

THE ANNALS  
of the  
UKRAINIAN ACADEMY  
of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.

---

VOL. III

FALL-WINTER, 1953

No. 2 (8)

---

CONTENTS

The Ukraine at the Turning Point . . . . .	<i>Vyacheslav Lypynsky</i>	605
<i>Istoriya Rusov</i> and its Author . . . . .	<i>Andriy Yakovliv</i>	620
Where Was <i>Istoriya Rusov</i> Written? . . . . .	<i>Olexander Ohloblyn</i>	670

REVIEW ARTICLES

On Slavic Linguistic Interrelations . . . . .	<i>Yury Šerech</i>	696
Book Reviews . . . . .		731
Obituaries . . . . .		736
Chronicle . . . . .		740

---

Published by

THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
IN THE U.S., Inc.



---

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

DMITRY ČIŽEVSKY  
*Harvard University*

OLEKSANDER GRANOVSKY  
*University of Minnesota*

ROMAN SMAL STOCKI  
*Marquette University*

VOLODYMYR P. TIMOSHENKO  
*Stanford University*

EDITOR

MICHAEL VETUKHIV  
*Columbia University  
New York City*

TECHNICAL EDITOR

HENRY M. NEBEL, JR.

---

*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.* are published quarterly by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc. *A Special issue* will take place of 2 issues.

All correspondence, orders, and remittances should be sent to  
*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*  
11½ West 26th Street, New York 1, N. Y.

SINGLE COPY: \$1.50

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: \$6.00

A special rate is offered to libraries and graduate and undergraduate students in the fields of Slavic studies.

*Copyright 1953, by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc.*

# THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U. S., INC.

---

FALL-WINTER, 1953

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
The Ukraine at the Turning Point . . . <i>Vyacheslav Lypynsky</i>	605
<i>Istoriya Rusov</i> and its Author . . . . <i>Andriy Yakovliv</i>	620
Where Was <i>Istoriya Rusov</i> Written? . . . <i>Olexander Ohloblyn</i>	670
 REVIEW ARTICLES	
On Slavic Linguistic Interrelations . . . . <i>Yury Šerech</i>	696
 BOOK REVIEWS	
W. Pobóg-Malinowski, <i>Najnowsza Historia Polityczna Polski, 1864-1945</i> . . . . . <i>Ivan L. Rudnytsky</i>	731
Michael T. Florinsky, <i>Russia, A History and Interpretation</i> . . . <i>Michael Luther</i>	733
 OBITUARIES	
Valentyna Radzimovsky . . . . .	736
Yuriy Tyshchenko . . . . .	737
Nykyfor Hryhoriev . . . . .	738
Ivan Dubynetz . . . . .	738
CHRONICLE . . . . .	740
A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION . . . . .	743
CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	744



## THE UKRAINE AT THE TURNING POINT\*

VYACHESLAV LYPYNSKY

The official break with Poland and the end of the policy of autonomy came in the closing months of the year 1653. Khmelnytsky characterized this memorable year, "It is the King's year, but for me and my desires it is just the opposite; it presages fortune of every kind for the Poles."<sup>1</sup> In reality the Hetman's situation was tragic. The Crimean Khan, who had been bribed by the Polish King for a hundred thousand ducats and allowed to take captives from the territory of Lviv and the more remote parts of the Ukraine, betrayed Khmelnytsky near Zhvanets at the most crucial moment. The Poles did not wish to begin new negotiations with the Cossack delegate, Vyhovsky, since the Polish senators again began to consider the Cossacks as their "subjects." Khmelnytsky wrote to the tsar that the Tatars wanted to hand him and Vyhovsky to the King and that they were preparing a full-scale Ukrainian campaign for the beginning of 1654 to subdue the "rebellious" Ukraine once and for all.

What was most important, the Hetman's monarchial and dynastic ideas, which were based on Turkish assistance and on the sultan's protection, tottered with the death of his beloved son and successor, Timothy, killed near Suchava in September 1653. They tottered and finally collapsed after the Tatar's betrayal and the Tatars' fearful devastation in the Ukraine. Everything, it seemed, aimed to make this terrible year truly a "King's year," to humble Khmelnytsky before the "Majesty of the Polish Republic"; and his only solace seemed to be the Cossacks, his loyal subjects. Such a change was not possible for the great Hetman, nor for the organized and sufficiently strong Ukrainian aristocracy. Rather than return to the Polish Republic, the Hetman and his aids conceived a new and daring plan, which would allow them to escape from the hopeless situation in which they found themselves. This was:

\* This is a reprint from *Ukrayina na perelomi*, 1920, Vienna, part III, pp. 27-39 and it is published as the sixth in the series of translations of Ukrainian source material. (v. *The Annals*, No. 1.)

<sup>1</sup> *Arch. Czartoryskich* cdx. 147, p. 168f.: "Krótka narratywa ekspedycyi w r. 1653 po świętach przeciwko rebelii kozackiej z potęgą tatarską."

to destroy Poland and the Crimea with the aid of Moscow. Khmelnytsky intended to get rid of the sultan, who was of a different faith, and establish a Cossack state under the aegis of an Orthodox tsar. The Prince of Moldavia, well-versed in Ukrainian affairs, wrote on February 14, 1654 to the Polish King: "These hostile Cossacks envisage nothing less than to join Moscow and invade the state of Your Royal Highness and destroy it. They want to have their own capital in Kiev after the victory."<sup>2</sup> The authors of the Pereyaslav Treaty visualized the significance and importance of the tsar's protection in this way: "The Tsar's Majesty will confer upon us greater freedom, the rights of dominion and goods than (did) the Polish kings or the old Rus' princes." They said, quoting Hetman Khmelnytsky, "for these freedoms, rights, and goods we shed our blood from grandfather to father, to maintain and preserve them from ruin."<sup>3</sup> The constructive spirit of statehood, the steadfastness in relation to the main enemy, at that time, Poland, and the fatality of the plan (either master or death) guaranteed him victory over all other concepts, which were advanced by other politician of that time and which were perhaps more practical, logical, and diplomatic.

We are accustomed to view the Pereyaslav Treaty through the prism of the Pereyaslav legend, a later creation. It is absolutely necessary to distinguish these completely different forms of the same historical fact. The Pereyaslav legend was created during the disintegration of the Cossack sovereignty. It assumed contemporary ideological form only after the Poltava defeat and the final destruction of the independent and sovereign aims of the Cossack aristocracy during the time of Mazepa. In this concept, the Little Russian people, under the leadership of Hetman Khmelnytsky, had liberated themselves from Poland and had voluntarily joined the Muscovite State, since they were of the same faith. This latter idea (of the same faith) is still more recent. At the end of the nineteenth century the idea of "one nationality" replaced it. Thus, the Pereyaslav legend was the basis of the theory, "a reunion of Rus'."

<sup>2</sup> *Zherela do istoriyi Ukraïny*, XII, 285.

<sup>3</sup> *Lyst Khmel'nyts'koho do Tsarya z dnya 17, II, 1654 r.*, " *Akty Yuzh. i Zap. Ros.*, Vol. X.

The Pereyaslav legend and the Lublin legend, the voluntary union of Rus' and Poland, were similar, indeed, one might say, spiritual sisters. The Lublin legend played a major role in the life of the Ukrainian aristocracy in Poland, and the Pereyaslav legend did the same for the Ukrainian Cossack aristocracy in the Russian empire. Both played the same role: the ideological and juridical preservation of the Ukrainian aristocracy, which, after the bankruptcy of their own state, did not become a defeated, subjugated, servile class in a foreign state. These legends provided our aristocracy with all the rights and privileges of the aristocracy of a sovereign state on the condition that this aristocracy would, voluntarily and without compulsion, co-operate with the state. It must be remembered that the legends were created for this purpose at a later date. This is one of the reasons that the sincere desire of historians to find in the Pereyaslav Treaty the essential prerequisites of the Pereyaslav legend, by which the Ukraine voluntarily joined the Muscovite State, did not yield any positive results. One might say that there are as many different opinions in this matter as there are historians.<sup>4</sup> However, they all agree on one thing: the points of the union were inaccurately drawn up, especially those which were to provide the basis for the forming of the "reunion."

In my opinion, this desire to find the prerequisites of the Pereyaslav legend in the Pereyaslav Treaty is meaningless scholasticism. The great influence which Moscow later exercised on Ukrainian history explains this interest. Had Turkey been in Moscow's position, historiographers of our legitimacy would have sought juridical foundations of our "reunion" with Turkey in Khmelnytsky's agreement with the sultan. Perhaps this would prove more productive, since Turkey played a considerably greater part in the genesis and development of Khmelnytsky's uprising. The historian who seeks a similarity between the Pereyaslav legend and the Pereyaslav Treaty and who sees in the Treaty the legend of a voluntary "reunion of Rus'," must first of all prove that Hetman Khmelnytsky stirred the uprising against Po-

<sup>4</sup> Professor Sergiyevych sees a personal union; Dyakonov and Popov, who followed him, a real union; Professors Hrushevs'ki, Korkunov, Myakotin, Sokol'ski, Slabchenko, a vassal's dependency; Rozenfel'd, an unequal incorporation; Nol'de, autonomy, and so forth.

land for the purpose of uniting the Ukraine with Moscow, and, then, that the Pereyaslav Treaty only marked the formal conclusion, a final strengthening on paper of an act which had been completed. Naturally, no one could prove that which had not taken place. Since Bohdan Khmelnytsky did not rebel against Poland with the purpose or the intention of uniting the Ukraine with Moscow, it is evident that the Treaty with Moscow in 1654 was an *incidental alliance against Poland, which was concluded to liberate the Ukraine from Poland*. It was similar to all previous alliances with the Crimea, primarily, with Turkey.

The practical purpose of this union was similar to all previous alliances. In the struggle against Poland, the tsar replaced the sultan, and no more. As the protector of the Ukraine, he was obligated to grant military assistance against Poland. In return, he was to receive a fixed annual monetary tribute from the Ukraine, equal to the amount which the sultan had received for his protection in Transylvania, Moldavia, and Wallachia. In a similar manner, the treaty with the tsar was made on the basis of previous examples and patterned on the former treaties of the Ukraine which pertained to the sultan's protectorate. The basic points were clearly drawn. Neither signatory omitted anything. The tsar's armies were to advance against Poland in the vicinity of Smolensk, and, in addition to this, the Ukraine was to receive uninterrupted military aid against Poland, and, if necessary, this included aid against the Tatars. Articles seven, eight, and ten of the Pereyaslav Treaty resolved this. In return, the tsar could accept tribute for his treasury (article one). This point occasioned much bargaining on both sides. The Hetman maintained that all expenses for the upkeep of the Cossack army be deducted from the tribute which was to be paid in return for military aid (articles two, three, four, nine, and eleven). The tsar in his resolution (article 9), which is longer than all the others, explains at some length how much his own "Russian, German, and Tatar troops," which he had gathered "for your defense," cost, and why he thought there will "not be any loss" from the Zaporozhians for his aid to them. In his letter of reply, the Hetman again points out that the Turkish sultan, although a Mohammedan, consented to give the Ukraine his protection without any tribute. In addi-

tion to the widely discussed matter of military aid and tribute, in only one article did the Zaporozhian army have plenipotentiary power to negotiate with foreign powers (five). The tsar was to be notified only in those matters which "would be contrary to the Tsar's Majesty." The property rights of the Kievan Metropolitan and clergy were confirmed in one article (which was unavoidable because of that same tribute). With a separate charter, the same property rights of the Ukrainian nobility were confirmed. This was all there was to the Pereyaslav Treaty.

