

## ANCIENT AND EARLY MODERN THOUGHT IN UKRAINIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

---

PAULINA LEWIN

---

### I

In this volume Frank E. Sysyn describes the political and cultural context of Ukrainian history-writing. I propose to examine the theory and practice of Ukrainian historiography from 1600 to the 1720s.

My method is to begin with the emergence of a Ukrainian theory of historical writing in the *Rhetorica* of Theophan Prokopovych (1706/1707) and only then to examine the works created in the period from the revival of Ukrainian historical writing around 1600 to the creation of the major Cossack histories in the early eighteenth century. This retrospective method may seem unusual, but in fact it corresponds with the real chronological development of historical thought in the Ukraine. Prokopovych's treatise constitutes a theoretical summation not only of European learning, but also of Ukrainian historiographical accomplishments and requirements at the time in question. It is generally acknowledged that Renaissance *ars historica* and the achievements of Polish historians were reflected in the practice of seventeenth-century Ukrainian history-writing, and that its authors began to discuss the reasons for and the methods of writing history. Still, it was only at the end of the seventeenth and at the beginning of the eighteenth centuries that a modern history-writing based on explicit principles emerged. This period also saw the incorporation of post-Renaissance historical thought in the teaching of the professors of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century (1705-1707) Theophan Prokopovych, who would later become the famous ideologist of Peter I, taught poetics and rhetoric at the Mohyla Academy in Kiev. His book of lectures on poetics was published posthumously at the end of the eighteenth century, in 1786, and has been republished in modern times<sup>1</sup>. His book of lectures on

---

<sup>1</sup> FEOFAN PROKOPOVICH, *Sočinenija*, ed. I. P. EREMIN, Moscow-Leningrad, 1961, pp. 227-333.

rhetoric was very recently published in its Latin original<sup>2</sup> and in a Ukrainian translation<sup>3</sup>.

Following the pattern of West European manuals of poetics, Prokopovyč talked briefly about the differences between poetry and history<sup>4</sup>. He expressed his disagreement with the learned (as he admitted) Jesuit Pontanus, who thought that the historian shares something in common with the poet, for in the works of historians verses sometimes are used. Prokopovyč was inclined, instead, to share Famiano Strada's discontent with Tacitus, because Tacitus began his history with a verse.

The Kiev professor distinguished between the poet and the historian on the basis of the kind of speech they use. One speaks in verse, the other in prose. However, says Prokopovyč, Aristotle did not see a great difference in this regard, and maintained that if Herodotus's history were narrated in verse, it still would be history and not poetry. The essential difference between the two is that the historian must keep in mind the three virtues of brevity, clarity, and probability, whereas a poet must observe only the last two. Also, the historian must follow the natural sequence of events, whereas a poet presents events in whatever order required by his art. Utterly different are their styles of writing. The poet is free to embellish his narration as much as he wishes, so long as the embellishments do not affect the decorum of his work. The historian's narration, on the other hand, should be polished, but without embellishments. It should be less elaborated than an orator's speech. Hence, in his choice of words, the historian must show great discretion and even paucity. Prokopovyč also uses the authority of Aristotle to support his opinion that a historian gives accounts of real actions, as they really happened, whereas a poet either invents the whole of what he describes, or, if he is describing an event that really happened, retells it not as it was in reality, but as it could or should have happened. These were Prokopovyč's preliminary remarks on history-writing made in his class of poetics. In his class of rhetoric, which in the school curriculum followed the class of poetics, he elaborated on the problem of history-writing, covering the text of the first half of the sixth book (Liber VI), *De ratione scribendae historiae et de epistolis*<sup>5</sup>. The relevant chapters are entitled: (1) What is history and what is its aim, and about the encomium of history, (2) What he who writes history must avoid, (3) Cited are two cases of falsity in history-writing from Josephus Flavius and four evidences of ill-intentioned writing from Plutarch, (4) A method of deducing fiction in the histories of saints and histories of miracles, mainly from contemporary

<sup>2</sup> FEOFAN PROKOPOVIČ, *De Arte Rhetorica Libri X*, Kijoviae, 1706, ed. RENATE LACHMANN and BERND UHLENBRUCH, *Rhetorica Slavica*, vol. II, Böhlau Verlag, Vienna, 1982.

<sup>3</sup> FEOFAN PROKOPOVYČ, *Fylosofs'ki tvory*, vol. I: *Pro rytoryčne mystetstvo. Pizni sentencii*, Kiev, 1979.

<sup>4</sup> See *De Arte Poetica Libri III: Liber II, Caput IV*, *Poeticae et Historicae Narrationis Discrimen* (ed. 1961, pp. 286-287).

<sup>5</sup> On history, see pp. 342-358 of the Latin edition.

Latin authors, (5) What a historian should leave out and what he cannot keep silent about (from Cicero and Lucian [of Samosata]), (6) What is it that a historian should take careful note of and execute (from Lucian, Cicero, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Quintilian).

The titles of the chapters in themselves indicate the authorities Prokopovyč calls upon to either allow or to disagree with. Then, while elaborating on his subject, he refers to and cites (sometimes quite extensively) not only these authorities, but also others mentioned in the text under investigation; the additional authorities are in order: Sallustius Caius (Sallust) (p. 342, and then 346, 351, 358, 360)<sup>6</sup>, Titus Livius (Livy) (342, 351, 358, 360), Curtius Quintus Rufus (342, 360, 363), Diodorus Siculus (344), Piotr Skarga (346), Marcin Polak (346), Bellarmine (346), Marcus Junianus Justinus (346), Baronius (347, 354), Jan Kochanowski (349), Marcin [Bielski] (350), Marcin Kromer (350), Maciej Strykowski (350), Andrzej Lipski (350), Jean Bodin (350), Vergil Polydore (350), Julius Caesar (350), Tacitus (350, 351, 360), Herodotus (350), Thucydides (350, 360, 361), Famiano Strada (351, 360), Jan Kwiatkiewicz (354), Justus Lipsius (360).

