Volhynia and their Lithuanian and Polish successors occasionally succeeded in gaining the approval of the patriarchs in Constantinople for establishing a separate metropolitan, it was never for long. The Lithuanian rulers had also been unable to convince the metropolitans of Kiev to reside permanently in territory of the Grand Duchy even though their state annexed Kiev and the historic core of Kievan Rus'. It was only the controversy over Constantinople's temporary acceptance of union with Rome in 1439 and the resulting break of the Russian church with Constantinople that resulted in the division of the old Kievan metropolitan see into a metropolitan of "Moscow and all Rus'" for the autocephalous Russian

<sup>3</sup> The basic works on Ukrainian historiography, which contain information on publications and secondary literature, are N.P. KOVAL'SKII and Iu. A. MYTSYK, *Ukrainskie letopisi*, "Voprosy istorii", 1985, no. 10, pp. 81-94; E. M. APANOVICH, *Rukopisnaia svetskaia kniga XVIII v. na Ukraine. Istoricheskie sborniki*, Kiev, 1983; Iu. A. MYTSYK, *Ukrainskie letopisi XVII veka*, Dnipropetrovsk, 1978; M.I. MARCHENKO, *Ukrains'ka istoriografii (z davnikh chasiv do seredyny XIX st.)*, Kiev, 1959; DMYTRO DOROSHENKO, *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, New York, 1957 (= The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., vols. V-VI); D.I. BAHALII, *Narys ukrains'koi istoriografii*, 2 vols. Kiev, 1923-1925 (= Zbirnyk Istor.-fil. viddilu UAN, vols. I-II), and the classic, V.S. IKONNIKOV, *Opyt russkoi istoriografii*, vol. 2, pt. 2, Kiev, 1908.

church and a metropolitan of "Kiev and all Rus'" under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate in Constantinople for the Orthodox church in the Ukraine and Belorussia. Even then, for reasons of security and proximity to political power, the metropolitans of Kiev long preferred to live in Belorussian Navahrudak, or in Vilnius, rather than in Ukrainian Kiev.

For subsequent generations of Ukrainian writers of history the Rus' chronicles, with their numerous documents and literary texts and their account of Rus' history from the formation of Kievan Rus' to the history of Galicia-Volhynia, could serve as a basis for a Ukrainian historical tradition. But unlike the Russian lands, where a continuous tradition of chronicle writing was maintained down to the sixteenth century, in the Ukraine it had disappeared with the end of the Rus' polities. The Galician-Volhynian Chronicle breaks off in 1292, even before the line of Orthodox Rurikid princes ended. While some chronicles may have been continued for a time in regional centers, they have not survived, and three hundred years were to elapse before writers in the Ukraine integrated the chronicle tradition contents into an account that carried the history of Rus' down to their own time.

The Lithuanian (or West Rus') chronicles written in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are usually regarded as the continuation of the historiographic tradition of Kievan Rus' — certainly they used the chronicles of Kievan Rus' as a model and source. However, they also differ in several ways. Written for Catholic rulers, many abandoned ecclesiastical Slavonic in favor of administrative Ruthenian (middle Belorussian-Ukrainian). Those written in the sixteenth century also began to date events from the birth of Christ, rather than the Creation.

The Lithuanian chronicles include a great deal of material on events in the Ukrainian land. They recount the last attempts of the princes of the Rurikid and Gediminid to restore a polity there, including the revolt of Švitrigaila and the deeds of the Gediminid Olel'kovychi down to the abolition of the Kievan principality in 1471. They cannot, however, be viewed as continuations of Ukrainian historical writing in the usual sense, because with the possible exception of the Suprasl' Chronicle, they were written in the Belorussian and Lithuanian lands. They derive from the chronicle writing of the Smolensk principality and often record northern, including Muscovite, events more fully than they do southern ones. In their Lithuanian reworking, they regard the seat of political power as Vilnius and the seat of Orthodox ecclesiastical power as Vilnius and Navahrudak. In essence their purpose is to trace the origins of the Lithuanian dynasty and Lithuanian state, however much they depend on the Rus' tradition to do so. Ultimately the Lithuanian chronicles did influence Ukrainian history-writing, but that influence would be as much indirectly through Polish histories as directly<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> On the relation of the Lithuanian or West Rus' chronicles to Ukrainian historiography, see T. SUSHYTS'KYI, *Zakhidno-rus'ki litopysy iak pamiatky literatury*, 2 parts, Kiev, 1921-1929.

In the fourteenth, fifteenth, and early sixteenth centuries, the Ukrainian lands were not devoid of cultural activity. Bishoprics and monasteries remained active literary centers and recorded family histories in lists compiled to commemorate donors. In the fifteenth century the great Kiev Caves Monastery copied a new text of the *Patericon*, traditionally viewed as a thirteenth-century collection of the lives of its monks and Orthodox lords restored its great church. But no stable political or ecclesiastical center existed that might serve as a patron or otherwise encourage the writing of history. The martyrdom of St. Macarii by the Tatars in 1497 demonstrated how perilous a place Kiev could be for one of the few metropolitans who visited his titular city. Only in the sixteenth century did political and economic conditions in the Ukraine begin to improve, thus providing the conditions needed for cultural and intellectual activity that revived historical consciousness.

*The Revival of Ukrainian Historical Consciousness in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries*

It was the challenge from Poland and Polish society that stimulated the revival of historical consciousness in the Ukraine. A unified Polish kingdom had been formed in the fourteenth century which incorporated the Galician principality and then entered into a dynastic union with Lithuania, bringing all the Ukraine under Polish influence.

In the late fifteenth and the sixteenth century the ideas embraced by the terms "humanism" and "Renaissance" had nurtured a new Polish culture, which included a Polish literary language. New schools were founded, creating a literate public for the increasing number of books printed in Latin and Polish. The penetration of the Protestant Reformation into the Kingdom of Poland stimulated competition in learning and debates that were safeguarded by the toleration act of 1573. An increasingly assertive nobility developed parliamentary institutions that it saw as emulating the political system of the Greeks and Romans.

The political and cultural dynamism of Poland increased its influence on its eastern neighbor, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Secure in its position as a "republic" of equals, the Polish nobility negotiated a union with the elite orders of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1569, thereby intensifying the penetration of Polish political and cultural influence into the Duchy and creating the "Commonwealth of the Two Nations." Many of the magnates of the Grand Duchy, descendants of the Gediminid and Rurikid princes, opposed the union, but had to accede to it because of the need for Poland's help against Muscovy and the popularity of the union among the serving orders of the Grand Duchy who were granted the rights of Polish nobles. Poland demonstrated its power in 1569 by annexing the Ukrainian lands of the Grand Duchy directly to the Polish Kingdom.

The political and intellectual developments in Poland were reflected in new history-writing. The Polish Kingdom had produced the great chronicler Jan Długosz in the fifteenth century and men like Maciej Miechowita and

Marcin Kromer published historical and geographical works in Latin in the sixteenth. Kromer discussed the purposes of writing history and developed a historical method that included a critical scrutiny of the myths and legends that had informed so much of earlier writing. The Polish historians' new learning both improved their comprehension of what a document could tell them and provided a tool for understanding the relations among the many peoples and lands of Europe and Asia, including the Slavs, in what was called the region of "Sarmatia". They integrated classical and Biblical explanations for the genesis of peoples and tongues. Finally history was dealt with in terms of the Polish nation, in addition to the history of the world and the deeds of princes. In time Renaissance historiography would create its own myths, among them the Sarmatian origin of Poland and other East European peoples and states. For subsequent Ukrainian historians these Polish Renaissance histories constituted the authorities for their works, led them to think in terms of national history, and provided them with models of historical critical thinking<sup>5</sup>.

Polish Renaissance historiography gave them more than a methodological model, however. Polish historians dealt with many of the central problems of Ukrainian history. Their discussions on the relations among the various Slavic peoples and tongues included the Ruthenians. Their accounts of the history of European and Asian Sarmatia and the Sarmatians, Scythians, Roxolani, Avars and Khazars dealt with the Ukrainian territory, and any history of the Poles included Ruthenian history because from the fourteenth century the Ukrainian lands had become part of the Polish and the Lithuanian states. Polish historians also utilized some Rus' sources. Finally in 1582 Maciej Strykowski, a Polish retainer of Lithuanian magnates, published his Polish-language *Lithuanian, Samogitian and All-Rus' Chronicle*, which long served as the basic history of Kievan Rus', the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Muscovy<sup>6</sup>.