As a military alliance against Poland and the Tatars, one that is guaranteed by a protectorate, the Treaty is very clear. The future political objectives of both signatories were absolutely different, and, therefore, mutually obscure. This different attitude toward the Treaty is apparent in the course of the negotiation and in all the acts; on the second day after the signing of the Treaty, they also became clear in deed. This was the reason why both sides began to interpret the Pereyaslav Treaty in its own way.

Hetman Khmelnytsky's classical statement to the Pereyaslav council, "We cannot live without the Tsar any longer," is in precise accord with contemporary Ukrainian reality and the political and social circumstances of the time. Only the Hetman, who made the statement, and the tsar's delegates, who heard the statement and related it to the tsar, saw diametrically opposite meanings in it. As a sequel, the Hetman proposed four candidates: the Turkish Emperor, the Crimean Emperor, the Muscovite Tsar, and the Polish King. He chose the Muscovite Tsar, since he believed that of the four "the Tsar of the same faith" would guarantee all "our freedoms." He also wanted this new protector to endow him, the Hetman and actual "absolute ruler of Rus'," with a larger state than had existed in the Ukraine not only in the time of the Polish kings but in the period of the princes of Rus'. The Muscovite Tsar believed and desired that the Zaporozhian Hetman would hand over the absolute rule of the Ukraine to him.

Since the Hetman considered himself the head of the state, he wanted to take the oath alone to preserve the alliance with the tsar, the protector. The officers and the army would not take this oath. Rumors to this effect spread throughout the Ukraine from

the circle of officials surrounding the Hetman.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the tsar wanted all new subjects to take a personal oath in his presence, and it was the first diplomatic victory of Moscow when a minor portion of the officers, townspeople, and Cossacks took the oath to the tsar. The Muscovite delegates openly boasted about this, although its truth had not been verified at this time. Nothing was said about it in the Ukraine. The Hetman, in turn, wanted the Muscovite delegates "to take an oath on behalf of the sovereign" to him, *as the tsar's equal*. This pertained to the maintenance of the alliance. Until the death of the Hetman, all Ukrainians were certain that the tsar had taken such an oath. However, the tsar did not want to take this oath before Khmelnytsky, since, as the Muscovite delegates stated, "only subjects take an oath before their sovereign." As a result, this matter was held in abeyance.

The Hetman wanted to pay the tribute directly to the tsar; he would have his officials collect it and he would pay it once a year in a lump sum. However, the tsar wanted to have his governors in all the principle cities collect the levied tribute directly in the Ukraine. Finally, this formal aspect of the disagreement was eliminated by some vague diplomatic statements. However, the Hetman never agreed to any real curtailment of his state or his power. In his lifetime, every Muscovite commander had to be approved by Khmelnytsky; and in his lifetime, the tsar did not receive a single penny in tribute from the Ukraine. The consequences of the tsar's protection will be discussed later; but, in short, the authors of the Pereyaslav Treaty were not the creators of the Pereyaslav legend.

Without taking the immediate causes of the discord into consideration, Khmelnytsky concluded the Pereyaslav Treaty and accepted the tsar's protection. In addition to the need for a military alliance in his hopeless position, there were other, far deeper and more important, social and political reasons which prompted this action. It must not be forgotten that the entire fabric of Ukrainian society at that time was strongly assimilated by Poland

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for instance, *Relacya Makarego Krynickiego* (a monk of the Pechersk Monastery, who was sent from Kiev by the Metropolitan to the town of Lutsk with a protest against the forced oath to the tsar) — "Chmielnicki samowtór z Wyhowskim w cerkwi sobornej przysięgę oddał i poddaństwo carowi moskiewskiemu, któremu wzajem przysięgli posłowie," *Chteniya moskov. obshch. ist.*, 1861, III.

and was closely tied to Poland by environment. And in addition, the monarchist segment, which had started the revolt and continued it, had a deep-rooted legal pietism for the "King's Majesty," which was marked by the people of the time and which in effect proved damaging to the Ukraine many times during the first period of autonomy. Therefore, the creator of a state, which would be independent of Poland, had to find a form which would correspond to contemporary legal concepts in regard to the break with Poland, and which in its legality would efface the deep Ukrainian legalism toward the Polish Republic. An alliance with a non-Christian monarch, the Turkish Sultan, would not accomplish this. The Ukraine was released from its oath to the Polish King on the grounds that the latter had violated his sworn duties to the Orthodox people of Rus' in the Polish Republic; the co-religionist proclaimed the liberation in Pereyaslav on the grounds that the God-anointed Muscovite Tsar was equal to the Polish King — this was the legal form of the Ukraine's separation from Poland. It made the Pereyaslav Treaty necessary for Hetman Khmelnytsky and the founders of the Ukrainian state.

The second important aspect of the Pereyaslav Treaty was the fact that it was public and official. The Hetman himself demanded that the tsar send his commander to Kiev immediately "that all the neighboring sovereigns would know of their allegiance to the mighty hand of the Tsar's Majesty." If we translate this diplomatic phrase into the language of contemporary political practice, it meant that all the neighboring sovereigns, who negotiated most frequently with the Ukraine as a state, and with whom, according to the Pereyaslav Treaty, the Ukraine had a right to negotiate, should be informed of the break with the Polish King. This concerned her sovereignty with respect to Poland.

The final and legal emancipation from the Polish Republic, created, according to the Ukrainians themselves and the neighboring sovereigns, the complete ideological and juridical idea of statehood of the Pereyaslav Treaty. And in this alone did the Treaty differ from the previous alliances with Turkey. The entire import and significance of the Treaty for the future of the Ukraine rested in this fact. And this was not considered by the authors of the Treaty. That the "rude and unruly" Moscow,

as she was conceived by contemporary Ukrainians, would ever replace the Polish influences (the Jesuits, the European brilliance and culture, the charm of the "heaven of nobles"), would not have entered the mind of a single Ukrainian politician, those who detested Poland but who, nevertheless, were educated in Polish schools.

The Hetman understood this profound political change which had been brought about by the tsar's protection. He resolved to take the step when all other efforts to liberate the Ukraine had failed and when the position of the hetmancy was strong enough to risk carrying out such changes in the mental attitudes. Prior to this time, his policy toward Moscow might be summed up in this way: to sunder at any cost the "eternal peace" which had been concluded between Moscow and Poland and to divide the two monarchs. The Hetman used every possible means. He began by granting the Siveria region, the Lithuanian cities up to the Dnieper, and the Polish throne and ended with threats "to destroy by means of the Tatars" the Muscovite kingdom. Nothing infuriated the Hetman more than the news of the Polish-Muscovite agreement. In the middle of 1651, when the tsar's envoy came to Khmelnytsky with a message that the Hetman should "not wage war against his master (that is, the Polish King), since, in such a case, the tsar would be obliged to send aid and an army to his friend, the King," an eyewitness, the delegate from Prince Janusz Radziwiłł, Mysłowski, related that Khmelnytsky "got angry, arose quickly, and wanted to strike the tsar's envoy in the face. Shumeyko, the Chernihiv colonel, scarcely had time to grab the Hetman."<sup>6</sup> In the preceding year he had chained the Muscovite envoys to the cannons for the same reason. He also harbored a pretender to the Muscovite throne, Tymoshka Akundinov, in his court at Chyhyryn; he intended to release him in Moscow if the occasion arose.

After much bickering and the pleas and threats of the Hetman, the Moscow *Sobor* finally agreed in 1653 that the tsar would accept Khmelnytsky and his Zaporozhian army as "subjects." At the begin-

<sup>6</sup> "Relatia p. Mysłowskiego, który był posłem od Xcia JMP Hetmana W. X. Lit. do Chmielnickiego," *Zbiory Rusieckich*, Miscel. 1645-1652, p. 147f.

ning of 1654 the Muscovite boyars came to the Ukraine to receive the oath. The military alliance with Moscow and the tsar's protectorate in the Ukraine became a fact. When the Marshal of the Polish Parliament, Franciszek Dubrawski heard of this, he said in his speech to the king, "The Polish Republic was abandoned merely at Khmelnytsky's discretion."<sup>7</sup> Subsequently, the Poles too showed respect to the Hetman. Having gathered his strength, he ceased to be a "revolutionary slave" in the opinion of the Poles and the neighboring sovereigns. He became the head of a new great state; the objectives of the Pereyaslav Treaty were achieved in their entirety.

But the means by which the objectives were achieved soon were exposed with all their dangerous weaknesses. The idea of the protectorate, strengthened by the mutual oath of the tsar and the Hetman, would not have been opposed in the Ukraine because of the circumstances. However, the oath given directly to the tsar met with stubborn opposition everywhere. Old Colonel Bohun, one of the most esteemed and respected of the leaders of the revolt, resolutely refused such an oath. He, naturally, was not the exception among the purely military Cossack officers, almost all of whom had shown hatred toward Poland, were hostile toward Moscow, and had favored Turkey. Moreover, the rank and file Cossacks did not want to take the oath. In the Kropyvna and Poltava regiments, the Cossacks "beat" the Muscovite officials "with sticks." The Uman' and Bratslav regiments, although most dangerously exposed to Poland, did not take the tsar's oath. The townspeople of Chornobyl' "accepted Moscow unwillingly." Those of Pereyaslav had to be driven by force to take the oath. Kiev took the oath "by force, subject to military punishment." And the most significant factor was that the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy refused to take the oath. "The Metropolitan and Crypt Archimandrite stated that they would choose death rather than take an oath before the tsar."<sup>8</sup> By a special messenger, they sent a protest against compulsory oaths to the Lutsk center and, in view of their behavior, they

<sup>7</sup> Kubala, *Wojna Moskiewska*, p. 371.

<sup>8</sup> "Lysty polk. Pavshy do kn. Radzivila, pysani v Lyutim 1654 r. z Mozyrya," *Arch. Czar-torskich* cdx. 143, pp. 83 and 98ff.

were refused the certificate of gratitude from the tsar, which had been prepared for them.

Using the available source materials, it is difficult to state whether this opposition was instigated by the Hetman with his understanding, since it suited his plans and aims, or whether it was a reflection upon the Hetman and his policy. But the very possibility of such a question suggests the weaknesses of that policy at this moment. Khmelnytsky, for all his genius, was dependent upon the Cossack class, which had been reared in the spirit of national inequality. He shook off the hypnotic power of the "majesty of the King," who was of another faith, with considerable difficulty and he did not want to venture a decisive struggle immediately against the majesty of the new tsar, although of the same faith. By degrees the concept of the Cossack hetman as a Russian autocrat grew and developed in the eyes of the Ukrainian people. At any event he was so powerful at the time that all internal opposition, if in reality it existed at all, could not threaten his position. Khmelnytsky brought the Pereyaslav Treaty into being, having resolved all misunderstanding with the tsarist government by using vague diplomatic language and settling the other opposition in one way or another.

Further events soon revealed all the errors of the political agreement, which both parties had understood in their own way. The Muscovite-Ukrainian conflict was inevitable. It began immediately after the ratification of the Pereyaslav Treaty in Byelorussian territory.