Perhaps not all of the writers Prokopovyč mentioned to his students were his own direct selections. It might well have happened that he (not unlike other teachers of the time in many Catholic and Protestant schools of Western Europe) used popular compendia, such as *Artis historicae penus* (Basel, 1576; second enlarged edition 1579), which contained twelve *artes historicae* ranging from Lucian's *De scribenda historia* that was thoroughly and freely exploited in Prokopovyč's lectures, to Bodin's *Methodus*<sup>7</sup>, whom Prokopovyč named as a most authoritarian source. Another such compendium was the *Theatrum humanae vitae*, a kind of universal encyclopedia comprising quotations gathered from many sources, a part of which applies to history and historical problems<sup>8</sup>. Yet another was Jean Tixer's de Ravisi compilation, *Officina vel potius naturae historia in qua diversis disciplinis plurimi* (Paris, 1522; and many later editions<sup>9</sup>). Even so, his selections and their use prove that the Kiev professor, educated in Rome, was well versed in the various trends used eclectically by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century authors of *artes historicae* and even after that by teachers of rhetoric throughout Europe. He was familiar with various authors' way of thinking, to the innovative, boldly spirited Bodin, to the Jesuits Baronius and Famiano Strada, to the Poles Piotr Skarga and Jan Kwiatkiewicz, Prokopovyč's contemporary<sup>10</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Given are the pages of the Latin edition.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. JOHN L. BROWN, *The "Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem" of Jean Bodin: A Critical Study*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D. C., 1939, pp. 47-48.

<sup>8</sup> Twenty-nine volumes of the work, compiled by Theodor Zwinger, appeared in Basel from 1571 to 1576. Cf. BROWN, cit., pp. 177-178.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 178.

<sup>10</sup> To establish that Prokopovyč's teaching was not anachronistic in comparison to the Western Europe of his time, it can be mentioned that in England, for instance, the *Relectiones hyemales*

If we compare Prokopovyč's concise lectures on history-writing with the post-Tridentine *ars historica* in Italy so thoroughly analyzed by Giorgio Spini<sup>11</sup>, we can apply to our Kiev author the ideas that the Italian scholar formulated about the works he had investigated. Spini says that to read one of these theoreticians or to read all of them is equivalent. All of them define history as a truthful recounting of past events. For all of them history has a pedagogic goal as "magistra vitae." All of them acknowledge the Aristotelian relation of subject and form, the use of ancient annales, of new archeological findings, etc., as well as the need to adorn the true and proper history — that is, the narrative of facts from the past — by stylistic means. All of them believed that the Ciceronian conception of the "opus oratorium maximum" should be aligned with Lucian's rules of the indispensability of personal experience in military art and political life. All of them linger, with equal obligation, on the "Ciceronian" general rules of factuality in history-writing, and, at the same time, following Lucian, unhesitatingly recommend the insertion of orations, digressions, descriptions, and other stylistic embellishments of the narrative. All of them insist on shunning blame and praise and the description of base deeds and atrocities<sup>12</sup>.

Let us look at what Prokopovyč taught. What he (and possibly some of his predecessors in Kiev, whose lectures on rhetoric did not survive) taught as history-writing was the sum of knowledge of all educated men in the Ukraine, among them the historiographers of the time<sup>13</sup>.

At the beginning of his lectures on history-writing Prokopovyč refers to, as Brown says, "the inevitable *testis temporum* passage" from the *Orator* of Cicero<sup>14</sup>, that is, the passage from the second book, chapter 9:

---

*de ratione et methodo legendi historias* by DEGORY WHEAR, strongly influenced by Bodin's *Methodus* and first published in Cambridge in 1623, was republished in numerous editions thereafter and was still used as a textbook at Cambridge in the eighteenth century; earlier, in 1685, it was published in London in an English translation under the title *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories*. Cf. BROWN, cit., pp. 174-175, footnotes 65 and 69.

<sup>11</sup> GIORGIO SPINI, *I trattatisti dell'arte storica nella controriforma italiana*, in: "Quaderni di Belfagor", diretti da Luigi Russo. Quaderno primo. Contributi alla storia del Concilio di Trento e della Controriforma, Firenze, Vallecchi editore, 1948, pp. 109-136.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 114.

<sup>13</sup> Not many of the Kiev lectures on rhetoric from the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries are extant. The few that are extant, of which one (from 1635) was recently published by M. D. ROHOVYČ in Ukrainian, translation (*Filosofija v Kyjevo-Mohylans'kij akademij. Josyf Kononovyč-Horbac'kyj*, "Filosofs'ka dumka", Kiev, 1972, No. 3, pp. 89-99), are described in JA. M. STRATIJ, V. D. LITVINOV, and V. A. ANDRUŠKO, *Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mohylanskoj Akademii*, Kiev, 1982. None of them, however, examines the subject of history-writing.

<sup>14</sup> BROWN, cit., p. 40.

“By what other voice too, than that of the orator, is history, the evidence of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the directress of life, the herald of antiquity, committed to immortality?”<sup>15</sup>.

The purpose of history, says Prokopovyč, is to give us the opportunity to benefit from the examples of other people's behaviour as if from our own experience; to make us learn how to act and what to avoid. He argues against those who think that history has two tasks: to be useful, and to give pleasure. To support his opinion he cites a passage from Lucian's letter to Philo<sup>16</sup>:

“history has one task and one end — what is useful — and that comes from truth alone” ([9], p. 15).

Then, summing up Lucian's reasoning, he says that pleasantry should be discussed as an additional virtue of history-writing, but not as its end.

For the encomium of history Prokopovyč chose an extensive passage from Diodorus Siculus, who compared history readers to an audience in the theater of human lives, where everyone can choose examples that suit him and can in effect take part in the actions and councils of famous men. Thus, history allows us, despite the brevity of our human life, to survey the rise, progress, and fall of great empires, and to learn the causes of social and personal calamities.

To pass on to the next problem: what shall he who writes history avoid in consideration of probability? Prokopovyč points out that it was his good fortune to discover, just by chance, the book of Lucian of Samosata about how to write history, which treats the subject so ingeniously that nothing is lacking; therefore he relies on it completely. However, Prokopovyč's good fortune was due not to chance alone. Characterizing “the elegant humanist tradition” taken over by the post-Tridentine currents, Brown mentions the basic ancient sources (beside Cicero's *De Oratore*) that the currents were drawn upon: “A small satirical writing of Lucian, *De conscribenda historia*, was extravagantly esteemed and quoted in spite of its inconsequence... *De Thucydides Historiis Judicium* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>17</sup> was of minor importance. The passage in Aristotle's *Poetics* setting forth the distinction between history and poetry engendered commentary in all the Italian arts<sup>18</sup>”.

In the second and then the fifth and sixth chapters of his work, Prokopovyč follows Lucian openly. In the second chapter he recapitulates Lu-

<sup>15</sup> My quotations of Cicero are from J. S. Watson's English translation of Cicero, *On Oratory and Orators*, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1860.

<sup>16</sup> Quotations are from the Greek edition of Lucian, with an English translation by K. KILBURN, in the Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Mass.-London, 1959. The letter appearing under the title “How to write history” is in volume VI, pp. 1-72.

<sup>17</sup> Published, like Lucian's work, in the above-mentioned *Artis historicae penus* (Basel, 1579).