Before Polish historiography could stimulate a revival in Ukrainian history-writing, Ukrainians had to undergo a long process of transformation that permitted them to perceive and then react to the challenge of Poland's eastward penetration. The view that the Ukraine was or should be a political entity had to be reestablished. New Ruthenian Orthodox social strata along the lines of the Central European orders had to form. Kiev had to resume its paramount position in the Ukraine as a political, economic and cultural center. An attack on the Ruthenian cultural tradition had to be mounted that would demand a response dealing with historical events. It is in the late

<sup>5</sup> For Polish historical thought, see HENRYK BARYCZ, *Szlakami dziejopisarstwa staropolskiego: Studia nad historiografią w. XVI-XVIII* (Wrocław, 1981) and TADEUSZ ULEWICZ, *Sarmacja: Studium z problematyki słowiańskiej XV i XVI wieku*, Cracow, 1950.

<sup>6</sup> On Strykowski's influence on Ukrainian historiography, see A.I. ROGOW (ROGOV), *Maciej Strykowski i historiografia ukraińska XVII wieku*, "Slavia Orientalis", vol. XIV, no. 3, 1965, pp. 311-329.

sixteenth century that all these transformations occurred, although in some cases their origins may be traced over two centuries earlier.

New perceptions of the Ukraine as a political entity and its elite as a political "nation" of Rus' began to emerge from the Union of Lublin<sup>7</sup>. A constitutional debate ensued, which centered on the question of how, when, and by what right the Ukrainian territories had been annexed to the Grand Duchy in the first place. The debaters were Polish political theorists and the retainers of Lithuanian magnates, many of whom were Polish immigrants. The Ruthenians of the Ukraine were notably silent, although the privilege of retaining their own law, language, and Orthodox religion, which had been extended to them when the Kingdom had annexed the territory in 1569, suggested some sense of Ukrainian particularism. The annexation had attached the palatinates of Volhynia, Bratslav, and Kiev to the Polish Kingdom, but the very newness of this annexation and the retention of special privileges by the inhabitants created a separate identity. As a result a nascent regional political structure began to form in the Ukraine where none had existed under the Lithuanian order. The Union of Lublin also separated these territories from Belorussia and placed them in the same polity as the western Ukraine, whose inhabitants long under Polish influence were to have great significance in the Ukrainian cultural rebirth. At the same time the elite of these territories took on final form as a corporate order as it turned itself into a political nation or nobility on the Polish model. Finally, prosperity and security permitted a rapid growth of cities, first in the western Ukraine, and then in the newly annexed lands.

The nobles of the lands annexed in 1569, the petty nobles of the western Ukraine, and the burghers in both regions, all were Orthodox strata that were increasingly influenced by Polish culture. Many of their numbers converted to Protestantism and Catholicism in order to assimilate fully into the Polish world. Others, however, remained loyal both to their faith and to their Ruthenian tradition, and sought ways of adapting that tradition to the Polish cultural influences. Had relative religious tolerance remained the rule in Poland, the Ruthenian elite might well have assimilated gradually with relatively little friction. The advent of the Counter-Reformation, however, created a militant adversary for Orthodoxy. It called forth a reaction from the Ruthenians and gave urgency to the need to respond to the religious challenge. In 1577, the Polish Jesuit Piotr Skarga published *About the Unity of the Church*, which argued for union under a Catholic aegis and denigrated Ruthenian religious and cultural traditions. A militant post-

---

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of the impact of the Union of Lublin on the Ukrainian lands, see JAROSLAW PELENSKI, *The Incorporation of the Ukrainian Lands of Old Rus' into Crown Poland (1569): Socio-Material Interest and Ideology—A Reexamination*, in *American Contributions in the Seventh International Congress of Slavists (Warsaw, August 21-27, 1973, vol. III)*, The Hague and Paris, 1973, pp. 19-52, and FRANK E. SYSYN, *Regionalism and Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ukraine: The Nobility's Grievances at the Diet of 1641*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", vol. VI, no. 2, June, 1982, p. 167-190.

Tridentine Catholic propaganda assault on Orthodoxy followed, signaled by the establishment of the Vilnius Jesuit Collegium as an academy in 1579. Orthodoxy rose to meet the challenge, first in the Belorussian territories of the Grand Duchy and then in the Ukrainian lands of the Kingdom of Poland<sup>8</sup>.

Paradoxically, it was the territory longest under Polish rule, the former Halych (Galician) principality, now called the Ruthenian palatinate, that soon became a stronghold of Orthodox and Ruthenian culture. The numerous petty Orthodox nobles of the region were a major force in the movement. Just as important was the existence of a large city in the region with a numerous Orthodox burgher group. Lviv was firmly in the hands of the Roman Catholic patriciate by this time, but its Ruthenian Orthodox burghers had substantial — if not equal — privileges. These, combined with the separate religious communal structure of the city, encouraged them to apply to themselves the new terms Ruthenian *natio* or *narod* ("nation")<sup>9</sup>. The Ruthenian burghers also constituted a public for the Slavonic primer published in Lviv in 1574 and a constituency for establishing the Brotherhood of the Assumption in the 1580s, which sponsored a school and a publishing house. The brotherhood was given stauropegial status — that is, it was placed directly under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople — in 1586, and it became the center of Orthodox renewal in the Ruthenian palatinate.

Influential as the burghers and petty nobles of Lviv and the Ruthenian palatinate may have been in cultural terms, the Ruthenian cultural revival and the defense of the Orthodox Church would have been impossible without the support of some magnates and wealthy nobles. Unlike the burghers and petty nobles of the Ruthenian palatinate, long under Catholic domination, the Orthodox princes and nobles of the Volhynian and Kievan palatinates had lived secure in their Orthodox faith and Ruthenian traditions. Nevertheless, by the 1570s contact with Polish families and the influence of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation had undermined the authority of the traditional faith and culture, and conversion was common.

The richest of the Ukrainian princes, Konstantyn Ostroz'kyi, responded to these new influences by creating a center of Orthodox learning and publishing at his family seat of Ostroh in Volhynia. For the first time Ruthenians had a higher Orthodox school and, after 1581, an authoritative Slavonic Bible at their disposal. But unlike the activities of the Lviv brotherhood, the efforts at Ostroh depended on the existence and enterprise of a single individual.

<sup>8</sup> On the issue of tolerance and intolerance in the Commonwealth, see JANUSZ TAZBIR, *A State Without Stakes: Polish Religious Toleration in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, New York, 1973, and MIROSLAW KOROLKO, *Klejnot swobodnego sumienia: Polemika wokół Konfederacji Warszawskiej w latach 1573-1658*, Warsaw, 1974.

<sup>9</sup> I.P. KRYPIAKEVYCH, *Do pytan'ia pro natsional'nu samosvidomist' ukrains'koho narodu v kints'i XVI-na pochatku XVII st.*, "Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal", 1966, no. 2, pp. 82-84.



By the 1580s, the segments of Ruthenian society most under Polish influence — burghers, nobles, and princes — had begun a Ruthenian Orthodox movement to conserve Ruthenian culture and provide it with the wherewithal to meet the Polish and Catholic challenge. It consisted first of all of taking stock of one's own. Both the Ostroh school and the Lviv brotherhood sought to restore Greek as the counter to the West's Latin and to revive the knowledge of Slavonic. Grammars and glossaries soon appeared to provide Ruthenian explanations for the by then virtually incomprehensible Slavonic tongue. Texts were unearthed, including the Gennadius Bible of Novgorod, which was used as the basis for the Ostroh Bible. The introduction of the new or Gregorian calendar of 1582 in the Commonwealth was resisted. The Orthodox turned to the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria for counsel and support. Nevertheless, these Greek, Slavonic, and Ruthenian resources were to prove insufficient against the forces of Latin and Polish cultural influence, which deeply penetrated Ruthenian society and shaped the very cultural revival movement. As time went on the Orthodox cultural leaders, themselves often the products of Catholic and Protestant schools, drew closer to Latin educational and cultural models.