Elsewhere,<sup>9</sup> I spoke of the occupation of Byelorussia by Ukrainian armies and of the institution there of the Cossack government, in the form of a "Cossack judgment." This was with the consent and even at the request of the Byelorussian peasants, townspeople, clergy, and a part of the Byelorussian nobility. This occupation was in line with Bohdan Khmelnytsky's policy of "liberating from Polish slavery," not only the Cossack territory (at that time Ukraine), but all of the so-called "Rus' territory" of the Polish Republic, which had been dependent upon the spiritual authority of the Kievan Metropolitan for a long period. In

<sup>9</sup> V. Lypynsky, *Z dziejów Ukrainy*.

conjunction with this traditional, ideal, spiritual authority from time immemorial, now would be reborn the old, real political authority under the leadership of the Hetman of the Zaporozhian army. The historical task of this government was to unite in some way or other all these Orthodox territories of Rus', which had fallen under Polish control after the decline of the Kievan state. (In the first period of the revolt, the union was to take place within the framework of the Polish Republic; in the second period of the revolt, these territories were to break away from the Polish Republic.) This task was apparent in the ideology of the Orthodox nobility and clergy of Rus'.

This traditional Kievan policy of Rus' met immediate opposition in the national Muscovite policy. The representatives of the latter wanted the Pereyaslav Treaty to represent a voluntary act of surrender to the Muscovite authority of part of the Polish state with its Orthodox Cossack population "of the same faith" and they imagined the military alliance with the Ukrainian Cossacks in the form of their voluntary military assistance to Moscow, which would aid her in conquering other Polish territories. There is little wonder that a stubborn struggle began between the Ukraine and Moscow over these Byelorussian cities. Evidently, Moscow began to regard them as her own possessions, and she did not recognize, nor even wish to hear of, a hetmancy, a Cossack judgment, or a dependence upon the Kiev Metropolitan. As a result of the Pereyaslav Treaty, the Polish-Muscovite war broke out, and the Muscovite army marched into Byelorussia under the personal leadership of the tsar.

I presented elsewhere an episode in the struggle of the two Rus' for the third Rus' in a biography of one of the eminent followers of Khmelnytsky, Ivan Nechay.<sup>10</sup> This struggle is very interesting, especially if we wish to understand the true character of the so-called "reunion." As with the other, more important phases of our history, this must be studied more fully than has been done. To better understand the events which pertain to the oath of the

<sup>10</sup> The son-in-law of the Hetman, a brother of Danylo, who was glorified in a famous song; "the colonel of White Russia, Mohyliv, Homel', and Chauss," as he spoke of himself in 1656. *Z dziejów Ukrainy*, p. 280f.

nobility in the Pinsk district, I will present one characteristic and typical aspect of the Muscovite-Ukrainian conflict in this period. It is the affair of Kost' Poklonsky.

Kost' Vyacheslav Poklonsky, a Byelorussian nobleman, a native of Mohyliv district, "a brave warrior, an eloquent speaker, an ingenious person, possessing good connections among the Mohyliv nobility," was an old acquaintance and friend of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. His political activities in the primary stages of the revolt are unknown, but we can assume that he belonged to that strata of Orthodox Byelorussian nobility who, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, were extremely hostile toward Poland and who, from the very beginning of the Ukrainian revolt, sought Cossack aid to further their anti-Polish plans. In any case, he must have had good political relations with the Hetman, been on friendly terms with him and under his influence during the preliminary negotiations of the Pereyaslav Treaty. Khmelnytsky and Vyhovsky assured the Muscovite boyars that Mohyliv and the Hetman of the Zaporozhian army would together accept the tsar's protection.

Poklonsky appeared in the camp of Nizhyn Colonel Ivan Zolotarenko, whom the Hetman sent to Byelorussia after the conclusion of the Pereyaslav Treaty for joint action with the Muscovite armies against Poland, and stated that he wanted to proceed to Chyhyryn to take the tsar's oath before the Zaporozhian Hetman. Poklonsky did not travel alone. He was accompanied by a retinue of four hundred townspeople and nobles from Mohyliv. Among the latter the more distinguished were: Les'ko Unchynsky, Stanislav Monvid, Bohdan Ivanovsky, Pavlo Okurevich, Mykhaylo Rudnytsky, Oleksander Kuchynsky, and the two Khomentovskis. Zolotarenko, naturally, despatched Poklonsky to the Hetman immediately, assigning a detachment of Cossacks for his protection. From this a bitter misunderstanding arose between the Cossack colonel and the Muscovite boyars. It immediately deepened and became the first reason for the Muscovite-Ukrainian conflict, although it was confined at this period to the diplomatic level.

The Muscovite boyars, adhering to their strict line of politics, demanded that Poklonsky take an oath to the tsar directly and not through the Hetman; and that Zolotarenko should send him

immediately to the tsar's camp and not to Chyhyryn. However, the Hetman's deputy refused to do this; he "shook off" the boyars and sent Poklonsky to the Hetman. Then, he vigorously began to occupy Byelorussia and organized the entire territory between Homel' and Mohyliv according to the Cossack arrangements. And, on Khmelnytsky's recommendation, he accepted the title of Siveria Hetman.

Moscow abandoned the diplomatic correspondence and adopted a different, but safer, method. Moscow attracted Poklonsky to her side by various promises and by granting him the title of a colonel of Byelorussia. She also demoralized his followers among the Byelorussian nobility by conferring lands upon them (thus, Petro Monkovsky received Samulka; Martsinkevichs received Dobuzh, etc. from the tsar). The nobility of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, who were hostile toward the Cossacks for a long time, now, as the Muscovite armies moved in, took an oath directly to the tsar. Thus, they acquired the unusual grace and protection of the tsar. (For example, Christoph Zavisha, the Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, received the huge estate of Princess Radziwiłł.) In this way Ukrainian political plans were check-mated by her "allies." Mohyliv, which previously had demanded a union with the Ukraine, now acceded to Moscow's request and disregarded the Nizhyn Archpriest's letter, which had been written to the inhabitants of Mohyliv in the name of the Hetman and the Metropolitan, advising them "to rely on the Zaporozhian army and to aid in the defense of the Zaporozhian hetmans and the whole army in order that, God forbid, Moscow would not attempt to establish her laws in your city as is her custom, *but that you should have the freedom which the tsar had given to the Ukraine and the Hetman.*"

This constant effort of the Ukrainian diplomats and politicians to separate the concept of the tsar as an ideal, a protector, from that of a genuinely "rude and unruly" Moscow, did not yield positive results. At this time the "tsar of the same faith" had not yet become the later Petersburg Emperor of all Russia, but was only a Muscovite Tsar. His policy was the national Moscow policy.

Zolotarenko's petition to permit those from the Mohyliv district, who wished to become Cossacks, to enlist in the Zaporozhian army

with the tsar's consent was rejected by the tsar's diplomats. This was not all. Poklonsky and his friends, who were dismayed by the cruelties which Moscow, having consolidated her position in Byelorussia, began to show (segments of the Smolensk and Vitebsk nobility were transported to Muscovy), lost all hope of liberating Byelorussia from the hands of Poland. Having severed their relations with the Ukraine, they returned to the control of the Polish Republic and received a joyous welcome and a full amnesty.<sup>11</sup>

From this, the Hetman could only conclude that the Muscovite government would not agree to the Ukrainian Cossack judgment and that the wild terror and absolutely different culture of this new ally would provoke a Polonophile reaction in the East Ukrainian Cossack territory and among the Cossack officers who had been educated in the West European culture. The obvious, increasing appetite of the tsar's commanders in Kiev,<sup>12</sup> whose purpose, as the Hetman saw it, was only representative, and the King's demagogical proclamations, calculated on the dissatisfaction with Moscow, to the Ukrainian people, promising not only "all kinds of freedom to the Cossacks," but even "eternal exemption from work and military obligations for the townspeople and the villagers tending their property," strengthened the Hetman's conclusions.

Therefore, the Hetman's attitude toward Moscow began to change radically. The Hetman put a stop to the Muscovite interference in the internal affairs of the Ukraine by punishing without mercy the prototypes of those later "self-denying little Russians," who, behind his back and without his knowledge or permission, negotiated with the tsar's government. He first deemed it necessary to renew the previous alliances with Turkey in order to make himself independent in external affairs.

The disagreements and divisions became fully apparent in the campaign with Moscow against Poland in 1655. The Hetman,

<sup>11</sup> *Akty Yuzh. i Zap. Ros.*, Vols. X and XIV. Vol. Legum IV, p. 234. Om. Terlets'ky, *Kozaky na Bili Rusy*. Kubala, *op. cit.*, pp. 268-79.

<sup>12</sup> Cf., for example, the matter of the land which the commanders wanted from Kiev for the Muscovite *streltsi*. Because of this Vyhovsky reminded the Muscovite boyars of the history of Subotov and the "shedding of blood for this unjust insult." *Akt. Yuzh. i Zap. Rossii*, III, 580.

having come to an understanding with a new acquaintance, Sweden, conducted this campaign so as to thwart Moscow whenever possible. He used adequate and decisive means to do this. Near Husyatyn, for example, the Hetman ordered his Cossacks to disperse the tsarist armies, which were storming the town. The reason given to the tsar's representatives for this unusual deed was that there were "many Orthodox people in Husyatyn." Later, during the siege of Lviv, Vyhovsky, with the Hetman's knowledge, secretly warned the inhabitants not to enter into any negotiations with Moscow. A sharp conflict again broke out near Lublin. This occurred between Potemkin, who commanded the Muscovite armies and who tried constantly to receive oaths "on behalf of the tsar," and Colonel Danylo Vyhovsky, who refused to allow this. This campaign ended when the Hetman, unbeknown to his unreliable Muscovite allies, concluded an agreement with the Tatars. He agreed to abandon the Muscovite armies and let them fare as they may. As a result of this, the Tatars surrounded Commander Buturlin, who had to pay a heavy ransom and surrender all his war booty, which he had gained on Ukrainian soil in the war against the Poles.

The strife increased on both sides and a break with Moscow appeared inevitable in such circumstances. The final and direct cause of this break was the peace treaty concluded in Vilno between Muscovy and Poland in September 1656 with the active intermediation of Austria.

# ISTORIYA RUSOV AND ITS AUTHOR

ANDRIY YAKOVLIV

More than a hundred years have passed since *Istoriya Rusov* — the historical legend of the Ukraine<sup>1</sup> — was published, and still the endless conjectures, research and critical work as to its author continues.<sup>2</sup> Already it has its own history and its own literature. Critical works as to the sources, the time of writing, and the author are numerous.

The first manuscripts of *Istoriya Rusov* were found in the first quarter of the last century, and for nearly forty years Yuriy Konys'ky, a White Russian Archbishop, was considered the author. A period of examination, critical investigation, and research began which continues until today. In his Preface the author conceals his name with unusual skill, referring to the names of eminent historians and political personalities of the latter half of the eighteenth century. One was Yuriy Konys'ky, the Archbishop of White Russia, famous for his historical and polemical works against the Poles and the Church Union; the other, Hryhory Poletyka, an able historian, a defender of the rights and freedom of the Ukraine and the Ukrainian nobility, and a delegate to the *Komissiya novavo ulozheniya* in 1767. It is interesting to note that the writer does not state that they are the authors; rather, he so merges the name of Konys'ky in the text that the editing, emendations, and confirmation of the authenticity is attributed to him and receives the sanction of his clerical authority. Its comparison to other chronicles, its evaluation as the best and most authentic, and its use in the *Komissiya novavo ulozheniya* is cleverly attributed to Hryhory Poletyka. In this manner, the author plants the idea in the reader's

<sup>1</sup> A phrase of Professor Borschak.