<sup>18</sup> BROWN, cit., pp. 55-56.

cian's opinions concerning the three virtues of history-writing — brevity, clarity, and probability — and the three vices that are a danger to the historian. He elaborates on the latter, in particular. They are: being insufficiently informed, becoming excited or involved, and taking things too lightly, that is, without any concern for veracity or even probability. To avoid such dangers, the historian should not believe anyone entirely, even those who personally took part in the event the historian wants to describe. He should believe only people who can be believed, and the many whose information is concordant. On the events of the ancient past, the historian should seek out information in the works of the most recognized authors and should follow the most distinguished and the greatest of them. If the historian finds differences or discrepancies in their works, he should not select his own preferences, but should allow the unresolved doubts to remain as they were. The historian should also investigate the time and location of the event, using geographers' chronologists' and other authors' works. And if he writes about events that happened recently, it is useful for him to visit the places where they happened. Here Sallust, who for his history-writing traveled through Africa, is cited by Prokopovych as an example. As a negative example, Prokopovych mentions, among others, Piotr Skarga's chronological mistake in his addendum to the life of John of Damascus.

Lucian dwells particularly on the danger of being too enthusiastic, involved, partial, and so does Prokopovych. The Kievan says that a historian should not seek anyone's favors, should not fall in love with anyone, should not become enflamed by anger, should not be dazzled by hatred or envy, and, in general, should not take the side of any party, but should always care for the truth. He cites Lucian:

"Most historians [who commit such a fault] neglect to record the events and spend their time lauding rulers and generals, extolling their own to the skies and slandering the enemy's beyond all reserve; they do not realize that the dividing line and frontier between history and panegyric is not a narrow isthmus, but rather a mighty wall" ([7]), p. 11).

Lucian, says Prokopovych, brings up many examples, among them a historian who compared a Roman general to Achilles and the Persian king to Thersites (not understanding that "Achilles" would have been a better choice if he were killing a "Hector" rather than a "Thersites"<sup>19</sup>). Prokopovych himself points out the similar faults of many ecclesiastic historians, and gives his own examples. From this standpoint he reproaches Baronius, who was, in his opinion, a very learned and assiduous scholar indeed, but who saw the main purpose of history-writing as praising the pope.

Prokopovych fully accepted Lucian's understanding of historical truth and of the historian's work. Thus, the Kiev professor repeats, after his authoritative source, that

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LUCIAN [14], pp. 21, 23.

“the historian’s sole task is to tell the tale as it happened. This he cannot do as long as he is afraid of Artaxerxes when he is his physician, or hopes to get a purple cufta, a gold necklet, and a Nisaeen horse as a reward for the eulogies in his work” ([40], p. 55).

And then he transmits Lucian’s precept:

“Do not write with your eye just on the present, to win praise and honour from your contemporaries; aim at eternity and prefer to write for posterity: present your bill for your book to them, so that it may be said of you: ‘He was a free man, full of frankness, with no adulation or servility anywhere, but everywhere truthfulness’” ([61], p. 71).

Prokopovyč also brings up Lucian’s example of Alexander’s remark to one Onesicritus:

“I should be glad, Onesicritus, to come back to life for a little while after my death to discover how men read these present events then. If now they praise and welcome them, do not be surprised: they think, everyone of them, that this is a fine bait to catch my goodwill” ([40], p. 55, 57).

However, says Prokopovyč, this does not mean that in history there is no room for occasional praise<sup>20</sup> or reproach; it means only that such comments must be given at the proper time and kept within reasonable limits, to avoid displeasing future readers<sup>21</sup>, and not for them whom he praises now.

In explaining the third vice, Prokopovyč uses Lucian’s example of the historian from Corinth who said that he has seen how the Parthians used live serpents bound to long poles and raised on high to create terror in battle, and then, in the encounter, freed them and sent them against the enemy. But this historian himself, says Lucian,

“had never set a foot outside Corinth... And he read all this to an audience of Corinthians who knew for a fact that he had not even seen a battle painted on a wall” ([29], pp. 43, 45).

The third chapter of Prokopovyč’s book calls upon the authority, among others, of Bodin and Jan Kochanowski. It deals with the problem of legendary sources and represents Prokopovyč’s perception of “the endless debates about the origin of peoples that raged during the sixteenth century” and “were a manifestation of the new national consciousness” at the time when “each nation sought to establish a genealogy more illustrious than its neighbors”, and “a great mass of bombastic nonsense was printed<sup>22</sup>”. Bodin refuted such extravagant claims. So does Prokopovyč, while referring

<sup>20</sup> Cf. LUCIAN [9], p. 15.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> BROWN, cit., pp. 79-80.

to the ninth chapter of Bodin's *Methodus*. However, the Kievan sees a certain usefulness in oral legendary sources, if there are no others to rely upon. Thus, he is inclined to share Kochanowski's approach to Lech, the legendary ancestor of the Poles. His legend survived in people's memory and could consequently be used by Marcin Polak, Kromer, and Strykowski to reconstitute the remote past of the nation<sup>23</sup>.

At the end of the third chapter, Prokopovyč once more instructs the historian-to-be to abstain as much as possible from the use of sublime, lofty words; not to touch upon anything that does not apply to history; and not to put forward anything shameful, that is, not to blemish anyone's virtue by pointing to his vices. The last is sometimes permissible, but only when the very substance of a happening cannot be explained without showing some vice. If there is any doubt, a historian should give preference to the more positive approach or pass the doubt along to his reader.

The fourth chapter of Prokopovyč's lectures on history-writing gives precepts concerning matters of church history. Regarding the history of the church as a component of universal history equal to natural history, human history, and divine history was also a signum of early modern time<sup>24</sup>. As Fueter points out, modern ecclesiastical history was an outcome of the Protestant Reformation and was ushered in by the Magdeburg *Centuries*. These were taken into consideration by independent minds like the French historian François Baudouin, who, as writes Brown, "taught in several German universities, changing his religion to suit his environment with a facility which passed into legend<sup>25</sup>". Thus, like Bodin before him and not unlike Prokopovyč (once Orthodox, then Uniate, then again Orthodox suspected of being a crypto-Protestant) after him, Baudouin was a highly questionable personality to the competing religious denominations of his time. The subject was taken over by the Counter-Reformation, in particular by the Jesuits, both the historians *sensu stricto* (Possevino, Baronius) and the authors of lives of saints. In their turn, the Counter-Reformation authors provided their opponents, the later polemical authors, with needed data and arguments. Prokopovyč's lecture belongs to that category.

In chapter five the Kiev professor reminds his students of two laws which, according to Cicero, a historian should follow:

"the first, that the historian must not dare to tell any falsehood, and the next, that he must be bold enough to tell the whole truth<sup>26</sup>".