In the first stage of the revival, the Orthodox hierarchy had appeared to be little attuned to the need for reform. Royal and noble patronage had filled many offices with inappropriate candidates, and a visiting patriarch of Antioch had even deposed Metropolitan Onysyfor Divochka in 1589 for moral offences. The Orthodox bishops of the 1580s and 90s were often churchmen only in the sense that they were nobles who had been granted royal sinecures. Ipatii Potii, bishop of Volodymyr, had earlier been a Calvinist and a castellan of Brest. The bishops were ill-prepared to deal with the religious reform movement and they resented the increasing interference of the Eastern patriarchs in their affairs. They had little real authority over Orthodox believers when they finally decided to launch their own type of reform of the church<sup>10</sup>.

Skarga's tract had stimulated new discussions about the "schism of the Ruthenians" in the Commonwealth, which after 1587 was headed by the staunch advocate of the Counter-Reformation, Zygmunt III Vasa. At the same time the Ruthenian Orthodox bishops, none too pleased by the challenge to their authority posed by the brotherhoods and the Eastern patriarchs, considered restoring the Florentine Union of 1439 in the lands of the Commonwealth. Prince Ostroz'kyi began negotiations with Warsaw and Rome to that effect, but insisted that any agreement have the approval of the patriarch of Constantinople before it could be undertaken. Ultimately,

<sup>10</sup> The large literature on the church is best approached through ISYDOR PATRYLO, *Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii Ukrain's'koi tserkvy*, Rome, 1975 (= *Analecta OSBM*, series 2, section 1, XXXIII) and his addendum, *Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istorii Ukrain's'koi tserkvy*, "Analecta OSBM", vol. X, 1979, pp. 405-487.

the majority of the Orthodox bishops supported by the king agreed to a union with Rome at the Synod of Brest in 1596, but a minority supported by Prince Ostroz'kyi and by emissaries of the Eastern patriarchs and a large part of the clergy and laity, rejected it. The king and the Diet recognized the Uniates as the only legal Ruthenian church, and the Orthodox church could only turn to those nobles who remained Orthodox for protection.

Orthodox activities centered first in Vilnius, and Lviv, and by the 1610s in Kiev, reflecting shifts in population and economic power from Belorussia and the western Ukraine to overwhelmingly Ruthenian Orthodox Kiev. The revival of Kiev had begun in the late sixteenth century, when Metropolitan Mykhailo Rahoza left Navahrudak to take up residence in his titular city. After the metropolitan had accepted the Union and St. Sophia Cathedral was given over to the Uniates, the Monastery of the Caves became the bastion of Orthodoxy. In 1615 the burghers, nobles, and clergymen formed the Brotherhood of the Epiphany which established a monastery and a school. That Kiev could hold out for Orthodoxy was partly due to the Zaporozhian Cossacks in the Dnieper basin, an organization the likes of which existed nowhere else in the Commonwealth. Their protection became more and more important as fewer and fewer great nobles remained in the Orthodox ranks. The Cossacks inscribed en masse into the brotherhood of Kiev. In 1620 the Cossack Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi offered his protection to the Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem to consecrate a new Orthodox hierarchy against the will of the government of the Commonwealth.

Throughout the struggle over the Union of Brest little that was new was said regarding Catholic and Orthodox doctrinal differences, but this debate initiated a renewed interest in Ruthenian history insofar as the arguments pro and con depended on the answers to questions such as how and by whom had Kievan Rus' been converted to Christianity?, when had the Ruthenians been in union with Rome?, and under what circumstances had various privileges been issued by the grand dukes of Lithuania and the kings of Poland? The Orthodox nobles at the Diet had to argue that Volodimer had accepted Orthodoxy, not Catholicism, and that the Union of Lublin had guaranteed certain rights. Orthodox clergymen sought to enlist princes' support by revealing their illustrious ancestry in the days of Kievan Rus'. Panegyrics had to be written about the Zaporozhian "knights," who helped the Orthodox resistance.

By the early seventeenth century the palatinates of Volhynia, Bratslav, and Kiev existed as a regional political grouping, in which the nobility referred to itself as the noble "Rus' nation," even though the Commonwealth remained a bipartite, not a tripartite state. Orthodox nobles and burghers had fully assimilated the political and social thought of Central European corporate orders. In addition, in brotherhoods and other institutions, they cooperated to defend and revive the Ruthenian inheritance. In the early seventeenth century, the Cossacks joined this struggle. Kiev had begun to reemerge as a major city. And everywhere Ruthenians, educated along Latin

and Polish models, debated religious and cultural issues by using historical examples.

*History-Writing and Ukrainian Politics and Culture, 1620 to 1690*

By 1600 many Ukrainians knew a great deal about their national past. Their references to history, however, came from the accounts of "others", and they produced few histories of their own. Why did the revival of Ukrainian historical writing prove so long in coming? The answer lies in the way the new interest in history reached the various strata of Ukrainian society, the way Ruthenian culture and identity were defined, and the subjects the Ruthenians chose to write about.

The new Latin and Polish learning had first been taken up by the nobles and burghers who took part in the political, economic, and cultural life of the Commonwealth. While they wrote about their identity and past as Ruthenians, they still presumed that the Orthodox Slavonic culture of the clergy was their true heritage. They wrote first in Ruthenian and Slavonic and later in Polish and Latin about numerous historical issues, taking their material from Polish authors. They wrote memoirs, autobiographies, and letters that reflected the new awareness of the individual and his role in history. Had they remained a homogeneous group, without any appreciable defections to the Catholic church or to Polish language and culture, educated nobles or their servitors might have written histories of the Rus' nation. But given the linguistic and cultural assimilation of many nobles and burghers, the conception of Ruthenian culture as properly the province of the clergy, and the lack of focus for history-writing in the form of an identifiable political entity, the Polish historical model could not easily take hold among the leading orders of Ruthenian society, the nobility and the burghers. The new Cossack order did not yet conceive of itself as a "political nation" and did not yet have a stable literate stratum that could write history.

Despite these obstacles to history-writing, the early seventeenth century reactions to contemporary events did cause laymen and clerics not yet fully drawn into the sphere of Polish and Latin culture to revive history-writing about the Ukraine in Ruthenian and Slavonic. The full revival of national history-writing, however, came only when the Orthodox clergymen in the great monasteries began to write works as a continuation of the older chronicles in order to defend the Church in general and its Kiev center in particular.

A number of historical works echo the Orthodox polemical literature in their goal of recording recent wrongs. They provide laconic historical notes before describing their real interest, recent momentous events. For example, the *Ostroh Chronicle* begins in 1500 (or in 1494, depending on the version), with the phrase "Necessary things selected from the Chronicle of Bielski," but centers on an account of the persecution of the Orthodox of

Ostroh in the 1620s and 1630s<sup>11</sup>. It was probably written by a clergyman of Ostroh, but it recounted the burghers' plight. The *Ostroh Chronicle* still can best be described as regional history, however.

In contrast, it is in the *Lviv Chronicle* that something like a "national" history is encountered among the historical works that primarily deal with seventeenth-century affairs<sup>12</sup>. Indeed, the name *Lviv Chronicle* given by modern scholars reflects the place where the chronicle was found and the public for which it was written rather than its contents. It is part of a manuscript book including the documents and notes of Mykhailo Hunashevs'kyi, its probable author. Hunashevs'kyi donated his book to the Lviv Brotherhood in 1649. A member of the petty nobility of the Bratslav palatinate, he took clerical orders and lived in Cracow, Zamość and Lviv, but he also took part in the Cossack uprising of 1638 and after 1648 served as a scribe and diplomat under Khmel'nyts'kyi. Returning to his clerical calling, he supported Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyi's anti-Muscovite policies and ended his career as a clergyman in Peremyshl', outside the boundaries of the Cossack Hetmanate. There are no patrons indicated for the *Lviv Chronicle*, which exists only in Hunashevs'kyi's *silva rerum*, but it did satisfy the need of the Orthodox burghers of Lviv to have an account of major contemporary events. Written as annals, it records events, many of Orthodox or Ukrainian-Ruthenian interest, from the late fifteenth century, but most of it deals with the seventeenth century, in particular, the Cossack revolt of 1630. An addendum covers the early Khmel'nyts'kyi years. The *Lviv Chronicle* demonstrates the growing interest in history among ever wider strata of the population and the perception that major events in the Ukraine should be recorded.