<sup>2</sup> The most recent works on *Istoriya Rusov* and its author:

- A. Yakovliv, "Do pytannya pro avtora *Istoriyi Rusov*," *Zapysky NTSh*, Vol. 154, L'viv, 1937.
- M. Voznyak, "Psevdo-Konys'ky i psevido-Poletyka," *Istoriya Rusov v literaturi i nautsi*, vydannya ukr. mogylyans'ko-mazepins-koyi akademiyi nauk, Pratsi viddilu ukraiyinoznavstva, III, P'viv-Kiev, 1939.
- O. Ohloblyn, "Khto buv avtorom *Istoriyi Rusov*?" *Nashi dni, Krakiv*, XI, 1943; "Do pytannya pro avtora *Istoriyi Rusov*," *Ukrayina*, ch. 2, Paris, 1949.
- E. Borschak, *La Légende historique de l'Ukraine*, Paris, 1949.

mind that one, or both, of these men were responsible for the *Istoriya Rusov*, and he achieved his purpose of concealing the true identity of the author for many years. Thus, the first copies and the edition published by O. Bodyans'ky were called "*Istoriya Rusov* by Yuriy Konys'ky." A. von der Brüggen was the first to consider Yu. Konys'ky the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. Others, Ryleyev, M. Maksymovich, V. Belinsky, A. Pushkin, N. Gogol, Bantysch-Kamensky, Sreznevsky, Kostomarov, T. Shevchenko, P. Kulish, O. Bodyansky, Klevanov, Archbishop Filaret, and, at one time, O. Lazarevs'ky, followed his example.

In the sixties of the nineteenth century, scholars refused to accept Konys'ky as the author and turned to Hryhory Poletyka. Michael Maksymovich was the first to voice his doubts. In his opinion, Konys'ky was not and could not have been the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, because the author, in many places, reveals definite anticlerical views. In 1874, Professor V. Ikonnikov suggested Hryhory Poletyka as the author. O. Lazarevs'ky ardently supported this position in many of his works. At one time, M. Voznyak, and later M. Hrushevsky, N. Vasylenko, O. Yablonovsky, D. Doroshenko, and Horban' also agreed with this assertion. V. Horlenko and, then, M. Drahomanov, A. Storozhenko, L. Yanovsky, and, of late, E. Borschak have viewed Vasyl', the son of H. Poletyka, as the author. M. Horban' resolutely opposed this, stating that in V. Poletyka's essay "On the Origin, Lineage, and Merits of the Little Russian Nobility" he had virtually copied the entire historical section from his father's notes. O. Lazarevs'ky advanced the hypothesis that the author was both the Poletykas. L. Maykov, Onatsky, and N. Vasylenko in part, later supported this.

Recent scholarship has rejected these views. Scholars, studying the text of *Istoriya Rusov* and the lives of the people named in the Preface, seek for the author outside the Poletyka family. In 1925 Professor Slabchenko advanced the opinion that the author was Oleksander Bezborod'ko.<sup>3</sup> P. Klepats'ky, using O. Bezborod'ko's letter to his father, Andriy Bezborod'ko, dated March 31, 1778, as a basis, supported him.<sup>4</sup> M. Voznyak and A. Yakovliv

<sup>3</sup> M. Slabchenko, *Materialy do ekonomichno-sotsiyal'noyi istoriyi Ukrayiny XIX st.*, Vol. I.

<sup>4</sup> P. Klepats'ky, "Lystuvannya O. Bezborod'ka z bat'kom, yak istorychne dzherelo," *Yubyl. zbirnyk VUAN no poshanu M. Hrushevs'koho*, Vol. I.

analyzed the problem in detail and unearthed more proof that the author was Bezborod'ko.<sup>5</sup> Although they worked on the same problem at the same time (the former worked in Lviv, the latter in Prague in the period 1933-1935), they arrived at their conclusions independently.

Finally, Professor O. Ohloblyn stated in his article that the author was Opanas Lobysevych, while others cautiously expressed their opinion that Prince Repnin and V. Lukashevich were the authors. However, the latter did not substantiate their assertions.

Scholars, believing the author to be anonymous, did not research the ideas of *Istoriya Rusov*, nor did they seek the original manuscript. Twenty years after the publication of *Istoriya Rusov*, M. Maksymovich began to search for the original, but without success. Another twenty-five years passed and in 1891, O. Lazarev'sky in an article "A Conjecture as to the Author of *Istoriya Rusov*"<sup>6</sup> wrote that "a few days ago," i.e., in 1891, an eighty-five year old man, A. I. Khanenko (1805-1896), had told him how and under what circumstances the manuscript of *Istoriya Rusov* was discovered "about 1828." It was found while taking an inventory of the Hryniv estate in the Starodub district which had belonged to O. Bezborod'ko.<sup>7</sup> S. Laykevich and O. Hamilia, who took the inventory probably in the absence of the new owner, found the manuscript in the Hryniv library and showed it to S. M. Shiray, the Marshal of the Chernihiv Nobility. The latter made a copy of it for himself and returned the manuscript to the library. Some of the Starodub landowners made copies from this for themselves, e.g., Yakiv Poletyka, the grandson of H. Poletyka. Later, Shiray sent his copy to Bantysh-Kamensky; A. Khanenko made a copy from the copy of Poletyka and sent it to O. Bodyansky, the publisher of *Istoriya Rusov*.

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 2.

<sup>6</sup> A. Lazarevsky, "Dogadka ob avtore Istoriyi Rusov," *Kievskaya starina*, 1891, No. 4, p. 113.

<sup>7</sup> After O. Bezborod'ko died (1799), the estate passed into the hands of his brother, Count Iliia Bezborod'ko. Then, as a dowry, the estate was given to his son-in-law, Prince Lobanov-Rostovsky; in 1828 it passed into the hands of Prince Golitsin. The inventory of the estate was conducted by the members of the Starodub court, S. Laykevych and O. Hamilia, according to court procedure.

This story of Khanenko is interesting for its information on the discovery of the manuscript "about 1828" by the court officials, i.e., those making an inventory of the Hryniv estate. In addition, we know who made copies of the manuscript for themselves and to whom it was afterward sent. However, the story also raises the possibility that copies of the manuscript of *Istoriya Rusov* existed prior to the inventory, since any arrangements for copying the manuscript were made privately.

In his monograph, M. Voznyak actually quotes A. F. von der Briggen's letter of October 21, 1825 to Ryleyev. It is evident from this letter that Briggen, a Chernihiv landowner, had previously informed Ryleyev about *Istoriya Rusov*. An excerpt was enclosed in this letter and he told Ryleyev that he intended to publish "Konys'ky," i.e., *Istoriya Rusov*, with critical remarks.<sup>8</sup> The fact that it was known prior to 1828 is evident in M. Voznyak, who relied on other, earlier copies. He says that there was a copy in the Prosvita Library in Lviv called: "*History of Little Russia*, written by the White Russian Archbishop, Georgy Konys'ky in the . . . year and copied in 1818." This was written on paper watermarked 1817. Its original owner was Yakiv Puhach of the Dniepr region, but Roman Zaklynsky had donated it to the Prosvita Library. Another copy entitled *Istoriya Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* was in the Ukrainian National Museum in Lviv, but it was not complete. It was also written on blue paper with the watermark, 1814. The library of the Society of History and Antiquities in Moscow possessed a copy similar to that of Lviv. It had 265 pages and was dated 1824; its title, "By Georgy Konis'ky, White Russian Archbishop, *Istoriya Rusov ili Maloi Rossii*." The library had received it from Ivan Roskovshenko.<sup>9</sup>

The material quoted by M. Voznyak indicated that prior to the official discovery "about 1828" of the manuscript, other copies were extant. Private arrangements to copy the manuscript were made, evidently with the consent of those who possessed the original copy. After the inventory was completed by the court, this manuscript was returned to the original place. It is uncertain

<sup>8</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

whether anyone looked for it later in Hryniv or on the other estates of Prince Golitsin, the new owner.

The original copy disappeared, but other copies were preserved. Later, a printed text of *Istoriya Rusov* was made from the best copy available and variant readings were provided from ten other copies, as its publisher, O. Bodyansky, had attested. The published works of Konys'ky, and Hryhory and Vasyl' Poletyka are also available. Thus, the content, idea, style, personal characteristics, and turn of phrase of the text of *Istoriya Rusov* can be compared with these works.

However, this was not done for a long time, and it was largely the result of the hypothesis which attributed the authorship to an unknown person. This preconceived notion interfered with all research. Now in rereading this material, written by our own and foreign historians and critics, one wonders how they could have considered, for example, Yuriy Konys'ky, a respectable Archbishop, a defender of the Orthodox Church in Poland, and a renowned authority on Church history, as the author. The *Istoriya Rusov* contained thoughts and expressions critical of religion, the clergy in general and priests in particular. In describing the so-called "Golden Age" in Poland during the reign of Stefan Batory, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* wrote: "He (Batory) made all the people of his kingdom aware of the spirit of unity and brotherly accord. Controversies about blood, preference, or religions, which often trouble the minds of man, were not apparent among them. Even the clergy, used to debating and the assumption of righteousness, then resembled pure lambs of the Golden Age, or of Adam's Fold, and, what was most delightful, there was perfect harmony of the major religions, the Roman and the Russian."<sup>10</sup>

Now, let us examine the following excerpt from *Istoriya Rusov* aimed at the clergy: "Some of the clergy removed themselves directly from that infection, i.e., the Church Union, and others feigned so doing, but they all regretted the loss of their power over the people, which had been given them by the Poles and, in addition, the fifteen families of parishioners who were enslaved and ruled over by the priests, and that every parishioner ought to

<sup>10</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 28.

confer with the priest as to the ceremonies of the Church: Lenten and Saturday memorial services and wedding ceremonies. In such conferences there were continuous and persuasive pleas of the petitioners to the priest and it was called 'getting the priest's consent' . . . From this a folk saying evolved: 'It is not terrifying to get married, but it is fearful to get the priest's consent.' This villainous tradition . . . continues to this day, and the priests, with their income fixed from above, continue their shameless demands and toll-collections as before . . . and no one speaks or cries out about it."<sup>11</sup> At the end of this passage, the author describes how the Catholic and Orthodox bishops substituted for one another in case of absence by a mutual agreement and, thus, ruled over both dioceses, Catholic and Orthodox.

Konys'ky, an Orthodox Archbishop and a respectable Church historian, could not have written anything like this. And, in addition, there are other things in *Istoriya Rusov* which it would have been impossible for Konys'ky to write, since he did not have the necessary knowledge or experience. For example, he could not have discussed in such details the "thirty-four Cossack battles" against the Poles, international politics, treaties, the international balance of power, neutrality, etc. Nor could he have attempted to relate purely juridical details about the rights of the Cossacks, this "knightly class," which in all respects was equal to the nobility. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* repeated this idea many times. He polemicizes with those who denied "rights to the knights." Nor could he have written about events in the period from 1760 to 1790 in the Ukraine. Konys'ky was not a witness of these events, but the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was.