<sup>23</sup> On Kochanowski's views on the matter, see JAN MALICKI, *Jana Kochanowskiego 'O Czechu i Lechu historia naganiona' wobec historiografii polskiej XVI wieku*, "Ruch Literacki", R. XVIII, 1977, Z.6 (105), pp. 431-445.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. SPINI, cit., p. 121, and EDUARD FUETER, *Geschichte der Neuren Historiographie*, München and Berlin, 1936. Reprint 1985 by Orell Füssli Verlag, Zürich und Swäbisch Hall, book III, section A: "The ecclesiastic history," passim.

<sup>25</sup> BROWN, cit., p. 54.

<sup>26</sup> CICERO, cit., XV, p. 99.



Then, advising that Cicero's thoughts can be learned from Lucian's doctrine, Prokopovyč follows the latter, using Lucian's examples and explaining that in history-writing to tell the whole truth does not mean to describe absolutely everything that really happened. For instance, when an emperor or a general leads a campaign, it could be an undoubted truth that he stopped in such or another place, that there he drank some beer and ate a chicken or a goose. But does the historian have to describe such events to be truthful? The conclusion is that a historian must concentrate on the events which are true and important. Hence, he should not omit anything essential, which can be compared to a hinge on which the whole matter swings. There belong the persons of emperors, generals, senators, and the like. However, not all their actions should be taken into account, but only such that are connected with the main event, as, for example, a war, and the events without which one cannot understand the course of this war. The same applies to commoners, if the course of the event depended on their actions. But everything that has no impact on the course of an important event should be omitted. The historian must thus have the skill to distinguish what is important and what is not. And, as Lucian proved, that is not an easy task<sup>27</sup>.

The sixth chapter teaches how to meet the demands formulated in the previous lecture. Prokopovyč quotes again from Lucian, who said that he who wants to write history should be not

“without ability to understand and express himself, keen sighted, one who could handle affairs if they were turned over to him, a man with the mind of a soldier”. “Let him go to a camp and see soldiers exercising or drilling and learn of arms and engines; again, let him know what ‘in column’, what ‘in line’ mean, how the companies ... are manoeuvred, the meaning of ‘deploy’ and ‘invest’” ([37], pp. 51, 53).

Relying on ancient historians and rhetoricians, and exploiting Lucian, the Kievan recommends the following to the historian-to-be: first,

“when he has collected all or most of the facts, make them into a series of notes, a body of material [which is the *inventio* of history]. Then after arranging them into order [which is the *dispositio*], let him give it beauty [which is the domain of *elocutio*]<sup>28</sup>.

A written history, taught Prokopovyč, should consist of three parts: exordium, narration and epilogue. The first and last parts should be short. The historian, unlike the orator, should omit in his preface any appeal for a favorable hearing and, as Lucian points out, should rather give his audience what will interest and instruct them. He should show that what he is going

<sup>27</sup> Cf. LUCIAN, [19], p. 29; [20], p. 31; [27], p. 39; [28], p. 41; [49], p. 63; [56], p. 67, 69.

<sup>28</sup> For the quotations, see LUCIAN [48], p. 61.

to say will be important, essential, personal. He should set forth the causes and outline the main events, just as the best historians, e.g. Thucydides, did<sup>29</sup>.

The *dispositio* of the main narrative part of a history work, that is, the disposition of the events which are described there, should keep to the natural chronological and cause-and-effect sequence. But if at the same time more than one important event happened, in different places, the historian should first describe the main event which caused everything that happened, and only then should he return to what happened before.

The final part of a history work, says Prokopovyč, may be treated as an addendum to its main subject. He repeats the precepts of the ancients on the qualities of a historian's eloquence, but also displays his knowledge of early-modern divergences of opinions in citing, as an example, the high evaluation of Tacitus by Justus Lipsius<sup>30</sup> and contradictory opinion of him held by Famiano Strada.

## II

Now let us examine if and how actual Ukrainian historiography corresponded with Prokopovyč's teaching. At the end of the seventeenth century there existed in the Ukraine two approaches, one can say, toward history-writing: the traditional one, which was used by the defenders of Orthodoxy, mostly clerics, to prove the dignity of their faith and tradition; and the innovative one, which followed modern trends of factuality, objectivity, actuality, sobriety, and logic in account-giving and style. The first one used the Kiev chronicles (mostly the Hypatian chronicle), the Bible, the fathers of the Church, and also some foreign sources to give their work more authority, above all, Polish Renaissance historiography, which also exploited the old Kiev chronicles.

Much has been done by modern scholars over the last two centuries to point out these reciprocal borrowings and stylistic influences. As for the second trend, it was well accounted for by Prokopovyč, who, while using ancient and modern authorities, seemed to summarize the experiences and the demands of the political and national awakening of the time when the Ukrainians, in particular the Cossacks, needed to justify themselves and to understand the grounds and causes of the Xmel'nyc'kyj war.

1. One of the earliest chronicles in the time of interest to us was the *Hustyn Chronicle*, composed in the 1620s, but extant in a copy of 1670,

<sup>29</sup> Cf. LUCIAN [53-54], p. 65, 67.

<sup>30</sup> On the "rebellious wave of tacitism in history-writing," see SPINI, cit., p. 114. On the perception of Lipsius in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian Commonwealth, see BARBARA OTWINOWSKA, *Modele i style prozy w dyskusjach na przełomie XVI i XVII wieku*, Wrocław etc., 1967, chapter VI.

which bears a noteworthy preface written by Mixail Losyc'kyj<sup>31</sup>. The chronicle, which was attributed to Kievan clerical circles, sought to give historical legitimacy to Rus'. For the beginnings of Slavs and Rus' history it looks to the biblical past and brings the account down to 1597. Its title (which probably dates from the copy of 1670) reads: *A chronicle beginning with the first flood of the world, and Babel and the division of tongues, and the scattering [of peoples] upon the face of the earth; and about different nations; and also about the beginning of the Slavonic Russian nation; and when Kiev was established; and how the pious devout prince Volodimer baptized the Rus' land; and about the great principality of Kiev; and about the Greek emperors. This chronicle was compiled in Little Russia at the Monastery of the Holy Life-giving Trinity of the community of Hustyn-Pryluki, with the blessings of the most reverend in God master, Father Avksentij Joakymovyč, ihumen of this same holy abode in the year 1670, month of August, second day.*

The chronicle's form and content were largely determined by the use of Kiev's ancient Hypatian codex. Also, some local as well as Lithuanian chronicles were used, together with Polish Renaissance histories, and their methodologies, such as discussion of sources and their veracity, were exploited. Marginal source notes also indicate the use of Baronius and other sources, but these notes are not always reliable.