Unlike Hunashevs'kyi's *silva rerum* other codices include materials to document the history of the Ukraine from the earliest times. The most important of these was the *Second Chronicle* contained in a manuscript volume scholars have called *The Chronicle of Volhynia and the Ukraine*<sup>13</sup>. Only part of the chronicle has been published. The compilation includes a variety of materials that must have been intended for the increasing number of clergymen and laymen interested in history in the growing center of Kiev in the 1610s and 1620s. Representatives of three different social strata, a no-

<sup>11</sup> O.A. BEVZO, ed., *L'vivs'kyi litopys i Ostroz'kyi litopysets'*: *Dzhereloznavche doslidzhennia*, Kiev, 1970, pp. 125-140.

<sup>12</sup> BEVZO, ed. *L'vivs'kyi litopys*, pp. 99-124. Also see MIKHAIL GRUSHEVSKII (HRUSHEVS'KYI), *O tak nazyvaemnoi L'vovskoi letopisi (1498-1648) i ee predpolagaemom avtore*, "Izvestiia AN SSSR" series 7, Otd. obshch. nauk, 1931, no. 5, pp. 569-587.

<sup>13</sup> See MYTSYK, *Ukrainskie letopisi*, pp. 35-39. For information on this chronicle, the manuscripts in which it is found and the fragments published in *Sbornik letopisei, ot-nosiashchikhsia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rusi*, Kiev, 1888, A.S. PETRUSHEVICH, *Dopolneniia ko svodnoi Halitsko-russkoi letopisi s 1600—po 1700 hod*, Lviv, 1891, and V. ANTONOVICH (ANTONOVICH), *Zapiski kievskogo meshchanina Bozhka Balyki o moskovskoi osade 1612 g.*, "Kiev-skaia starina", 1882, vol. III, pp. 97-105.

ble servitor of Prince Semen Lylko, the podstarosta of Cherkasy; Kyrylo Ivanovych, a clerical administrator of the Assumption Church in Podil; and Bohdan Balyka, son of the mayor of Kiev, all contributed to the compilation. The chronicle juxtaposes information extracted from earlier Rus' and Polish authors with information on the present. The unpublished first part covers the origin of the Rus' and the Slavs, while subsequent parts provide information on the Kiev Caves Monastery from the Rus' chronicles (1051 - 1177), events in Smolensk (1162 - 1492), references to Lithuania (1394 - 1572), comments on the Cossacks (1516 - 1600), the short Kiev-Volhynian chronicle (1393 - 1611), and the more detailed and personal Kiev chronicle (1612 - 1620). The compilation provides material for a history of the Ruthenians and the Ukrainian lands, and information on important people, such as Konstantyn Ostroz'kyi, and on the Cossacks. The final fragments cover the military intervention of the Polish Commonwealth in Muscovy, the repair of the Assumption Church, and the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy in 1620.

Works such as the *Lviv Chronicle* and the *Second Chronicle* indicate that nobles, burghers, clergymen and Cossacks in the Ukraine wished to know about, and to record, historical events in their own historical works. The *Second Chronicle* reveals the Kievans' desire to trace their origins to the ancient Kievan past. An additional stimulus for Ukrainian authors in Kiev to write about their past in their own works and to turn to their own sources was provided by the need to justify the consecration, against the will of the Polish king and the Polish Diet, of a new Orthodox hierarchy in Kiev in 1620. In a work published in 1621, Meletii Smotryts'kyi called on Ruthenians to turn to "trustworthy" chronicles for information about their religious tradition<sup>14</sup>. In practice the Polish historians were to continue to serve as basic sources for all seventeenth-century Ukrainian historians, but Smotryts'kyi's statement demonstrated a new stage in history-writing, the rediscovery of the manuscripts including the Primary, Kievan and Galician-Volhynian chronicles and the return of these texts to the monasteries of Kiev. We await a thorough study of the "refinding" of the chronicle cycle in the Ukraine, but it seems likely that the philological and historical work of the 1570s and 1580s resulted in the "Khlebnikov" copy made from a codex at the Leshch monastery (Leshchyns'kyi monastyr) near Pinsk and probably taken by Zakharii Kopystens'kyi to Kiev in the early seventeenth century when he became archimandrite of the Caves Monastery<sup>15</sup>. By the early 1620s the Primary, Kievan, and Galician Volhynian chronicles served as the source for a new account of Ukrainian history, the *Hustyn' Chronicle*.

<sup>14</sup> *Verificatia niewinności* republished in *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, part I, vol. VII, Kiev, 1887, p. 333.

<sup>15</sup> OMELJAN PRITSAK, *The Hypatian Chronicle and its Role in the Restoration of Ukrainian Historical Consciousness*, in: *Chomu katedry ukrainoznavstva v Harvardi? Vybir stattei na temy nashoi kul'turnoi polityky (1967-1973)*, Cambridge-New York, 1973, pp. 54-60.

With the *Hustyn' Chronicle* the revival of interest in history in the Ukraine culminated in a new "national" historical work<sup>16</sup>. As with so many Ukrainian historical texts, we are hampered in our analysis by inadequate and incomplete publication and by a lack of secondary works on sources and content. Nevertheless, its importance in answering the needs of seventeenth-century Ukrainians to trace the origins of the Ruthenian people cannot be in doubt. The title, which may well date from the 1670 recopying rather than the composition in the 1620s, informs the reader of its contents: *A Chronicle (Kroinika) beginning with the Deluge and Tower and the division of tongues, and the scattering of [people] upon the face of the earth, and about different nations, also about the origins of the Slavic-Rus' nation, and when Kiev was settled, and how the pious, devout prince Volodimer baptized the Rus' land, and about the great principality of Kiev, and about the Greek emperors*. The chronicle has been attributed to the Kiev clergyman, Zakharii Kopystens'kyi, archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, and author of the polemical work *Palinodiia* which deals with historical events. It certainly served the needs of the Orthodox institutions of Kiev—the metropolitan see restored in 1620, the Epiphany Brotherhood founded in 1615, and the Caves Monastery, which was being converted into an active educational and publishing center. All these institutions were interested in texts that would give historical legitimacy to their defense of the Orthodoxy of the Ruthenian church and people.

The chronicler begins the history of the Slavs and the Rus' in the Biblical past, devotes most of his account to the events between the ninth and thirteenth centuries, but brings his account down to 1597. The subjects of the work are the Ruthenian people and the Ukrainian lands. In one of the first pages he asks: "Why is our nation called Rus'?" And toward the end he describes the history of the Cossacks and the genesis of the Union of Brest among the Rus'. Despite these discussions of the history of the Ruthenian people and major events, the author uses political rulers as the major focus of organization.

In his chapter headings, he reflects the political vicissitudes of the Ukraine. The chapter title began "On Kiev, the Kievan princes, and on the establishment of Kiev, and how our Slavs were subdued by the Varangians and Khazars", "On the Great Prince Rurik, from whom the great Rus prince's rule, and our nation was called Rus'", "On the adoption of

<sup>16</sup> An incomplete text of the *Hustyn' Chronicle* is published as an appendix to "Letopis' po Ipatskomu spisku" in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 233-373. The published version is from a manuscript that was a later reworking of a text that most scholars assume was composed in the 1620s. The text presumed to be the earlier version has not been published. For information on manuscripts and publications, see the works in note 3 and D.I. MYSHKO, *Hustyn's'kyi litopys iak istorychne dzherelo*, "Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal", 1971, no. 4, pp. 69-73 and A. IERSHOV, *Koly i khto napysav Hustyn's'kyi litopys?*, "Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka", vol. C (1930), part 2, pp. 205-211. Myshko disputes Iershov's claim that Kopystens'kyi wrote the work.

Slavonic letters and the translation of books from the Greek tongue to the Slavonic”, and proceeds to the reign of princes, aside from one chapter on the conversion of the Rus’, down to 1243. Then there are no chapter headings until 1392 which begins the chapter, “Shyrrhailo the prince in Kiev”. For 1471 it is said that at the death of Symon Olel’kovych “the Kievan Prince” a palatine was appointed, “And henceforth princes ceased to be in Kiev”. The chapter headings reemerge only with the three great “national” events—the origin of the Cossacks, the introduction of the new calendar, and the Union of Brest. Thus the use of chapter headings reflects the political history of the Ukrainian lands. The chapter on the Cossacks lines this powerful social stratum of the 1620s to the Rus’ political tradition in one of the most explicit statements of Ukrainian national consciousness of the age.