When a critical examination of *Istoriya Rusov* began, i.e., an investigation of the sources and a collation of the contents with these incontrovertible historical sources, then immediately the "holy robe of historian was taken off Konys'ky," according to Kulish. This "disrobing" was no sooner completed than the researchers "robed" another person mentioned in the Preface, Hryhory Poletyka. Professor Ikonnikov in 1874 was the first to attribute the authorship to H. Poletyka, but only as an hypothesis. It

<sup>11</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, pp. 38-39.

remained for O. Lazarevs'ky to present the case in all its details. Using the Poletyka archives, he published three articles in 1891 in *Kievskaya starina* under the general title: "Excerpts from the Family Archives of the Poletykas."<sup>12</sup> O. Lazarevs'ky based his assertion that H. Poletyka was the author of *Istoriya Rusov* on external evidence and on Vasył' Poletyka's letter to Rumyantsev and did not collate the writings of H. Poletyka with the text of *Istoriya Rusov*. The letter was dated November 25, 1812. Vasył' Poletyka describes a fire which destroyed the large and valuable library of his father, H. Poletyka. He wrote that the library was "collected carefully and with great difficulty by my father in his final days and later by me. The books are mostly on Little Russian history, the writing (of this history) was his aim and, finally, mine." O. Lazarevs'ky used this letter as the basis for his hypothesis that H. Poletyka had begun a history of the Ukraine and that his son, Vasył', undertook its completion. He added that he found *no traces of this history in the family archives of the Poletykas*. Actually, M. Voznyak pointed out that M. O. Sudienko acquired some of the documents from the Poletyka archives before O. Lazarevs'ky, and, if he had found the *Istoriya Rusov* among them, he would have, undoubtedly, so informed O. Bodyansky, since he shared his discoveries in the field of "ancient Ukrainian writings" with him. Lazarevs'ky bolstered his hypothesis by saying: "The author of *Istoriya Rusov* was an ardent Ukrainian patriot, and so was H. Poletyka." He also supports his case with a passage from *Istoriya Rusov*, the story of the death of Hetman Mnohohrishny. Here, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* relates that Mnohohrishny died "of wounds" and "was buried with great military and church honors in Baturin." In reality, Mnohohrishny died in Siberia, having been banished by the tsar with his family after a trial in Moscow. Lazarevs'ky rationalized this historically incorrect account of the death of Mnohohrishny by saying that Poletyka could not describe Mnohohrishny's fate in accordance with the facts, since a distant relative was married to a daughter of Mnohohrishny. Such authoritative historians as M. Hrushevs'ky and N. Vasylenko sup-

<sup>12</sup> The three articles were: "Proiskhozhdeniye Poletyk," "Shest pisem raznykh lits o biblioteke Gr. Poletyky," "Dogadka ob avtore *Istoriyi Rusov*."

ported this hypothesis; D. Doroshenko was a particularly fervent follower.

One must admit that H. Poletyka possessed an outstanding knowledge of the history of the Ukraine. Furthermore, he possessed a large library on Ukrainian history, which increased his advantages.<sup>13</sup> His knowledge of history and his competence as an historian, author, and speaker were amply displayed when he was a delegate from the Lubny nobility to the Commission for Drawing Up a New Code of 1767. As a representative of the nobility, Poletyka was well prepared: he wrote some articles, propositions, notes, and made speeches. He debated with the representative of the Little Russian College, D. Natalin. Academician N. Vasylenko published many of his notes in the first volume of the Ukrainian Archeographical Collection of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1926.<sup>14</sup> The remaining notes were published in other editions.

Those scholars who proposed H. Poletyka as the author tried to bulwark their assertions by saying that the various political and historical views, which are scattered throughout his writings, were later focused, creating the homogeneous historical *Weltanschauung* of *Istoriya Rusov*. D. Doroshenko wrote: "When the theses, expressions, and language of these notes are compared with those of *Istoriya Rusov*, there is no doubt that this man and the author of *Istoriya Rusov* are one and the same person," i.e. H. Poletyka.<sup>15</sup>

I once had the opportunity of questioning the accuracy of Doroshenko's statement in my article: "On the Question of the Author of *Istoriya Rusov*."<sup>16</sup> A comparison of Poletyka's political and historical views with those of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was proof that H. Poletyka was not and could not have been the author. I want to quote this article to point out how the proponents of this idea, i.e. H. Poletyka was the author, "read and compared" his writings with the text of *Istoriya Rusov*. Three important themes in the works of Poletyka are his attitude toward

<sup>13</sup> He observed that the library was able to compete with any national or private library in Russia.

<sup>14</sup> *Ukrayins'ky arkheohrafichny zbirnyk VUAN*, Vol. I, 1926.

<sup>15</sup> *Khliborob's'ka Ukrayina*, No. 3, p. 189; *Ohlyad ukr. istoriohrafyyi*, p. 50.

<sup>16</sup> See footnote 2.

the Ukrainian nobility (its position in the state, its rights and privileges, its relation to other classes of the population), his attitude toward the Ukrainian state structure after 1654 (the Hetmancy), and toward the national and the political program for the future.

H. Poletyka conjectured in reference to the privileges of the Polish kings that the Ukrainian nobility benefited from the same rights, privileges, and freedom as the Polish nobility. All military and civil establishments and laws depended upon the nobility who had the right to introduce laws at their Little Sejms and to submit them to the General Sejm for confirmation by the king. The Civil and criminal court were controlled by the nobility, and appeals to these courts went to the tribunal, which consisted of the nobility. The Ukrainian nobility were active in both *curiae*, "the senatorial and the knightly," which ruled over the Polish Republic with the king. The Ukrainian townspeople had the same legal status as the Polish. This, according to Poletyka, is the real basis of the nobility, clergy, and townsfolk under the Polish rule. With regard to the populace, the "muzhiks," Poletyka wrote that they, like the Polish and Lithuanian peasants, were completely dependent upon their landlords, who levied taxes and imposed work upon them, although, according to the tradition of the time, these were light and moderate.<sup>17</sup> With respect to the Cossack army, a completely different basis was apparent. Poletyka, in presenting a history of the Cossacks' origin in 1516, named Ostap Dashkovych as their "founder and first commander." (In *Istoriya Rusov* Prentslav Laskorons'ky is named the first Cossack hetman.) Then, the Cossacks' table of organization during the reign of King Batory was described and the fact was stressed that the Cossacks were allowed the privileges of selecting their officers and the "supreme commander" from their own ranks, and that their estates were tax-free, etc. In addition, they could use the courts of the nobles in matters pertaining to their estates. But this did not mean that the Cossacks were eligible to serve in the zemsky administration; "the Cossacks did not have the prerogatives and preference of the nobles, who alone were

<sup>17</sup> *Istoric. izvestiye*, pp. 148-149, 151-152.

privileged to hold civil rank.”<sup>18</sup> In their legal acts, the supreme commanders were not called hetmans, but “senior officers of the Zaporozhian army.”<sup>19</sup> When the Ukraine accepted the protection of the Muscovite Tsar, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, with his army, negotiated all the necessary points with Moscow, but, neither in the treaty nor in the petition to the tsar, “did he dare mention that he ought to be the supreme Regent in Little Russia and manage both civil and military affairs.” On the contrary, there was a provision in the treaty that “the nobility should continue to benefit from their rights,” i.e., the right to select senior officers for judicial posts and to hold the civil and criminal courts and that these rights should never be violated.<sup>20</sup> As a result of the Treaty of 1654, the nobles, the hetman, the army, the clergy, and the townspeople received separate certificates. Poletyka commented, “Hetman Khmelnytsky, although he considered himself the liberator of Little Russia, did not dare demand absolute power over this land, although, judging by his strength at that time, he could have gained it.”<sup>21</sup> What he was not able to accomplish openly, he gained secretly for himself and the succeeding hetmans. He did not mention the tribunal and the court of appeals in the treaties, since he wanted to take the control into his own hands. Actually, this assertion is correct and is confirmed by the fact that the civil and criminal courts existed under the rule of B. Khmelnytsky and Vyhovsky, while they were not mentioned in the treaties during Yuriy Khmelnytsky’s reign. “And a period of misfortune followed in Little Russia.” The nobility, thus ignored and scorned, was forced to submit to the power of the Hetman and to enlist in the Cossack army. In such a situation there were many opportunities for the hetmans to carry out their arrogant and capricious desires.<sup>22</sup> Poletyka continues: “Having deprived the nobility of the courts, the hetmans handed them to the military officers, captains and colonels, and took the appeal cases into their own hands. Instead of concentrating on military affairs

<sup>18</sup> *Vozrazheniye . . .*, p. 153.

<sup>19</sup> *Istor. izvestiye*, p. 153.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 159.

exclusively, they handled civil and criminal cases. They did the same with the town magistrate courts. They flagrantly usurped the prerogatives and powers of the sovereigns: the general treasury of Little Russia and the distribution of real property (towns, villages, lands, and the appendages of landed property). And in another place Poletyka wrote: "I do not know if any good man of the Little Russian nobility, one who knows his rights, would ever want to have a hetman. For it is common knowledge that they appropriated all the power and the rights of the nobility and then secured these usurpations by bribing those above them. If the power of the hetman was restricted, as the superior officers had requested, then they would not be harmful to Russia and would never be a burden to Little Russia. . . . Neither the hetman of Little Russia, nor the power of his office is necessary, nor is any other power necessary; such an absolute power over all military, civil, and administrative details has no useful function. These hetmans would have the right to do whatever they wished, and, according to the law, absolute power belongs to a sovereign and to no one else."

From Poletyka's writings and speeches at the *Komissiya novavo ulozheniya*, we can summarize his national and political program: All rights and freedoms must be returned to the Ukrainian people, primarily, to the nobility, as it was under Poland. The national, executive, and judicial affairs must be administered by the nobility. The nobility will carry on its legislative functions at its sejms or general meetings, with the requisite that they submit the adopted laws to the tsar for approval. The army and military matters must be separated from the civil, rural, and urban affairs. The rule and administration of the hetman or anyone else, except the nobility, are unnecessary. It is on these premises that "Little Russia must be established, a state with its own rights and freedom and still useful to the Russian Empire."

Hryhory Poletyka, this so-called "ardent patriot," expressed these ideas in his writings and speeches during his most intense political and public activities. Now, what does the author of *Istoriya Rusov* have to say in respect to these questions? First, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was familiar with Poletyka's writings. Thus, he disputes with him and controverts certain statements. A few passages in *Istoriya Rusov* deal with the nobility and other classes of the

population. The former is discussed in the chapter dealing with the set-up of the Ukrainian lands under Lithuanian rule. "The government officials, and the hetmans themselves, and the town and rural officials were elected from the knightly ranks and the population was made up of three classes: the nobility, the clergy, and the *pospolstvo*."<sup>23</sup> "The nobility, in conformity with the examples of all people and states, was composed of the worthy and distinguished families in the land, who always bore the title of knights in Rus'. The boyars, who derived from the princely families, were included in this class. Also, the selected officials and simple soldiers, who were called Cossacks by origin. These provided all ranks through an election and, after the tour of duty, returned to their former rank. These made up one knightly class. The clergy, composed of the most worthy of the knightly class, were distinguished by their service to God, and, according to the *zemsky* administration, they had equal rights." And finally the *pospolstvo*, in which class the author of *Istoriya Rusov* included the merchants and the people who lived in the city, the free men who lived in villages and paid the military tax, and those who were subject to the boyars and officials. The *pospolstvo* were tried according to the Magdeburg Laws. Thus, differences are already apparent in the outlooks of H. Poletyka and the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. In the latter, the basis of law for the nobility, clergy, and the Cossacks was one and the same. While in Poletyka's writings, the king's privileges and rights equal to the Polish nobility prevailed for the knightly class, the nobility, and the clergy. There was another set of laws, purely military, for the Cossacks, and, furthermore, the Cossacks did not belong to the nobility.