The new approach toward history, which was ushered in by the tumultuous times of Xmel'nyc'kyj's uprising and the modern learning at the Kiev school, can be traced to Losyc'kyj's foreword to the copy of 1670. At the outset Losyc'kyj points out that his understanding of the goal of history-writing is patriotic, and patriotism is an inborn quality of every man. So, he says:

"Every man is obsessed by a certain inborn desire and love toward his fatherland that attracts everyone the way a lodestone attracts iron" (p. 233).

To convince his learned reader, he cites Homer's well-known words about the everlasting desire to see at least the smoke from the chimneys of one's fatherland. The same inborn love stimulated Ruthenian chroniclers to write so as not to let the events of the glorious past remain hidden from future generations of the Rus' nation and from the world. For the history of Rus' is a part of the world's history, and as such begins with the biblical flood from which various nations originated and established themselves in various parts of the world. Losyc'kyj emphasizes the understanding of the history of one nation as a part of world history by connecting Rus' history with the Greek monarchy (that is, Byzantium) and with its occupation by the Turks. From his point of view, the writing and reading of history is mankind's way to overcome the oblivion of death in which human bodies are buried. This precept comes from the Bible, for the holy prophet Moses

<sup>31</sup> For the text, see *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, Spb., 1843, t. 2, pp. 233-373.

said: "Ask thy father, and he will shew thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee" [Deut. 32:7]<sup>32</sup>.

2. During the last three decades of the seventeenth century the Ukrainian *Litopys Samovydcja* (*Eyewitness chronicle*) was composed<sup>33</sup>. Modesty, or, to the contrary, ambition to write history in a modern way caused its author to compose not so much a chronicle as rather an account of the important events he himself had witnessed. Hence the name given to the unknown author by nineteenth-century scholars. The main event the writer found important to convey to posterity was Xmel'nyc'kyj's uprising. His account is a very matter-of-fact one. There are no Church-Slavonicisms and none of the rhetorical, stylistic embellishments characteristic of Ukrainian history-writing based on ancient Kievan and Polish Renaissance chronicles.

Ukrainian and Russian scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have seen this absence as proof of the author's lack of higher education, which Ukrainians were then receiving at the Kiev Mohyla Academy and at other schools in the Ukraine or abroad<sup>34</sup>. I am tempted to doubt such a judgment. This way of writing history could just as well — as I have already mentioned — been chosen consciously by the author as a more progressive, more modern approach. Supporting that hypothesis is the author's obvious effort to take no side, but to judge every event as such, objectively, just as Prokopovyč was to teach. This approach allows any other scholar or reader to interpret the author's political and social stand, and even his liking of one or another person, in any variety of ways.

In accordance with more modern historiography and historical theory, which holds that a good historian must concentrate on the most important events and must first show the cause and then the effect, our author begins his account with the very words: "The beginning and cause of Xmel'nyc'kyj's war was..." (p. 45) followed by an enumeration of the wrongs done by the Lachs to the Orthodox people in general and to the Cossacks and Xmel'nyc'kyj in particular. Then the author explains the circumstances which made the Cossack hetman seek the friendship of the Crimean khan and which made the Cossacks join Xmel'nyc'kyj and proclaim him their leader. This section is obviously the *exordium*. The second chapter of the eye witness account (pp. 49-56) recounts the "war of 1648 itself". There, through many specific military details, the most important military events are brought forward in a way that shows their cause and effect relationship. The author again and again uses such expressions as "and so", "thus", "all this happened because", "and because of that", "and from this time on", "and this caused that...". In the subsequent chapters, which cover year-by-year the period from 1649 to 1701, the cause and effect approach remains. There we also find a new understanding of the international

<sup>32</sup> Quotations from the Bible are from the King James version.

<sup>33</sup> For the text, see *Litopys Samovydcja*, ed. I. DZYRA, Kiev, 1971.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, the editor's introduction.

status of the author's fatherland. In the Samovydec's report it is not the biblical past or even the Kievan past, witnessed in the old chronicles that were also used by Polish historians, that is to prove that Ukrainian history is a part of the world's history. The author himself does not engage in polemics with those who denied the antiquity, dignity, and standards of the Ruthenians and their faith. He does not use the elaborate baroque style to prove that his learning is as good as that of his adversaries. Instead, he describes the interest and participation of foreign powers in the events in the Ukraine. For example, in writing about the meeting at Perejaslav in 1649, he points out:

"There were also at this council the Hungarian king's envoys. And so the fame of the Cossacks and of Xmel'nyc'kyj spread out to all lands [of the world]. Various monarchs sent [to Xmel'nyc'kyj] their protestations of friendship and gifts. His Majesty the Tsar's envoys came. And envoys of the Wallachian and Multanian hospodars began to arrive with great gifts" (p. 56).

However, in his conclusion the author shows his objectivity, for he adds that all the attention paid by foreign powers

"made Xmel'nyc'kyj even more arrogant and less inclined to make the then justly-needed agreements with the Polish monarch, despite the gifts he received from the king's envoys and despite the advantageous promises he was given. Instead, he made an agreement with the Crimean khan and so brought to our lands the Crimean, Bilhorod, Nahaj, and Circassian hordes for the destruction of Christianity" (p. 56).

The account for the year 1654 has the title: "The war of His Majesty the Tsar begins" (p. 66). From that point on the author is preoccupied with Xmel'nyc'kyj's relations with Muscovy and their development and with the military actions that followed and their consequences. He also pays attentions to Muscovy's other wars, such as the one with Sweden in 1656. The author very seldom engages in a description of a marginal event, and even then he makes it clear that he does so because he happened to be present on the spot and because it helps to understand the mood of the time. Such is the report on the year 1655, which includes a note (*vzminka*), about a fire at a church in Korsun' during a funeral. The author says: "I am writing about it, for I myself was there and quite frightened, too" (p. 71). He also remarks that it could have been a sign of God's particular anger over all the troubles caused then and there by man.

In the report on the year 1657 Samovydec writes about Xmel'nyc'kyj's successful efforts to engage the Hungarian and Swedish kings against the Polish kingdom and about the consequences of those actions. He mentions Xmel'nyc'kyj's death and funeral, briefly, but writes at length (here and for the subsequent years in his chronicle) about the struggle and intrigues among the Cossacks, about the involvement of the Polish, Muscovite, Crimean, Turkish, and other neighbouring powers, and about the church affairs in the Ukraine that followed the hetman's death.