1516. In this year the Cossacks began in the Ukraine, we shall say something about who they were and whence they came: Even though from its beginning this our Rus’ nation has always been engaged in wars and from the earliest time has known in them skill, weapons, and battles, as has been discussed in length in an earlier chapter (whence came the Slavic people), when princes came into being, better governance and more agreeable customs started in our land. However, our warloving people did not cease to fight, if not with neighboring peoples, that is, with the Greeks, and later with the Polovtsians and Pechenegs, among themselves, as can be seen in this chronicle, until Batyi, the Tatar tsar, who devastated our Rus’ land, diminished and humbled our people. And still by the Poles, the Lithuanians, and the Muscovites and also from civil wars [our people] were severely damaged and diminished and then also our princes declined, and our nation became somewhat pacific...

Afterwards, linking the organization of the Cossacks in the Ukraine to this historical tradition, the author writes:

And then this warloving people, having tasted of booty, appointed for themselves an elder from among them named “Kozak”, and from him they were later called Cossacks themselves, and they frequently raided the Tatar land and from there brought back much booty. There were more and more of them from day to day, they became more numerous with time, and even unto today they have not ceased to do harm to Turks and Tatars<sup>17</sup>.

In his statement the author of the *Hustyn’ Chronicle* echoes other Kievan churchmen of the 1620s who sought to cast the Cossacks in the role of defenders of the faith and the Ruthenian tradition. The *Hustyn’ Chronicle* is particularly important because it attributes this role to the Cossacks in this first seventeenth-century work that provides a continuous history of the Ukrainian lands and their Kiev center.

<sup>17</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. II, p. 367-368.

The quarter century after the composition of the *Hustyn' Chronicle* was one of rapid development of Ukrainian cultural and intellectual life, particularly under the leadership of Peter Mohyla, archimandrite of the Caves Monastery for 1627 and metropolitan of Kiev from 1633<sup>18</sup>. The Kiev Collegium that he founded in 1632 by combining the schools of the Kiev Brotherhood and the Caves Monastery ensured that wider circles of Ukrainian society would learn Latin and would read the historical works included in the Jesuit-based neo-scholastic curriculum, although history was not a separate course of study. In the Kiev of the 1630s and 1640s, numerous activities reinforced and developed historical knowledge. A copy of the Rus' chronicles was made and these chronicles were studied for information on the genealogy of Ruthenian noble families in order to write panegyrics. The metropolitan's rebuilding program not only restored the glory of the princely churches that lay in ruins, but also included excavations that unearthed the relics of Volodimer the Great, resulting in the reestablishment of his cult in a newly rebuilt Tithe Church. The entire restoration program in Kiev accompanied a campaign to demonstrate the sanctity of its Orthodox relics and holy places and to defend them from Latin Christian calumnies. Mohyla was particularly zealous in his defense of the relics of the fathers of the Caves Monastery described in the *Patericon*, and he formally proclaimed the fathers' glorification as saints in 1643. Leading up to this act, the Kievan churchman Syl'vester Kosov had reworked the Kievan *Patericon* into Polish in 1635, providing historical commentaries and refutations of Latin Christian charges<sup>19</sup>. Kosov added a complete list of the metropolitans down to Mohyla, in an attempt to buttress the authority of the Kiev Orthodox see. Three years later Atanazii Kal'nofois'kyi documented the miracles of Kiev in a book containing the first published map of the city<sup>20</sup>.

The major new historical work of the period was the copying, and probably the composition (which certainly occurred after 1611), of the second version of the Ukrainian Chronograph<sup>21</sup>. The original Southern Slavic

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion of Mohyla's age and recent literature, see the special issue of "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", vol. VIII, no. 1/2, 1984, commemorating the 350th anniversary of the founding of the Kiev Mohyla Academy.

<sup>19</sup> SYLWESTER KOSSÓW, *Patericon abo żywoty ss. oyców pieczarskich...*, Kiev, 1635, republished in part in *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, part I, vol. VIII, fasc. 1, 1914, pp. 448-472.

<sup>20</sup> ATANAZY KALNOFOJSKI, *Teratourgēma, lubo cuda...* (Kiev, 1638), published in part in *Arkhiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, part I, vol. VIII, fasc. 1, 1914, pp. 478-504.

<sup>21</sup> Fragments have been published in *Letopis' Grigoriia Grabianki*, Kiev, 1854, pp. 274-300, and by N.N. ULASHCHIK in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XXXII, Moscow, 1975, pp. 15-127 and H.I. PAVLENKO, *Stanovlennia istorichnoi beletristyky v davnii ukrains'kii literaturi*, Kiev, 1984, pp. 232-273. In addition to the literature in note 2, see V. NAUMENKO, *Khronografy iuzhno-russkoi redaktsii*, "Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia", vol. CCXXXIX, no. 5, 1855, pp. 34-82 and Iu. P. KNIAZHKOVA, *Nekotorye voprosy publikatsii ukrainskogo khronografa*, in "Analiz publikatsii istochnikov po otechestvennoi istorii" Dnipropetrovsk, 1978, pp. 75-82.



Chronograph, composed in the fifteenth century and reworked in both the Ukrainian and Russian territories, was a compilation of texts on various events of Biblical and world history. To this the compiler of the second Ukrainian redaction added the *Slavono-Rus' "Kroinika" about the Rus', Polish and Lithuanian Realms* taking the history of these lands down to 1588. Only fragments of this important text have been published and it will consequently be excluded from this discussion. Publication and research will enable a determination of when the *Kroinika* was composed, how it relates to other texts, and what historical concepts it contains. Even should it be determined that the second Ukrainian Chronograph was written between 1632 and 1648, we will be left with the problem of why no work of the Mohylan period carried the history of the Ruthenians beyond the terminus of the *Hustyn' Chronicle*, the end of the sixteenth century. Contemporary history remained the domain of writers such as Hunashevs'kyi and the author of the *Ostroh Chronicle* or memoirists such as Ioakhym Ierlych.

It is always difficult to propose why something did not happen. We can, however, see reasons why the Mohylan milieu was not as conducive to "national" history-writing as the Ukraine of the first quarter of the century had been. The early seventeenth century had produced an outburst of Ruthenian sentiment, centered on religious issues, but definitely connected with outrage over the denigration of Rus' traditions. Having no contemporary state or dynasty as a representative of the Orthodox Rus' tradition, the clerical writers of history had perforce to concentrate on the Ruthenian "national" community and its religious traditions and historical rights. They also had to challenge the civil authorities' actions by denying the legitimacy of the Polish-Lithuanian government's ban on Orthodoxy. Orthodox leaders casting everywhere for assistance were motivated by profound anti-Polish feelings and were willing to turn to the rebellious Zaporozhians, and to give them a new "national" role. They had even looked to Muscovy for support, recalling the common elements of the Ruthenians' and Muscovites' past, although for them this did not outweigh the manifest differences between the two peoples in their own age. These Ruthenian clerics were not guided by a national ideology, but they did mirror a pent up nativist indignation.

Metropolitan Mohyla was a man of very different formation and he created a very different environment in the 1630s and 1640s. He was not a Ruthenian, but a Moldavian, and his interests went far beyond the Ukrainian lands to embrace the entire Orthodox world. Son of a Moldavian ruler and related to the greatest noble families of the Commonwealth, he did not share the anger that so many Ruthenian clerics of petty noble or burgher descent bore against the Poles or "Liakhs". Indeed, Mohyla and the leading Ruthenian nobles had worked out a compromise with the Commonwealth's government in 1632 to obtain legality for the Orthodox church. While he might use Ruthenian motifs to shore up nobles' support of Orthodoxy, he had no desire to fan Ruthenian anti-Polish feeling. One of his supporters even insisted that the Orthodox church should mediate in Polish-Ruthenian

disputes<sup>22</sup>. In addition, Mohyla broke with the Cossacks, and had no desire to continue the traditions of the *Hustyn' Chronicle* or the statements of his predecessor Metropolitan Iov Borets'kyi who had depicted the Cossacks as Christian knights and the descendants of the retinue of Prince Oleg<sup>23</sup>. Mohyla's policy was to augment the importance of the church and the clergy and show they could be of service to the existing political order. His emphasis on the church as an institution is reflected in that the major work demonstrating historical continuity published in this period was a list of metropolitans of Kiev from the Christianization to Mohyla, appended to the *Patericon*. With Ruthenian identity and Orthodoxy so closely intertwined, this shift of emphasis from the Ruthenian community to the church as an institution was not sharp. It reflected, however, the difference between the "illegal" Orthodoxy of 1596 to 1632, which was popular and politically radical, though conservative in form and dogma, and the "legal" Orthodoxy of 1632 to 1648, which was politically conservative and elitist, though open to changes in form and dogma.