In a further discussion of the effects of the Church Union upon Ukrainian society, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* wrote that "a schism occurred between the Little Russian nobility in the military and provincial offices and the people, when the former proved unable to endure the loss of their rank and the Polish persecutions, i.e., the loss of their property. They renounced their Little Russian heritage, changed their names, and began to call themselves "native Poles." And their property, offices, and rights, equal to those of the Polish

<sup>23</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 7.

nobility, were restored. "And in gratitude, they accepted, in the minds of the Little Russian people, the Polish system of politics, and, in imitating the latter, harried these unfortunate people without regard."<sup>24</sup> In a further description, the author brands those nobles who betrayed their people "as Poles, but of the same religion as the Little Russians." In the provisions of the Treaty of 1654 with Moscow, it was agreed in the third article with regard to these "Polish" nobles that the nobility should continue to profit from their rights and privileges in the Ukraine, since they were equal to the native nobility and under military protection.<sup>25</sup> However, this hit the Government like a thunderbolt and proved a bitter pill to those who protected such vicious people. These nobles, always occupied the "highest ranks and offices in Little Russia and in the army and they introduced new faces into government service and were responsible for treacheries in favor of the Poles. They were instrumental in providing a bitter cup for the people to swallow and for all the vileness and carnage in Khmelnytsky's wake." These Polonized nobles slowly occupied all Cossack offices, gained control of the officers, and were proud of their families and "education"... Many of the Little Russians "envied and were jealous of them," especially the sons of priests who had sided with their "system." "The latter Polonized their names somewhat and boasted of their origin." Baptized Jews, those who were forced to accept Christianity, joined them and were entered in the ranks of the nobles on the basis of the articles of the Statute on Converts. "In merging the languages and origins," a class of nobles was formed, which was the "only whip for the Cossacks and Little Russians."<sup>26</sup> These nobles controlled all offices and institutions and became rich by various intrigues, or, rather, taking advantage of the simplicity and submissiveness, they deprived them (the Cossacks) of all rights as nobles, which included the title of knight. They had possessed these rights from time immemorial and these had been sanctioned by all treaties. These were acquired as their birth right. Consequently, many were driven to the remote regions of the land and others, into the rural

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121.

districts. The rest, into the situation in which they now find themselves.<sup>27</sup>

The author of *Istoriya Rusov* availed himself of another opportunity to discuss certain characteristics of the Ukrainian nobility. He evaluated the judicial reform of 1763 of Hetman Rozumovs'ky and emphasized that the Cossack land affairs (zemsky, civil) were handed over to the district zemsky court with the civil affairs of the officials of the nobility. The Cossacks belonged to this class on the basis of their ancient privileges and treaties, which allowed all Cossack affairs to be resolved in courts on the basis of ancient privileges and treaties. Even the Polish nobles were protected by the army according to the articles of the treaty and they had not dared to appropriate rights for themselves alone. They did not deny these rights to the Cossacks, who were their protectors.<sup>28</sup>

The last passage dealing with the courts was the reply of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* to such words of Poletyka to Natalin: "The College proclaimed that the Cossacks be respected as nobles; [it does so] without considering the general laws and the form of government of the Polish people. According to the laws and statutes of this Republic, there is a great difference between being tried according to the laws of the nobility and having a nobleman's preference. . . . From ancient times, the Cossacks, as a military class, were tried according to the laws of the nobility. Thus it is today, military personnel are tried by the same law, but this is not satisfactory. Clergy are tried by the same law in Poland. Those clergy who are not of noble origin are judged by the same law as the military Tatars and the Jews. They do not have nobles' privileges. Why is it that in Cossacks' courts or amongst themselves they call themselves nobles? They do this through carelessness and because they are judged as nobles."

In collating the text of *Istoriya Rusov* and the writings of H. Poletyka on the trials of the Cossacks according to the articles of the laws of the nobility, the fact that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was acquainted with the differences of opinion between Poletyka and the delegate, Natalin, is made clear. But he favored the

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 249.

opinion of the latter. Another fact must be emphasized here: to prove his point on the rights of the nobles, Poletyka relied on Polish laws; the author of *Istoriya Rusov* clung to the resolutions of the Ukrainian Code of 1743, although he did not refer to it specifically. This Code differentiated between the noble and knightly classes because of their origin and balanced the rights of both classes. Poletyka depended on what existed in Poland, while the author of *Istoriya Rusov* took his facts from the reality of the Ukrainian state.

Thus, a major disparity in outlook is apparent in the comparison of the texts in the matter of Cossack affairs, the status of the nobility, and the power of the hetman. Poletyka believed that the hetman was a usurper of both the rights and freedom of the nobles and the state power, which presumably in the Ukraine belonged only to the Muscovite tsars. On the other hand, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* believed that the hetman was "the head of the people," "the supreme chief and master of the lands of Rus'," "and a person who represented the nation."<sup>29</sup> Nowhere in *Istoriya Rusov* are there ideas critical of the hetmancy or of its functional value. When a stricture of the hetman is expressed, it is only directed to the person of the hetman and not to the administration, nor to the hetman as the chief instrument of the state. Poletyka used the idea of a republic of nobles with the Russian Tsar at the head, patterned somewhat after the Polish Republic; the author of *Istoriya Rusov* hoped for the restitution of the republican order in an independent Ukrainian state with an elective hetman at the head. Bitterly, he states that Hetman K. Rozumovs'ky, in refusing the hetmancy, did not show a firmness of spirit, having accepted as "compensation" the gift from the Empress — the Hetman's estate, the so-called *Hadyats'ky Klyuch*. He reproached the General Staff, which according to ancient custom, was to convene and send a delegation to the Empress to demand an election of a new hetman in such a case (the abdication of the hetman). But this time the officers were calm and did nothing. Following the example of the hetman, they expected to receive estates becoming their rank "as the last officials of the old system. They patiently awaited

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95, 142 and 203.

the fulfillment of their expectations, priding themselves in the hope of becoming powerful officials at the expense of the nation, while leaving the nation to await a bounty from above." And they were badly mistaken. The author ironically remarks: "the results were entirely different."<sup>30</sup>

I will not dwell on the minor points of difference, but I will emphasize the fact that Poletyka, like Kony's'ky, was not sufficiently versed in international politics or military matters to discuss them adequately. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* was.

The language and expressions in the works of Poletyka have much in common with *Istoriya Rusov*. It was the official Russian language used by Ukrainian writers of the second half of the eighteenth century. It is not in the similarity of expressions, however, that one must look for signs of identity, but in the personal characteristics of the language.

In Poletyka's work the language lacked local Ukrainian color in its construction and expressions. It is more cultured and more closely related to the official language; in certain cases, it is more refined than the Russian language of the period. Poletyka, having lived in Petersburg from an early age, was a foreign language translator and, consequently, used the literary language of the time.<sup>31</sup> The language in *Istoriya Rusov* is not as smooth, dry, or academic.<sup>32</sup> The most interesting feature is its personal characteristics of the following type: 1) *The use of Ukrainian proverbs*, either in their entirety or single words taken from them. For example: *yednat' popa; nabrydla; abyyak; dobryden'; shybenytsya; yakykh stvorylyste, takykh y mate; parafiya; zdyrstvo*; and many, many others. 2) *The use of biblical words and sentences*. For example: "and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," "and wicked men shall die," "there was none to bury them," "into the ravenous birds of every sort, and to the beasts of the field to be devoured," "and my sin is ever before

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>31</sup> He worked in the Academy of Sciences and, later, as chief inspector of the Nobles Naval Cadet Corps.

<sup>32</sup> I am not a philologist and, as a dilettante in this respect, I may be mistaken in some things. Unfortunately, a philological study has not been made of the language. Such a study would be of great value to us, historians and jurists.

me," "come and see," and many others. 3) *A style taken from documents, which he had composed, and a speech style, adapted to contemporary language and persons.* For example: In the Privileges, given to Halychyna in 1339 by King Casimir: "In view of the persecutions and grief of the people of Rus', who have been impoverished by the local priests and ruined by the Hungarian kings, whence came impudent Byelovs and Kolmans, who appropriated the above-mentioned lands and destroyed them. . ." [obachivshi utiski i frasunki lyudu ruskovo, oskudelovo ksenzhatami tuteishimi i yak ikh nivechat kroli Vengerski, otrodky nakhalnykh Belov i Koloman, yaki zdavna zemlyu onuyu sobechili i nishchili. . .] Or the Muscovite delegates write from Poland to the tsar in the following language: "The servicemen (*żolnierstwo*) clink and rattle through the city and taverns to a terrifying degree and this in the presence of the ambassadors; and they say that in all the villages they have immense numbers of troops, and very often the bragging Poles say: "The Cossacks are ours.'" [zholnerstvo (polske) po gorodu i v korchmakh vseгда pri nikh (poslakh) poshchelkivayet i pobryazgivayet, shto azhno uzhasht beret; a po derevnyam u nikh voisk, govoryat, vidimo-nevidimo i chastekhonko khvastlivyie polyachishki, progovarivayutsya, chto "nashi yuzh kazaki." ] Or Sirko writes to Hetman Samoylovych: "We are only amazed that you, Hetman, play with us so much, as does your father with the parishioners at dinners in Zinkov, which we wish you in return." [To nam tilko dyvno, shcho ty, pane getmane bagato kolo nas kharkhiruesh, mov tviy batyushka na khavturakh s parafianami v Zinkovi, choho my vam upriime zhalayem.] There are many others. 4) *Wit, humor, irony, and sarcasm* are scattered throughout *Istoriya Rusov*. They are used to poke fun at someone or something, or to jeer at someone and seal it with a sharp word. For example: Bohdan Khmelnytsky, in replying to the reproach of the Crimean Khan that the Hetman wished to accept the tsar's protection, stated that from among the evils which surround the Zaporozhian army, he choose the lesser one: "when the people of Rus' are unfortunate, they are unfortunate because of their neighbors (meaning the Tatars), who, without reason, tormented and insulted them, and now they are

jealous and torment themselves with pity which is aspic on the head of man.”<sup>33</sup> Speaking of the Zaporozhian dissatisfaction with the Muscovite protection, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* describes the reasons for this mood in the following manner: “During the campaigns of the Cossacks and Russian *streltsi* and quiver-bearers, the Cossacks endured frequent and deliberate mockery because of their shaved heads. The Russians, in grey, long-skirted coats and bast shoes, unshaven and wearing beards, looked like peasants and, nevertheless, had the unbelievable effrontery, or the odious habit, of using mocking, slang names for the troops of the other nations, *Polyachishki*, *Nimchurki*, *Tatarishki*, etc. They called the Cossacks *chuby* and *khokhly* and sometimes even “brainless *khokhly*.” The Cossacks were completely exasperated, quarreled and fought with them, and, finally, became irreconcilably hostile and breathed deep abhorrence.”<sup>34</sup>

Or, Hetman P. Doroshenko wrote to the Hetman of the Left Bank Ukraine, Bryukhovets’ky: “You and your officers enriched yourselves in Moscow with women, while the people pay for the dowry . . . you resemble the shepherd who holds a cow by the horns while others milk her.”<sup>35</sup>

On the atrocities and licentiousness in the Ukraine of the Muscovite army, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* said that it followed the formula, “I am a servant of the Tsar. I serve God and the Tsar for the entire Christian world. The chicken and geese, young women and girls belong to us according to the right of a serviceman and according to the command of His Honour.”<sup>36</sup>

Rumyantsev’s Census and Inventory displeased the author and provoked this comment: “But as a boon to humanity, through an unknown fate, they are being persecuted by all kinds of evil of those burdening them and they supply materials for philosophers, who wrangle for centuries about the origin of good and evil, and have not yet settled these questions. The people of Little

<sup>33</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 109.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.