In what I consider the epilogue to the chronicle, for the year 1682, Samovydec reports on events in Moscow after Fedor Alekseevič's death, mainly because, as he says, not only the tsar's military men then in Moscow were executed, but also those then in Kiev, Černihiv, and other Ukrainian cities were brought to Moscow, tortured there, and executed. For the next year, 1683, he reports on Jan Sobieski's victory, in Vienna, an encounter before which the Polish king had mobilized forces and means "all over his realm and in the Ukraine" (p. 138), and after which many enemy captives were imprisoned in Lviv.

3. At about the same time that the *Hustyn Chronicle* was copied and supplied with Losyc'kyj's foreword and the *Samovydec's chronicle* was written, the chronicle by monk Leontij Bobolyns'kyj was also produced. Its title clearly indicates to which of the above-mentioned two trends it belongs: *Annals, that is, a chronicle from various authors and from many historians written [now] in our dialect in the Monastery of the Holy Trinity and Saint Elias in Černihiv by the hieromonk of the Vydubec' Monastery of Kiev in the year from the Nativity of Christ 1699, the month of April, 23rd day*<sup>35</sup>. Bobolyns'kyj represents a very different kind of learning than does Prokopovyč. His is strictly religious and Orthodox. His language is a very ornate Church Slavonic and his style is influenced by the works of the fathers of the Eastern Church and the Bible. His approach toward history is determined by the theology of providence, as is most clearly evident in the author's introductory "Word to any of my dear readers," which begins as follows:

"God, who has neither beginning nor end, Creator of all things visible and invisible [cf. Colos., 1:16], created with His hands a man and breathed into him a soul [cf. Gen., 2:7] to make him able to know his Creator and to love Him. And thus, blessed [man] was created by blessed immortality (but himself is mortal). Nothing in his earthly life shall be more desirable and more necessary than to bring all his thoughts, the whole of his diligence and learning to the greatest Wisdom, which teaches him to know, and love, and worship God his Creator" (p. 273).

From Bobolyns'kyj's point of view the writing and reading of history must serve this very purpose first and foremost. This is why, says the author, the history of every nation shall be told from the very beginning, which is the act of Creation. He ends the foreword by advising his readers to satiate themselves not with food, but with reading, and not only alone, but by reading to those who do not know how to read. For this is the way to make people know God, through the deeds and acts of other men and monarchs.

<sup>35</sup> Fragments were published as a supplement to GRIGORIJ GRABIANKA, *Dějstvija prezěl'noj brani i ot načala polakov krvavoj nebyvaloj brani Bogdana Xmelnickogo...s poljaki...* Izdana vremiennoju komissieju dlja razbora drevnix aktov, Kiev, 1854, pp. 273-327.

Bobolyns'kyj's chronicle is a typical compilatory work accounting for church and lay events from the beginning of the world up to the author's own time — the middle of the seventeenth century, which he treats briefly.

4. In 1672-73 Feodosii Sofonovyč, the archimandrite of St. Michael of the Golden Domes Monastery in Kiev, wrote his *Krojnika* in three parts, which were dedicated to the history of Rus', of Lithuania, and of Poland. Sofonovyč was a graduate of the Kiev Mohyla Collegium, and in 1653-55 served as its vice-rector. Like the author of the foreword to the *Hustyn Chronicle*, Sofonovyč saw history-writing as a patriotic duty, a means to prove and defend the dignity of the Ruthenians. In the preface to his work he wrote:

"I have considered it a proper matter to learn myself and to tell other Ruthenian sons from whence Rus' arose and how the Ruthenian state continued from its initial establishment until now. For it is necessary for everyone to know all about his fatherland and to be able to answer other people's questions about it, because men who do not know their origins are regarded as stupid<sup>36</sup>".

Each of the three parts of Sofonovyč's history went back to the biblical past before showing how each of the three states arose and entered each other's history. The Rus' segment is based on the tradition of the south Ruthenian chronicles and on Strykowski. The Lithuanian segment depends primarily on Strykowski and Guagnini, while the Polish part relies on Guagnini and Bielski. Local Ukrainian chronicles that have not come down to us provided much of the information for the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Personal experience played a very small role in Sofonovyč's work<sup>37</sup>.

Although the system of dating (from the beginning of the world) maintains the Church's Byzantine tradition, the choice of language — Ruthenian, Middle Ukrainian — represents a major step away from the Slavonic tradition in which the *Hustyn* and *Bobolyns'kyj*'s chronicles were written. For Sofonovyč viewed the language and the simple style he applied as a means for assuring that all the "Ruthenian sons" would understand their history and origin. However, to make his "simple language" sound as literary, well organized, educated, he inserted many Polish words and constructions and so polonized it.

5. In 1674, the Kiev Monastery of the Caves published the so-called *Synopsis* attributed by some scholars to Innokentij Gizel. The work,

<sup>36</sup> For a discussion of the Sofonovyč text, see IURII MYCYK, "Krojnika" Feodosiia Sofonoviča kak istoričeskij istočnik i pamjatnik ukrainskoj istoriografii XVII veka. Avtoreferat, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1975, and his *Ukrainskie letopisi XVII veka*, Dnipropetrovs'k, 1978, pp. 16-21. The quotation is on p. 18.

<sup>37</sup> MYCYK, *Ukrainskie letopisi*, pp. 18-19.

republished in the Ukraine and in Moscow about 30 times, tended to show the historical unity or oneness of the Ukraine and Russia. Its title reads: *Sinopsis, that is, a short collection from various chroniclers about the beginnings of the Slavono-Rus' nation and about the founding princes of the God-preserved city of Kiev; and about the life of the holy, God-fearing Volodimer, prince of Kiev and first monarch of all Rus'; and about the successors of his devout Rus' state even up to [the times of] our most illustrious and devout sovereign, the great prince Aleksej Mixajlovyč, the monarch of Great, Little, and White Rus'*<sup>38</sup>. The text has many errors and shows little erudition, which puts Gizel's authorship in doubt. It begins with the biblical descent of the Slavs, Rus', and related peoples, and, after considerable attention to Volodimer and the Christianization, recounts the progression of the rulers of Kiev down to the Tatar conquest. It also includes a lengthy account of the struggle of the great prince of Moscow, Dmitrij Ivanovič, with Mamaj. No mention is made of the Cossack revolt of the seventeenth century or the role of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj.

The major sources to the *Synopsis* were the *Hustyn chronicle*, Sofonovyč, Kosov's *Paterikon*, Strykowski, Kromer, Guagnini, and a Polish translation of Botero. There are many other sources listed in the columns of the work to prove the author's erudition and to give authority to his account. But scholars have demonstrated that they are frequently erroneous. Dating is usually dual, and the language is Slavonic. Although the Ukrainian reader can learn a good deal about the history of his land in it, the discourse was not a continuous account nor did it extend far beyond dynastic-political and ecclesiastical history.