In the absence of a Ruthenian state or dynasty, Mohyla did turn to the Ruthenian nobles for support. Although he did not find their support adequate, he would not turn to Cossacks and commoners. The traditions of the earlier period did continue among the lower clergymen, and at some monasteries. The polemicist Afanasii Filipovich expressed their views<sup>24</sup>. Nevertheless, as long as Mohyla controlled the church and the Commonwealth remained strong and controlled the Cossacks, Mohyla's cultural and political course was dominant. What this course would have meant over the long run for history-writing in the Ukraine cannot be known since the entire order on which it was based crumbled in 1648. However, the elements of historical consciousness that arose in Mohyla's Kiev were to influence history-writing in the entirely different political, intellectual, and cultural environment of Cossack Ukraine.

From the outbreak of the Cossack revolt of 1648 until the 1670s, when the next major historical works emerged from the Kievan clerical circles, the political and cultural environment of Ukrainian life changed greatly. It remained in a state of flux well into the 1680s. The Cossacks regained their position in political affairs and became the most powerful social stratum in the Ukraine. The Cossack military order became the *de facto* civil administration in the Dnieper basin, at its greatest extent including areas of Volhynia. Wherever the Cossacks maintained control, Orthodoxy became the established faith. Most significant, the Cossack Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi rejected the authority of the Polish-Lithuanian Com-

<sup>22</sup> THEODOSIUS BAEWSKI (FEODOSII BAEVS'KYI), *Tentoria* ..., Kiev, 1646, fol. 7.

<sup>23</sup> Borets'kyi's statement is cited in DOROSHENKO, *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography*, p. 36.

<sup>24</sup> For Filipovich's works, see A. KORSHUNOV, *Afanasii Filippovich: Zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, Minsk, 1965.

monwealth and began the process of state-building. The Cossack hetman could not, however, resolve the problems of establishing political legitimacy and providing effective military security.

These weaknesses led him to negotiate the Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654, swearing an oath of loyalty to the Muscovite Tsar. Whatever the real intentions and judicial nature of the Pereiaslav Agreement, the subject of debate to the present day, the events of 1654 brought Russians and the Muscovite tsar into a new relation with the Ukraine. The tsar adopted the titles of ruler of "Great Russia" (for Muscovy) and "Little Russia" (for the Ukraine), using the term "Rossiia" that the Kievan clergymen had so often favored over "Rus'" in designating the Ukraine in the 1620s, as well as giving official recognition to the old terms "Great" and "Little" which had been only rarely employed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Orthodox tsar now claimed protection over the Ukraine and later over Belorussia (White Russia). The frequent fragmentation of Cossack leadership, at times resulting in three hetmans, each allied to a different power, contributed to endless uncertainty and wars in the Ukraine. Although the political situation long remained uncertain as successive Cossack hetmans entered into new political agreements with the Commonwealth, Sweden, the Ottoman Empire, the Crimean Tatars and other states, the Russian factor came to loom greater and greater in Ukrainian affairs — particularly for the clerical establishment. The Truce of Andrusovo of 1667 between the Commonwealth and Muscovy, dividing the Ukraine along the Dnieper (with a special proviso that Kiev temporarily go with the Left-Bank territories), revealed how great the Muscovite influence in the Ukraine had become. It also demonstrated how little chance remained to maintain a united autonomous Cossack Hetmanate on both banks of the Dnieper, however cherished this goal remained among the Cossack elite.

The Khmel'nyts'kyi revolt undid the Mohylan course and provided new opportunities and new dangers for the church. On the one hand, at Christmas 1648 the clergymen of Kiev greeted Khmel'nyts'kyi as a "Moses, a liberator of his people from Polish servitude" and hoped that the Cossacks would sweep away the Latins. The lower clergymen were particularly adamant in their opposition to compromise with the Catholics. On the other, many clergymen were reluctant to tie their cause to rebellion, especially since the Cossacks would prove difficult masters for the church. The post-Mohylan hierarchs led by Syl'vester Kosov favored an agreement with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, partly because they themselves were of noble origin. In any event, the hierarchy had to consider church interests throughout the Commonwealth, not just in the Dnieper basin. When the Cossack Hetmanate split off from the Commonwealth, the Kiev metropolitanate that included Minsk and Peremyshl' as well as Kiev and Chernihiv was threatened with dissolution. The integrity of the Kiev metropolitan see was not very likely to survive political division. In the end political events determined the fate of the church.

Efforts to reach a real accommodation between the Polish-Lithuanian government and the Cossack rebels failed time and again. Although Poland did not succeed in conquering the Cossacks, most of the Kiev metropolitan see, including the western Ukraine, remained under the Commonwealth's control. The Hetmanate failed to become sufficiently stable to guarantee security to the Orthodox church as political power disintegrated during the "Ruin".

In this turbulent political situation, metropolitans such as Kosov (1647 - 1657), Dionisii Balaban (1657 - 1663), and Iosyf Neliubovych-Tukal's'kyi (1663 - 1675) strove to maintain the integrity of the metropolitan see and to preserve its rights and privileges under the patriarchate of Constantinople. This diplomacy, supporting first one, than another, hetman or foreign power, was intricate. They, and most of the Orthodox hierarchs, were especially determined to maintain their independence from the patriarch of Moscow (Kosov had even opposed the Pereiaslav Agreement), but political disintegration in the Ukraine and Muscovite power on the Left Bank and in Kiev strengthened the Muscovite hand. The Treaty in 1686 between Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy once again divided the Ukraine along the Dnieper and left Kiev under Muscovite control. It was accompanied by the transfer of jurisdiction of the Kiev metropolitan see from Constantinople to Moscow. Ultimately Orthodoxy provided a bond between the Ukraine and Russia. The Left-Bank Cossack Hetmanate and the Kiev metropolitan see were to share the same fate, absorption into the Russian Empire and into the Imperial Russian Church.

In the 1670s, although the political struggle for the Ukraine remained undecided, national history-writing reemerged in the Ukrainian monasteries. Mykhailo Losyts'kyi of the Hustyn' monastery near Pryluky on the Left-Bank recopied the *Hustyn' Chronicle* in 1670. Although he did not add to this text, he did preface his work with an introduction that constitutes the most extended discussion in any of the Ukrainian historical works of the 1620 to 1690 period of the reasons for writing patriotic history.

#### FOREWORD TO THE READER

Every man is possessed by a certain inborn desire and love toward his fatherland, which attracts everyone the way a lodestone attracts iron. This was clearly explained by the Greek poet Homer in his text [that about one who] was far from his homeland due to captivity and could no longer return, caring about nothing else, he desired to see at least the smoke from the chimneys of his fatherland. The same goes for the authors of this Rus' Chronicle; although they were mortal men and undoubtedly knew that death would end up in the way, they, filled with inborn love toward their fatherland, desired even after their demise not to let the events of the past remain hidden from the future generations, namely, from the Rus' nation...

For what reason is the reading of history absolutely necessary to every man? For were it not to be described and presented to the world, all would descend unknown to the earth together with the [human] body, and people would remain as in the dark, not knowing what took place during the past centuries. After reading all in this Chronicle, you may pass it on to other, younger

people who need to learn and to whom the holy prophet Moses [advised]: “ask thy father and he will show thee; the elders, and they will tell thee” [Deut. 32:7]. But I, not diverting you anymore with this foreword, am referring to you further to this book for the better understanding of all you gentlemen, who are willing to read it.

The well-disposed scribe of this chronicle, wishing you, gentlemen, the salvation of the soul and health of the body, the unworthy hieromonach, Mykhailo Pavlovych Losyts'kyi<sup>25</sup>.

Losyts'kyi's preface is evidence of the degree to which new learning and thinking on history-writing had penetrated Orthodox clerical groups. While in re-copying the *Hustyn' Chronicle* he made available to his contemporaries a history of the “fatherland” (which he calls *Malaia Rossiia*) to 1597, he did not connect that history to the events of the seventeenth century. This was accomplished in Kiev by Feodosii Sofonovych, who provided a history that could serve to link the new Ukraine with the Rus' past.