Russia, in their bliss, were visited by this infliction of an evil calumny."<sup>37</sup>

When the inhabitants were burdened with the quartering of soldiers and the support of the army of the Muscovite garrisons, the author quotes the following quasi-folk proverb: "O, Muscovites! O, Falcons! You have devoured our oxen! And if you return in good health, you will devour our remaining cows!"

5) Finally, the author used terms, concepts, and expressions foreign to Russian, which he borrowed from Western European languages of the period of the French Revolution. These pertain to national organization and bodies, international politics, and law. In addition to the frequent use of the terms national, nation, the author used others, e.g., politics, ministers, ministry, government, patriot, anti-patriot, citizen, departments, chancellor, revolution, neutrality, neutral, balance of power, blockade, contribution, and many others.

6) In addition to the above-mentioned individual characteristics, the original method of treating the historical process in the Ukraine at that time is striking. Granting the many historical errors and fabrications, *Istoriya Rusov* presents a true perspective of the internal affairs, the international situation in the Ukraine, her political weight and role among contemporary European states, and this in a broad and idealized manner.

The Ukraine of the Princely Period is described as an independent state under the leadership of elected princes.<sup>38</sup> As a result of the Tatar invasions and disputes among the princes, its independence was lost. Then, voluntarily, the Ukraine joined Lithuania and Poland on the basis of a treaty, occupying a position of equality in the federated Polish-Lithuanian-Ukrainian State.<sup>39</sup> Poland violated this federation; gradually the rights and freedoms of the Ukrainian people were abrogated and they were forced to accept the Church Union. Hetman Khmelnytsky, with the aid of the Cossacks, freed the Ukraine and restored its independence. From the period of B. Khmelnytsky, the author writes of the

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 257.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

history of the Ukraine against the background of contemporary European history. The Ukraine is part of the European system, states which are interconnected by an international, political balance. He points out the misgivings in Europe as a result of the Pereyaslav Treaty, since these states viewed the Treaty as a dangerous violation of the balance of power in Europe. Actually, the Muscovite State was strengthened by this Ukrainian union and was unexpectedly elevated to the ranks of the "mighty and fearful sovereignties."<sup>40</sup> It was for this reason that these western nations "besieged" Khmelnytsky with threats and demands that the Ukraine be returned to Poland, or, at least, "to its original, neutral position." After the victorious battle against the Poles, these threats became real. Supposedly, the author speaks through the Crimean Khan and characterizes the internal and external position of Moscow, her lack of culture, her desire for power and the annexation of kingdoms and empires.<sup>41</sup> The author points out the Ukraine's obligations as an ally of Sweden and the demands of the latter that the Ukraine assist her in the battle against Poland and against the powerful German designs on Lithuania, Pomerania, and Holstein.<sup>42</sup> Khmelnytsky aided Sweden to defeat Poland, Denmark and other nations. The latter, more concerned with their own interests, did not help Poland. After the conclusion of the treaty between Sweden and Denmark, the Holy Roman Emperor and German ruler, Ferdinand III, and the Polish Primate, Urban, sent Khmelnytsky a note asking him to sever the alliance with Sweden and to return to the Polish federation with equal rights. They promised to guarantee this, or, at least, "to maintain a neutrality." When he disagreed, they threatened to destroy "his nation," considering his actions to be detrimental and hostile toward the Catholic world.<sup>43</sup> Khmelnytsky presumably replied that he could not sever the treaty of alliance with Sweden, since international treaties are holy and inviolable. Soon a "unity mission" came from the Sultan and the Holy Roman Emperor. The "mission" stated that

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 134-135.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 156.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Poland, having been utterly defeated in the wars with the Cossacks, Moscow, and Sweden, would be compelled to unite with Moscow either by treaty or under pressure, and, as a result, would become a "colossal state." Therefore, the Turkish and Roman rulers, espousing the peoples' rights and upholding the political balance of power, again demanded that the Hetman sever relations with Sweden, abandon the protection of Moscow, and unite with Poland "with the rights and freedoms of a free nation." A "constitutional enactment" with the Poles will be drawn up, which these rulers will guarantee and defend forever.<sup>44</sup> Here, Khmelnytsky makes an interesting reply, since it follows the eighteenth century concept of the "natural rights" of nations, i.e., the right to self-determination and defense of independence. Khmelnytsky accuses these nations of "seeking to preserve this balance of power by enslaving the Ukrainian people, which seems strange and incompatible with a political or moral code."<sup>45</sup>

Again the author returns to the international significance of the Ukraine after the election of Yuriy Khmelnytsky. He says that foreign delegations came to the young Hetman and asked: "On what foundation and according to what plan and circumstances will he rule over the people of Rus'?" To this Yuriy Khmelnytsky replied that, having suffered enough from the "protection" and having been liberated from them "by the past revolutions and by the pressure of the nations upon them, he is resolved, in respect to the interested nations, to remain neutral and to trust only himself."<sup>46</sup> Finally, in the speech made by the Hetman Mazepa when he went over to the side of Charles XII, the author describes the Ukraine's difficult position when the territory became the scene of decisive battles between two "fearful despots." If the Swedish King proved the victor, then the Ukraine would be given to Poland as a spoil of war; if the Muscovite Tsar proved victorious, then Moscow would actuate its infernal plan, which had been prepared for the Ukraine. Mazepa chose the lesser evil; he signed

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151.

a treaty with Sweden and demanded the same rights that the Ukraine had possessed under its previous princes and which are the right of every independent nation. Also, he demanded neutrality with Sweden, Poland, and Moscow.<sup>47</sup> "We, therefore," Mazepa stated, "should consider the Swedes as friends and allies sent by God to liberate and to raise the Ukraine 'to the highest degree of freedom and independence.' For it is known that formerly we were what the Muscovites are now: government, supremacy, and the very name Rus' passed from us to them."<sup>48</sup>

These quotations from *Istoriya Rusov* indicate that its author had a thorough knowledge and understanding of international politics in the seventeenth century, but he adapted the concepts, ideas, and terms of the end of the eighteenth century to it. He idealized these political concepts and made his personages express themselves in the way the author deemed most appropriate. In this respect, he reveals himself. *Apropos* of the Poltava battle, he commented that Mazepa remained completely neutral and did not send his Cossacks against the Muscovite army. However, a fate befell them which was similar to the "dead bodies from Lebedyn." He then added: "It is noteworthy that the idea of neutrality, a foreign word, *was interpreted differently than it is today.*"<sup>49</sup>

Only a person familiar with all the contemporary secrets of diplomacy, the system of the European balance of power, neutrality, etc., could have described international politics in such a way. The author was one who was experienced in the dealings of international politics with Sweden, Poland, Germany, Turkey, and the Crimea. Neither Konys'ky, nor the Poletykas had this experience.

## II

The personal characteristics of language, the professional knowledge of international politics and of the governmental structure

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 204.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215.

of West European nations, and the detailed descriptions of military incidents and battles, coupled with the evidence to be introduced, convince me that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was Oleksander Bezborod'ko. This was my hypothesis in my article "On the Question of the Author of *Istoriya Rusov*."<sup>50</sup> M. Voznyak simultaneously came to the same conclusion in his monograph "Pseudo-Konys'ky and Pseudo-Poletyka."<sup>51</sup> Since we did not know of each other's work, we therefore advanced different arguments and different methods of exposition. However, they supplement each other and lead to the same conclusion.

Oleksander Bezborod'ko, the son of a chief clerk, Andriy Bezborod'ko, was the most talented and prominent of the Ukrainians, who by a trick of fate served not his Fatherland but Moscow, which at that time was already called the Russian Empire. He was born in 1747 in the district of Chernihiv and died in 1799, being only fifty-two years old. During 1755-1765, he studied in the Kiev Academy and, having completed his studies with the rank of an Officer of the Hetman's Suite, entered the service as a secretary to Peter Rumyantsev, the Governor-General of the Ukraine and president of the Little Russian College and, after the abdication of Hetman K. Rozumovsky, he ruled the Ukraine. Two years later, at twenty, he became a member of the reformed General Court and, in 1769, after the declaration of war against Turkey, he enlisted. He commanded the Nizhen Cossack regiment and, later, a detachment made up of the Lubny, Myrhorod, and Kampany regiments. With these regiments, he participated in the battles in Moldavia and then beyond the Danube in the conflict with Turkey, 1769-1773. For this service he was promoted to a colonel and attached to the Kiev regiment. In 1774, he was sent by Rumyantsev to Empress Catherine II to report on the war. He remained as a private secretary to the Empress, receiving petitions destined for her. In 1780, he was attached to the College of Foreign Affairs and was "authorized to handle all negotiations" (with foreign nations). This post was the result of a memorandum on political affairs which he had submitted. In 1784 he actively

<sup>50</sup> See footnote 2.

<sup>51</sup> See footnote 2.

participated in drawing up a peace treaty with Turkey; this concerned the Russian annexation of the Crimea, Taman', and Kuban'. He was awarded the title of Count of the Roman Empire, presented to him by the Holy Roman Emperor. As a reward for his work in the Swedish wars, he was granted the rank of a secret councilor, chamberlain, and given the post of the second vice-chancellor (after Osterman) in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1791, he bore complete responsibility for the negotiations at Jassy, which concerned the peace with Turkey. Afterwards, he took part in the partition of Poland, 1793-1795. When Catherine died in 1796, Tsar Paul I assigned him the chancellorship of the Russian Empire and he received the title of Most Serene Prince.

N. Hryhorovych in his monograph "Prince O. A. Bezborod'ko and the Affairs of His Period,"<sup>52</sup> pointed out that O. Bezborod'ko had a fluent command of Russian, both spoken and written; however, his pronunciation had a decided Ukrainian accent. He had a phenomenal memory (he knew the whole Bible by heart). He quickly learned French, German, and Italian during his service. When Catherine was interested in the theories of the French Encyclopedists, she corresponded with Diderot and Voltaire; these matters passed through the hands of O. Bezborod'ko, her personal secretary.<sup>53</sup> O. Bezborod'ko was also influenced by the Encyclopedists and became, as was said at that time, "a freethinker, a Voltairian."

"In his writings, notes, and other documents," wrote N. Hryhorovych, "he is a man who thinks factually and penetratingly. He states his thoughts clearly, precisely, and, sometimes, with attractive vivacity. One might suppose that Bezborod'ko, had he entered the literary field, would have become a famous writer."<sup>54</sup>

De Parello, the ambassador of the King of Sardinia, wrote of him: "Bezborod'ko is the only one to report directly to the Empress. Blessed with a good memory, which helps him considerably,

<sup>52</sup> N. Grigorovich, "Knyaz' O. A. Bezborod'ko v svyazi s sobyitiyami yevo vremeni," *IRIO*, Vols. 26 and 29 and a separate publication in two volumes.

<sup>53</sup> Bezborod'ko did not relinquish this duty even after he became vice-chancellor.

<sup>54</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, 29, 87.