6. The new trend, reflected and theoretically brought up-to-date in Prokopovyč's lectures, found its full realization in the Cossack chronicle of 1710, entitled *The events of the great and from the beginnings of the Poles most bloody unheard-of war of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, the hetman of Zaporož'ia, against the Poles during the time of the most illustrious Polish kings Władysław and then Kazimierz, begun in the year 1648 and still unfinished ten years after Xmel'nyc'kyj's death. Compiled from various chroniclers and from a diary written during that war in the city of Hadjač by the efforts of Hryhorij Hrabjanka and confirmed by testimonies of local old-timers, in the year 1710*<sup>39</sup>.

In his "Notice to the reader about the intention with which this history was written" (pp. I-IV), Hrabjanka himself speaks at length of his understanding of history-writing. He starts with a statement asserting the ancient origins and the importance of the Cossacks to the Christian world. Thus, he reminds his readers that

<sup>38</sup> For a reprint of the *Sinopsis* with an extensive historical introduction, see *Sinopsis: Facsimile mit einer Einleitung*, ed. HANS ROTHE. Vienna and Cologne, 1983.

<sup>39</sup> For the publication of the text, see footnote 35.



“In the books compiled by the ancient Roman and Polish (Kromer, Bielski, Strykowski, Guagnini, Kochowski) as well as German (Pufendorf and Huebner) historiographers...a great deal is said about the many battles the Cossacks fought against the Muslims. [These historiographers] told [the world] how the Cossacks, who of yore gathered on the uninhabited meadows in the basin of the river Dnieper, many times defeated Turks and Tatars not with gains on their mind, but moved by the desire to spread the Christian faith”.

Aware of the accusations made against the Cossacks concerning their lawless and cruel behaviour, Hrabjanka excuses them, citing at least two of their virtues:

“First, they gave freedom to Christian prisoners of war whom they rescued from the predatory Tatars. Second, they forcibly defended the Polish kingdom and Rus’ from the various menaces caused by the Tatars”.

Then, to prove the Cossacks’ right to their realm, Hrabjanka says that

“The limits of their lands were clearly shown to the world by cartographers”.

After situating the Cossacks in world history, Hrabjanka, not unlike the Samovydec (whom he follows in many instances), explains the cause of the Cossacks’ hostility against the Poles. Here he attempts to be even less personal and less emotional than his predecessor, and thus adduces historically documented data, such as the decisions of Polish councils

“not to have on the Ruthenian lands any Ruthenian palatines, castellans, starostas, judges, or any other authorities, in contravention of the [guarantees and privileges] given by king Kazimierz I in the year 1340 [and despite the fact] that the king commended his successors to protect these privileges”.

His, the historian’s goal, says Hrabjanka, is to prevent the Cossacks’ deeds, both illustrious and those forced by circumstances, to be buried in total oblivion. Their exploits should go down for posterity.

As if following Prokopovych’s precepts, Hrabjanka assures his readers that he collected from the diaries of Cossack warriors and from the works of clerical and lay chroniclers only such information as “was written with a due degree of probability”. About his use of oral testimonies he says:

“I also collected accounts made by eyewitnesses of the events who are still alive, for their reports confirm the veracity of the chroniclers”.

He also emphasizes that by indicating all his sources he removes all suspicions that he could have added anything from his own divagations. This emphasis shows how conscious Hrabjanka was of the way he chose to write history, that is, by the new way, based upon undoubted authorities, documents, and direct testimonies.

In his foreword, in a polemical tone, Hrabjanka defends the place and importance of contemporary events in history-writing against historians' preference for the fame of very ancient monarchs. He finds the historians' denial, by silence, of the most famous war-deeds of their own time not only oppressive, but even harmful to the young generation. If he himself uses the Bible and accounts from ancient history, it is not so much to show the origins of the world's history or of the rulers, as, rather, to prove that without the written word we would know nothing and would be unable to benefit from a knowledge of the past. Thus he writes:

"But who would know about Moses, the leader appointed by God, who delivered the Jewish people from laboring for the Egyptians and brought them out, miraculously going on dry ground through the midst of the [...] sea, and who drowned the monarch of Egypt and his warriors, if not the testimony of the Scriptures? Who [would know about] Nebuchadnezzar, the first in fame upon the earth? [About] Cyrus who was the first to fill the sea with ships? [About] Alexander exalted in fame? And [about] Augustus who was the absolute ruler of the Universe? And finally also [about] Dimitr, the Muscovite prince, who destroyed one million two hundred thousand Tatars indulged in pride with their Mamaj and who forced their Tatar kingdom to bend to the Russians [if not the written word]?"

Written history, Hrabjanka maintains, gives subsequent generations not only a knowledge of the world's and their own nation's past, but also the words to express themselves, just as the Scriptures gave the prophets and eloquent orators godly words for the adornment of their speeches. While reading very often and with delight about the exploits of many [foreign] "victors of history," he himself, says Hrabjanka, "came to understand what a great gain their immortal fame was to their nations". To his extreme grief he noticed then that the heroic deeds performed in his own fatherland, which differ in no way from other countries in military prowess, have sunk into deep oblivion.

Once more the temptation to link Hrabjanka's approach to Prokopovyč's precepts, arises as in the chronicler's foreword we read that his decision to write the history of his own time was not prompted by a selfish love of fame, but was inflamed with the common good and that for the sake of it he concentrated on the most remarkable event

"to reveal to the world the famous exploits of Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj the most faithful Ruthenian son and sensible leader".

The end of Hrabjanka's address to the reader contains one more feature characteristic of the new Ukrainian trend. It opposes the history of the nation as a whole and of its unknown individuals against the history of rulers. Thus, Hrabjanka states that Xmel'nyč'kyj proved that not only monarchs, but also their

"subjects are able to arm themselves strongly, to withstand the most powerful foreign monarchs in defense of their fatherland".

Even preceding the foreword to his reader, Hrabjanka explains in a very short note following the title page that in beginning to write the story of the Cossack's exploits and wars, he found it necessary first, for a better understanding, to tell about the ancestors of these people, to answer such questions as from where did they get their name, from which tribe and nation, and to explain how their ancestors, the Khazars, from the time of their ancestor Gomer, the grandson of Noah<sup>40</sup>, wandered as nomads from one country to another; also, how the Khazars' relations with other peoples and their languages changed, and how they grew to be a great power and created their own empires, and how after military defeats they became transformed into Cossacks. The note concludes with the author's explanation to the reader about the necessity for a long preliminary section on this particular subject, for it will make the reader eager to learn what happened afterwards and will prepare him well to understand the main subject of Hrabjanka's history.