In 1672-1673, Sofonovych, archimandrite of St. Michael of the Golden Domes monastery, wrote the three parts of his *Kroinika*<sup>26</sup>. A descendant of a Kiev burgher family, Sofonovych had attended the Kiev Collegium in the 1630s. In 1649 he had accompanied a group of Kievan clergymen to Moscow, a journey he made again in 1654. In 1653-1655 he served as vice-rector of the Kiev Collegium and from 1655 to his death in 1677 he served as archimandrite of St. Michael's monastery.

<sup>25</sup> *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. II, p.233.

<sup>26</sup> In addition to the works cited in footnote 3, see CECILIA BORELIUS, *Safonovič's Chronik im Codex 10 der Väteraser Gymnasialbibliothek*, Uppsala, 1952 (= Publications de l'Institut slave d'Upsal VI). This book includes information on manuscripts and publication of fragments, as well as some fragments. Also see, A. ROGOZINSKII, *Kroinika, Feodosiia Sofonovicha i eia ot-noshenie k Kievskomu Sinopsisu Innokentiiia Gizelia*, “Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk”, vol. XV, no. 4, 1910, pp. 270-286, O.A. BEVZO, *Feodosii Sofonovych i ioho Kroinika*, “Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal”, 1968, no. 8, pp. 101-104. Iu. A. MYTSYK has published widely on this topic in recent years on the basis of his dissertation: *Kroinika Feodosiia Sofonovicha kak istoricheskii istochnik i pamiatnik ukrainskoi istoriografii XVII veka, Avtoreferat*, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1975. See his *Vliianie Kroiniki Feodosiia Sofonovicha na Kievskii Sinopsis, Nekotorye voprosy istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia*, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1972, pp. 129-136; *Kroinika o pochatku i nazvisku Litvy Feodosiia Sofonovicha i ee istochniki, Nekotorye voprosy sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi i politicheskoi istorii Ukrainskoi SSR*, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1973, pp. 158-167; *Kroinika o zemli Polskoi F. Sofonovicha kak istochnik po istorii narodno-osvoboditel'nykh dvizhenii XVII v. v Vostochnoi Evrope, Voprosy rabochego i natsional'no-osvoboditel'nogo dvizheniia*, no. 1, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1974, pp. 164-169; *Voprosy izuchenii Kroiniki Feodosiia Sofonovicha v istoriografii, Voprosy otechestvennoi istoriografii i istochnikovedeniia*, no. 2, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1975, pp. 76-92; *Feodosii Sofonovych—vydatnyi predstavnyk istorychnoi dumky*. (300-richchia z dnia smerti), “Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal”, 1977, no. 12, pp. 113-115; *Voprosy publikatsii teksta Kroiniki Feodosiia Sofonovicha, Analiz publikatsii istochnikov po otechestvennoi istorii*, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1978, pp. 58-74; *Kroinika o zemli Polskoi F. Sofonovycha pro Vyzvol'nu viinu ukrains'koho narodu 1648-1654 rr. i vozz'ednannia Ukrainy z Rosieiu*, “Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal”, 1979, no. 6, pp. 116-23.

An opponent of the Moscow patriarch's influence over the Kievan metropolitan see, Sofonovych followed a wavering political line, seeking Muscovite help in the 1650s, backing attempts to compromise with Poland in the 1660s, and returning to a pro-Muscovite line in the 1670s to counteract Tatar and Ottoman incursions into the Ukraine. In addition to the chronicle, he wrote religious, hagiographic and poetic works and recopied the *pomiany* of the St. Michael Monastery.

Although Sofonovych's work remained in manuscript form, he undertook his history for a wider public. He prefaces his text:

"I have considered it a proper matter to know myself and to tell other Ruthenian sons from whence Rus' arose and how the Ruthenian realm [*panstvo*] has continued from its initial establishment until now. For it is necessary for everyone to know about his fatherland and to be able to answer other peoples' questions about it. Because men who do not know their origins are regarded as stupid<sup>27</sup>".

Each of the three parts of his history goes back to the Biblical past before showing how the Rus' state arose, how the Lithuanian state arose and entered Rus' history and how the Polish state arose and entered Rus' history. His principal subjects are rulers, with particular attention to the thirteenth-century prince of Galicia-Volhynia, Danylo. But in shifting from the history of Lithuanian and Polish rulers to events in the Ukraine, he inevitably changes his primary subjects. In the Lithuanian segment, this meant concentration on Ruthenian princes, above all Prince Konstantyn Ivanovych Ostroz'kyi, while in the Polish part this results in a discussion of the Cossacks, and after 1648, of the Cossack Hetmanate. In both segments Sofonovych pays great attention to ecclesiastical institutions and leaders.

If in national terms Sofonovych provides a straightforward presentation of Ukrainian history, his vision of political events is more hazy. He discusses the Khmel'nyts'kyi revolt and the formation of the Cossack Hetmanate without taking a clear position on the conflict and the role of the Cossacks. He describes the Pereiaslav Agreement and the claims of suzerainty of the Muscovite tsar without outlining his views of the relation of the tsar and Muscovy to the Ukraine. In essence, Sofonovych reflects the political uncertainties of the Ukraine in the early 1670s.

In contrast to Sofonovych's *Kroinika* which remains unpublished to the present, the *Sinopsis* was published in three editions between 1674 and 1681, and appeared in over thirty subsequent reprintings<sup>28</sup>. Despite the great attention to *The Sinopsis, or short compilation from various chronicles*,

<sup>27</sup> BORELIUS, *Safonovičs Chronik*, p. 95.

<sup>28</sup> HANS ROTHE, ed. *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facsimile mit einer Einleitung*, Cologne-Vienna, 1983 (= Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven XVII). The introduction examines the scholarly literature. Of particular note is I.P. EREMIN, *K istorii obshchestvennoi mysli na Ukraine vtoroi poloviny XVIIv.*, TODRL, vol. X, 1954, pp. 212-222; S.I. MASLOV, *K istorii iz-*

about the beginning of the Slavic-Rus' nation and the first princes of the God-saved city of Kiev and the life of the holy, devout prince of Kiev and all "Rossiia", the first autocrat Volodimer and about the pious successors of his Rus' rule, even unto our illustrious and pious sovereign, tsar, and grand prince Aleksei Mikhailovich, autocrat of all Great, Little and White 'Rossiia', a number of questions about it remain unresolved. Among them is whether there were any editions before 1674, and whether the text as we know it reflects Muscovite censorship. For the purposes of this discussion, the text as it emerged in the third edition of 1680-81 will be used as an illustration of Ukrainian political culture and historical thought of the period and the complex issues of how this text evolved will be set aside. Another unresolved issue is the identity of the author, usually thought to be the archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, Innokentii Gizel' who is described in it as blessing the publication<sup>29</sup>.

While the authorship of the *Sinopsis* remains unknown, its patron and readers are more easily determined. In contrast to other historical works in the 1670s, the author of this one does not begin by exhorting his readers to the knowledge of history necessary for a true son of the fatherland. It begins with the archimandrite's blessing. The title links the ruling tsar's name to Volodimer's lineage, so it is to the monastery and the Muscovite court that we can look for patrons of this first printed history to be intended for both the Ukrainian and the Muscovite public.

The *Sinopsis* begins with the Biblical descent of the Slavs, Rus' and other related peoples, devotes considerable space to Volodimer and the conversion of the Rus', lists the rulers of Kiev down to the Tatar conquest. After an account of Batii's destruction of the Caves monastery and the devastation around Kiev, it tells of the fourteenth-century struggle of the Grand Prince of Moscow Dmitrii Ivanovich with the Tatar ruler Mamai. It then turns to the fate of Kiev after Batii's destruction and the transformation of the metropolitan see of Kiev into two. The 1680-81 version also includes an account of the proclamation of the metropolitan see of Moscow as a patriarchate. The princes and palatines of Kiev down to Adam Kysil (1649-1653) are then listed. Kiev is "returned" to the rightful tsarist rule of

---

*danii Kievskogo Sinopsisa*, in *Stat'i po slavianskoi filologii i russkoi slovesnosti. Sobranie statei v chest' akademika A. I. Sobolevskogo*, Leningrad, 1928, pp. 341-348 and S.A. PESHTICH, *Sinopsis kak istoricheskoe proizvedenie*, "TODRL", vol. XV, 1958, pp. 284-298.

<sup>29</sup> Opponents of that view argue, however, that the German-born Gizel' was too well educated and too loyal to the autonomy of the Ukrainian church and opposed to Muscovite rule in the Ukraine to have produced a text with so many errors, with so little erudition, and with such unswerving devotion to the Muscovite tsars' political needs. Proponents of his authorship maintain that if one sees the *Sinopsis* as espousing the program that Kiev should be ruled by the Muscovite tsar, and of portraying positively Kiev, the Caves Monastery, and the autonomous Ukrainian church, it is quite consistent with Gizel's opinions. The issue is discussed in *Rothe* ed., *Sinopsis*, pp. 42-64. Mytsyk proposes Petro Kokhanovs'kyi as the author. *Ukrainskie letopisi*, pp. 25-26.

Aleksei Mikhailovich, and, in later editions, accounts of the Chyhyryn campaigns follow.

Although the Cossacks are mentioned in the account of the Chyhyryn campaigns and of the peoples and languages in the early part of the work, no mention is made of the Cossack revolt of the seventeenth century or the role of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossacks in the "return" of Kiev. The Union of Brest, the point of primary interest to most writers of the history of the period, is not even mentioned. Thus, instead of dealing with the two major events of early modern Ukrainian history—the Union of Brest and the Cossack revolts—the *Sinopsis* concentrates on legitimate rulers of Kiev, finding the proper one for its own time in the Muscovite tsar.

The *Sinopsis* served as the basis for Imperial Russian historiography and historical legitimacy in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but for Ukrainian historiography the age of the clerics had come to an end. Rather, Ukrainian clerics such as Petro Kokhanovs'kyi, compiler of the *Full Rus' Sinopsis of 1681-1682*, collected and combined materials from Ukrainian and Russian historical writings that would contribute to the formation of the new Imperial Russian historiography<sup>30</sup>. The copy of the *Khronograph* made by Leontii Bobolyns'kyi in a Chernihiv monastery in 1699 even lacked "national-patriotic" tones in his one original contribution, the preface, and Bobolyns'kyi confined his remarks to religious exhortation<sup>31</sup>. It is true that Feofan Prokopovych, professor at the Kiev Academy and author of the historical play *Vladimir*, argued for attention to history in the early eighteenth century. But that impulse, like Prokopovych himself, was to travel northward to St. Petersburg, to influence Imperial Russian affairs.

The end of clerical history-writing in the Ukraine reflected more general changes in cultural and ecclesiastical life. Ukrainian historical consciousness and historical writing had arisen in response to the threats posed to the Orthodox church at the end of the sixteenth century. The spread of learning and the political and religious controversies had awakened an interest in history among nobles, burghers, and Cossacks alike. The writers of history were still predominantly clergymen, and the great monasteries remained the centers for the writing and preservation of historical records until the end of the seventeenth century.

At the beginning of that century the Union of Brest deprived the Orthodox church of its legitimacy and its hierarchy, and it had already been losing its nobles to the Western church for over a generation. Its great successes were the revival of Kiev as a monastic and educational center and the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy, defended by the Cossacks, against the Polish government's will. Rus' consciousness burgeoned in this at-

<sup>30</sup> МΥΤΣΥΚ, *Ukrainskie letopisi*, pp. 25-27.

<sup>31</sup> *Letopis' Grigoriia Grabianki*, pp. 273-275.



mosphere of crisis, and national history-writing with it<sup>32</sup>. The old Kievan chronicles were recopied; polemical literature made use of the Rus' past. When the church was again made legal by the compromise of 1632, Mohyla could divorce the church from the all-Rus' "national" popular resistance of the years between 1596 and 1632.

Despite the initial expressions of support on the part of the clerical intellectuals for the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising, the clergy did not comfortably condone rebellion, particularly since conflicts over power soon emerged between the Cossack administration and the clergy. Political instability further weakened their support. In their politics as in their culture the Kiev higher clergymen of the 1660s to 1680s were complex men who combined many traditions. The influence of the tradition of the Polish-Lithuania Commonwealth only slowly receded as the Muscovite influence grew. What became apparent was that the Cossack Hetmanate would not develop into the autonomous political entity that would unify a stable political and religious culture. The churchmen would have to look out for their institutions themselves.

Despite all these political, military, and ecclesiastical uncertainties, however, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church underwent a considerable florescence in the 1660s to 1680s and achieved a position superior to that of Mohyla's time. Orthodoxy triumphed in Kiev, and throughout the Left Bank, clergymen occupied important positions in cultural and political life. As the church rose in status as an institution, it attracted new loyalty and new cadres. In contrast to many of the high churchmen of the early seventeenth century, who were Ruthenian nobles deeply rooted in the political culture of the Commonwealth, the new leaders, even if of noble origin, were primarily clergymen who were less attracted to the inchoate Cossack political culture than their predecessors had been to that of the Commonwealth's nobility. In this manner, the way was prepared for their shift to the new Imperial loyalty through the amalgamation of Russian and Ukrainian clerical cultures. The *Sinopsis* provided the basis for the new Imperial identity and culture.

After the 1680s, few historical texts written by churchmen dealt with the Ukraine in a broader sense. Their Orthodox faith had found a protector in the tsar and, however reluctant the higher Ukrainian clergymen had been to transfer their allegiance from Constantinople to Moscow, opportunities for advancement were numerous in the Imperial Russian church. Moscow could also protect them from both Catholics and Muslims. After the battle of Poltava of 1709, and the defeat of Mazepa, no secular power existed in the Ukraine to compete for their loyalties. The results of clerical history-writing in the 1620 to 1690 period could now be adapted to Russian needs.

<sup>32</sup> On the Cossack theme in seventeenth-century Ukrainian history-writing, see V.O. HOLOBUTS'KYI, *Problema kozatstva v ukrains'kyi ta inozemnii istoriografii XVI-pershoi polovyny XVII st.*, "Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal", 1960, no. 1, pp. 109-117.

The history-writing that had proved the antiquity and glory of the Orthodox Kiev Rus' state could now be used by the eighteenth-century Russian Orthodox state that claimed dynastic links to Volodimer.

The failure of the clergymen to continue to write Ukrainian historical works was keenly felt in the Cossack Hetmanate of the early eighteenth century. In undertaking his *Accounts of the Cossack War with the Poles* in 1718, Stefan Savyts'kyi, the chancellor of the Lubny regiment, complained that none of his countrymen "particularly from the spiritual ranks — who since the time of the emancipation from Poland lacked neither people capable nor the necessary typographical means" had written a history of the Khmel'nyts'kyi wars<sup>33</sup>. In fact, by the time Savyts'kyi wrote, Ukrainian historiography dealing with the Cossack Hetmanate flourished. Laymen, educated officials of the Cossack Hetmanate, replaced clergymen as the writers of Ukrainian history. The new political and cultural situation had created new subjects, producers, and consumers of history.

Works such as the *Eyewitness Chronicle*, Hryhorii Hrabianka's *The Events of the Most Bitter War of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi* and Samuil Velychko's *The Tale of the Cossack War Against the Poles begun by Zynovii Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi* are the major works of literature and political thought of the Cossack Hetmanate<sup>34</sup>. However much they reflect the new, post-Khmel'nyts'kyi political, social, and cultural situation in the Ukraine, they have their roots in the rebirth of history-writing in early seventeenth-century Ukraine. The relationship between the clerical period and the lay Cossack period remains one of the most intriguing questions of Ukrainian cultural history.

<sup>33</sup> The introduction to *Pověsti o kozatskoi' voině s Poliakami* published in SAMUIL VELICHKO, *Lětopis'*, 4 vols., Kiev, 1864, vol. 4, pp. 1-84.

<sup>34</sup> For discussion of the cultural significance of the Cossack histories, see MIKHAIL GRUSHEVSKII (MYKHAILO HRUSHEVS'KYI), *Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka: Neskol'ko soobrazhenii*, "Bulletin de l'Academie des Sciences de l'URSS. Classe des Sciences Sociales", 1934, pp. 215-233, translated into English as *Some Reflections on Ukrainian Historiography of the XVIII Century* in *The Eyewitness Chronicle*, part I, Munich, 1972, pp. 9-16.