In accordance with the note, the chronicle itself (after the foreword to the reader) starts with a distinctive section (chapter one)<sup>41</sup>, which, following the theory put forward at the Mohyla Academy by Prokopovyč, we may define as the *exordium*. Hrabjanka's *exordium* is a discussion on the origins of the Cossacks based on detailed chronological and geographical arguments, skillfully linked in a logical chain. In many regards Hrabjanka replaces old myths with new ones, based upon "undeniable" sources. However, no exact references to these sources are given. Hrabjanka says only that extensive information about the courageous exploits of the Khazars can be found in ancient Greek and Roman chronicles, where it was stated how greatly they helped the Persian ruler Cyrus, and also Alexander the Great and the Roman Augustus, in their conquest of the power of this world (p. 5).

Hrabjanka's extensive discussion does little to elucidate the early history of Eastern Europe. What it does do is to provide a genealogy for a Cossack-Ukrainian nation that incorporates various Slavic and non-Slavic peoples in an attempt to show the ancient and related origins of the Cossacks and the Ukrainians, or Little Russians.

Hrabjanka's language and style in this erudite *exordium* are those of an educated man who has restrained himself for the sake of lucidity. To convince his reader he uses facts rather than rhetoric — an abundance of facts taken, as he affirms, from authoritative ancient historiographers.

<sup>40</sup> It is worth mentioning that the same claim was made by a French author, GUILLAUM POSTEL, in his *L'Histoire memorable des expeditions depuys le deluge faictes par les Gauloys ou Françoys depuys la France jusques en Asie, ou en Thrace en l'orientale partie de l'Europe*, 1522. About this work Brown writes that it contains "a great mass of bombastic nonsense" to show "that the Gauls play in universal history the same role that the Hebrews played in the Old Testament" (BROWN, cit., p. 80).

<sup>41</sup> The enumeration of the chapters is mine—PL.

Following the new trend of Ukrainian historiography, Hrabjanka moves in logical succession to the main narrative part of his work and to his main subject, that is, to the — in his estimation — most important event in the recent history of his fatherland: the Xmel'nyc'kyj war. With obstinate constancy he repeats in his titles and in the text of subsequent chapters phrases that indicate the historian's belief that it is necessary, first of all, to retrace and depict to the world the real cause of the event. Thus he emphasizes his approach toward history-writing as an exposition of cause and effect relations based on facts and documents. For example, the title of the comparatively long chapter 17 (pp. 95-99), dealing with a period already well in the midst of the war, reads: "About the cause of the battle of Berestečko". And only thereafter does there follow an elaborate chapter (pp. 99-105) about the battle itself. Then, another chapter (22) is entitled, "Why and for what reason did Xmel'nyc'kyj submit to the Russians, and about the battle of Drižpole in 1654".

In his narrative the chronicler consistently uses such expressions as "v tom vyna syceva" (the cause of it was such), "poneže" (because of, since), "toho rady" (for that reason), "čto uvidav" (learning it), etc. He largely exploits quotations (or made-up quotations) of Xmel'nyc'kyj's many messages and speeches to the Cossacks, and his and other persons' talks with Polish and foreign officials. He cites popular poems and songs about Xmel'nyc'kyj and his war composed at that time. He recapitulates and often quotes *in extenso* or in part from many documents, for example, from Xmel'nyc'kyj's letter to the Polish king of 2 June 1648 (pp. 49-51), Jan Kazimierz's letter to the Crimean khan and the khan's answer (pp. 75-77), Xmel'nyc'kyj's ordinances (pp. 77-78), Jan Kazimierz's privileges sent to the Zaporozhian Army and to Xmel'nyc'kyj in December 1650 in response to their supplication (pp. 89-92), an excerpt from the Cossack register on the numbers of Cossacks in every regiment with the names of their colonels (p. 94), a copy of Xmel'nyc'kyj's letter to tsar Aleksej Mixajlovyč sent from Čyhyryn 17 February 1654 and brought to the tsar by two Zaporozhian envoys of high rank (pp. 123-127), and the articles of the tsar's charter given in response (pp. 127-129).

Chapter 23 (pp. 135-154), the longest in the whole chronicle, can be regarded as the finale in the description and analysis of the main event in the manner chosen by the chronicler, because what follows, as the last part of Hrabjanka's work, can be considered its epilogue and is written in a different manner. Thus, the last chapter of the *narratio* tells about Xmel'nyc'kyj's last diplomatic efforts, his last campaign of 1655, and his death. Abundantly quoted (or redramatized) are his last talks with the Crimean khan, as well as his farewell speech to the Zaporozhian high-ranking officers, and their thankful answer. Near the end of the chapter Hrabjanka pronounces an eulogy on Xmel'nyc'kyj, allowing himself, in accordance with the genre and the special circumstances, to use rhetoric here more than anywhere else.

The epilogue of the chronicle, which shows the consequences of the main happenings already presented at length, is composed in a more tradi-

tional way. It is an account of what happened afterwards, about succeeding hetmancies, described year by year, as in the ancient *annales* and with their typical expression “during the same year” (tohože hodu), up to the time for which the chronicler concludes his account, here, 1710. The chronicler’s language and style does not change much. He still points out, providing quite detailed descriptions, the most important battles or other very important happenings, and he still quotes from documents. But near the end the account for each given year becomes shorter and less colorful, for in accordance with the historiographer’s views on the most important happenings in the recent history of his fatherland, the events after Xmel’nyc’kyj’s are to be regarded as an addendum. In fact, he returns to that main event whenever it can be used to explain its aftermath. For example, in chapter 30, under the year 1672, in connection with the election of Ivan Samojlovyč to the hetmancy in Zaporozhie, Hrabjanka writes that this happened in accordance “with the tsar’s ordinances given to Hetman Bohdan Xmel’nyc’kyj, to other hetmans, and to the whole Zaporozhian Army” (p. 208).

To the beginning of the eighteenth century another Cossack chronicle also belongs — that written by Ivan Velyčko, who followed in the path of Hrabjanka. This very extensive work<sup>42</sup>, which historians of Ukrainian literature see as its major achievement in historical style, must still be examined for its historical thought and method.

<sup>42</sup> See *Letopis' sobytij v Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossi v XVII-m veke, Sostavil Samoil Veličko, byvšij kanceljarist kanceljarii vojska zaporožskogo, 1720.*, Izdana vremennoju komissieju dlja razbora drevnix aktov, t. I, Kiev, 1848 (over 500 pages); t. II, Kiev, 1851 (over 600 pages); t. III, Kiev, 1855 (about 570 pages); t. IV, Kiev, 1864 (over 400 pages).