. . . he also possessed gifts of a higher order to resolve surely the most delicate matters. . . ”<sup>55</sup>

O. Bezborod'ko was interested in history, literature, and art. He was an adequate authority on art, possessing a large collection of paintings of the best European masters. M. O. Lvov, a poet, critic, and authority on contemporary art, lived for some time in Bezborod'ko's palace and introduced him to Derzhavin, Khemnitser, Fonvizin, and "freethinkers," like Radishchev, Novikov, etc. He maintained a close contact with them. In 1782 he accepted Vasyly Kapnist into the postal service of his department and in 1788 he helped him submit a plan to the Empress, entitled: "How an Army of Volunteer Cossacks Might Be Selected and Maintained," to which Bezborod'ko appended his favorable opinion. It might be conjectured that Kapnist went on a secret mission to Frederick William II in 1791 with the aid of Bezborod'ko, who was then vice-chancellor and in charge of international relations. Bezborod'ko influenced Tsar Paul to release Radishchev, sentenced during Catherine's reign, from capital punishment. Later he was instrumental in Radishchev's pardon. He also stopped the investigations of the so-called "Martinists" in Moscow.<sup>56</sup>

From this brief biography and from an analysis of his writings, it is evident that O. Bezborod'ko was highly educated for his time. His political and social views were similar to the ideas of the freedom-loving thinkers and writers of Western Europe. O. Bezborod'ko differed from the other magnates of the time in his gentleness, graciousness, and readiness to help those who turned to him. These qualities were even known abroad. M. Voznyak quoted H. I. Poletyka's letter from Vienna to his relative, also Hryhory Poletyka. H. I. Poletyka advised him as soon as he reached Petersburg "to address yourself to Bezborod'ko as soon as possible. I have heard much of his honesty and kindness and I am sure of these qualities."<sup>57</sup>

His home in Petersburg was open to all, especially to his coun-

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 321.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26, 95-97.

<sup>57</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

trymen from the Chernihiv and the Poltava districts. His waiting-room was always filled with these people, who came to the capital either with their private matters or to seek employment for themselves or their sons. O. Bezborod'ko personally received them and helped them with advice, money, and protection.<sup>58</sup>

In defense of his countrymen, O. Bezborod'ko wrote and submitted to the Empress in 1784 "A Memorandum on the Chief towns of the Hadyach and Zmiyev Districts." The purpose was to introduce a petition in the Senate on behalf "of many nobles and members of the intelligentsia, who did not belong to the privileged class and who were deprived of their estates in favor of the Hadyach castle. This matter was litigated from 1778 and "the fate of these cities and many respectable families and persons from the armed services depended on a prompt decision." The Empress presented the *Hadyatsky klyuch* to ex-Hetman Rozumovsky. In his Memorandum, O. Bezborod'ko proved that these cities had never belonged to the Hadyach castle. Former hetmans had never assumed a specific ownership in this vicinity; however, "it was unknown how many inhabitants of these cities found themselves under Hetman Apostol, even though they had a tsar's certificate for the use of the Magdeburg Law. They took part in the elections of the hetmans and they signed statutes. This is another proof of the fact that O. Bezborod'ko kept the promise given to his father: a deep, unfeigned feeling for (his) fellow-citizens."

### III

Two letters of O. Bezborod'ko to his father first indicated to M. Voznyak and myself that Bezborod'ko was the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. In the first letter of August 1, 1776, he asked his father to send him "the book containing the Hetman's Statutes, two books on the constitution, the old and the new; the manuscript histories of Little Russia, one folio (quarto) and one in sheet form, and to buy a very clearly printed book of the Statute, and, if possible, the Order of the Magdeburg Laws. . . Some peo-

<sup>58</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

ple need these books to publish a history of Little Russia and to print a translation of the Statute."<sup>59</sup>

This list of sources which Bezborod'ko made up shows that he was familiar with the historical source materials of the Ukraine. A year after this letter, in 1777, Vasyl' Ruban published *A Short Chronicle of Little Russia from 1506 to 1776* in Petersburg. In the Preface he wrote: "The notes of this *Short Chronicle* for the period 1506 to 1734 were written by the Little Russian general clerks who were with the hetman, from the time of B. Khmelnytsky to the death of Danylo Apostol. I received these from His Grace, Georgy, Bishop of Mohyliv. Additions were made from that time until 1776 and the description of the present form of government, the notes to the hetmans, the chiefs of staff, and to the colonels were written by O. A. Bezborod'ko, a Kievan colonel. He served with *HRM* at the reception of the petition. Bezborod'ko knew the history of the Fatherland and possessed sufficient ability to execute the work. . ."

The text of Bezborod'ko quoted above and Ruban's Preface to the *Short Chronicle* supplement and explain each other. O. Bezborod'ko used the historical sources which his father sent him. These were needed to supplement Ruban's *Chronicle* and to compile the appendixes which Ruban published. It was the first historical work of O. Bezborod'ko.

After the publication of the *Short Chronicle* by Ruban, O. Bezborod'ko sent a copy of it to his father with a letter dated March 31, 1778. He wrote: "I take pleasure in presenting to you this *Chronicle of Little Russia up to 1776*. It includes the geographical description (of the land), a description of the government, and other vital information. Ruban, a court adviser, published it. I

<sup>59</sup> This letter needs some explanation. "The Hetman's Statutes" is undoubtedly B. Khmelnytsky's Treaty of 1654 with Moscow and similar treaties of succeeding hetmans. The two books on the constitutions refer to the Constitution of the Polish Republic. The manuscript histories of Little Russia: the small one might have been the "Sobraniye istoricheskoye" by Lukoms'ky, while the larger one might have been the "Litopys'" of Hrabynka, which had considerable influence on the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. "The very clearly printed book of the Statute" is without doubt the Lithuanian Statute in Polish. This was published in several editions, some of which were not clear. The Lithuanian Statute was indeed translated into Russian and published in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Finally, the Order of the Magdeburg Laws (Porjadok prav magdeburkskykh) was a collection of the Polish compiler B. Groicki. It is in Polish.

present it to you as a just tribute to you, who have shown in many instances a direct love for our country, our loving Fatherland, and whose sincere efforts have been extended to draw from oblivion the events and circumstances, which indicate the fame and glory of our ancestors. In the Preface, you, dear sir, can see that I gave Mr. Ruban some help in the publication of this book and have provided the most authoritative information of the present period. It is unfortunate that he hurried the printing of the foregoing pages, which contain mistakes against reality which I would have thrown out and I would have added the necessary facts which were omitted.”

“This little work is a guide to a more detailed history of Little Russia, which has been planned. Naturally, all errors appearing in the *Chronicle* will be rectified when we collect all the necessary data. I do this pleasant work in my leisure time and I bless your kind parental solicitude, which saw to it that I received a precise and detailed knowledge of my native land’s position and of all its past events. My satisfaction will be consummated when I complete this work, and, in particular, when its completion is followed by other instances which allow me to express my love for my fellow citizens.”<sup>60</sup>

This excerpt from the letter written in 1778 is of primary importance in supporting the hypothesis that O. Bezborod’ko was the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. It confirms the fact that he was gathering material for a history of the Ukraine. Compared with Vasyl’ Poletyka’s letter, Bezborod’ko’s letter is more important in that it speaks not only of future intentions but also of events which had already occurred and which were subject to investigation. In regard to the latter, the following facts should be mentioned: 1) A. Bezborod’ko had taught O. Bezborod’ko Ukrainian history from an early age and A. Bezborod’ko had spent almost forty years in the General Chancellery, one of the most important sources of Ukrainian history. Therefore, he could provide his son with complete information about “events and circumstances which indicate the fame and glory of [his] ancestors.” 2) The fact that O. Bezborod’ko had supplemented Ruban’s *Chronicle*.

<sup>60</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 262.

In regard to Bezborod'ko's future intentions, the letter mentions the services rendered to his Fatherland and his countrymen. These facts are substantiated by documents which prove that O. Bezborod'ko, using his high office in the Russian Government and at the Court, had defended the interests of the Ukraine. For example, during the reign of Catherine II, he resolutely opposed the plan of the General Prosecutor, Prince Vyazemsky, "to increase the state's income," by allowing the "three Little Russian province" to retain their privileges, while the Cossacks still have to serve in the army."<sup>61</sup> He supported the plan of Vasyl' Kapnist for the renewal of the Cossack army.<sup>62</sup> He protested the conscription of Ukrainian recruits in 1794<sup>63</sup> and, during the reign of Paul, he so influenced the tsar that the judicial system of 1763, which was abolished by Catherine, was restored. He was instrumental in moderating some of the severer aspects of Catherine's regime. I have already mentioned his solicitude and care for his countrymen. There were similar facts which were not recorded in documents, but which, nevertheless, offered basis for a reproach made against Bezborod'ko and for the rumors that he wanted to rule the Ukraine in the way the former hetmans ruled.<sup>64</sup> Now, it is necessary to prove that O. Bezborod'ko actually made use of the *Short Chronicle of Little Russia*, when he wrote the *Complete History of Little Russia*; that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* used it in his works; that O. Bezborod'ko made the corrections and appendixes which were mentioned in the letter to his father.

Ikonnikov, Slabchenko, and Yershov in their investigations of *Istoriya Rusov* confirm the fact that its author used Ruban's *Short Chronicle* with the appendixes by O. Bezborod'ko. In many instances, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* followed exactly certain descriptions, names of persons, and expressions and ideas. In his monograph, M. Voznyak compared the text of *Istoriya Rusov* with the text of the *Short Chronicle* in some detail.<sup>65</sup> In my article

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, I, pp. 514-522.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, II, pp. 516-517.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 314.

<sup>64</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

<sup>65</sup> On pages 139-150 he quoted parallel passages.

“On the Question of the Author of *Istoriya Rusov*” I did the same, emphasizing the emendations and additions which support the idea that *Istoriya Rusov* was written much later than the publishing of the *Short Chronicle*. With this in mind, the valid and definitive conclusion is that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* borrowed from the *Short Chronicle*.

Let us now compare this conclusion with O. Bezborod'ko's letter of 1778. He wrote “This little work (Ruban's *Short Chronicle*) is a guide for the complete history of Little Russia, now being planned. Naturally, all errors appearing in the *Chronicle* will be rectified.” Therefore, the letter categorically established the same relation between the *History of Little Russia* and the *Short Chronicle* as existed between *Istoriya Rusov* and the *Short Chronicle*. One logical conclusion evolves: the *History of Little Russia* by O. Bezborod'ko is nothing else but the *Istoriya Rusov*, and the author is the same Bezborod'ko. This was the conclusion of my article written in 1935.

In his monograph, M. Voznyak arrived at the same conclusion, only expressed more categorically. He wrote: “The similarities between *Istoriya Rusov* and Bezborod'ko's letters to his father are of particular importance. Without them, it would be impossible to prove that O. Bezborod'ko was the author on the basis of similarities between *Istoriya Rusov* and his additions to Ruban's book, i.e., it would be impossible to explain them as a borrowing from an unknown author. The similarity between *Istoriya Rusov* and Bezborod'ko's supplementary material and the similarity between *Istoriya Rusov* and O. Bezborod'ko's letters to his father provide a solid basis for recognizing him as the author of *Istoriya Rusov*.”<sup>68</sup>

In addition to these similarities between the *Istoriya Rusov*, Ruban's *Short Chronicle*, and the letters of O. Bezborod'ko to his father, a comparison of the text of *Istoriya Rusov* with the thoughts, style, and personal characteristics found in the works and the correspondence of O. Bezborod'ko, are of tremendous value. Here again, Voznyak and I found many similarities which substantiated our conclusion. I will quote the most outstanding:

a) In 1776 O. Bezborod'ko wrote a memorandum: “A Picture

<sup>68</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

or Short Description of the Russian-Tatar Wars and of the Events which Originated in the Middle of the Tenth Century and which Continued almost Uninterrupted for 800 Years." It begins with the following "Forewarning": "King Janus considered himself a most shrewd sovereign because of his knowledge of past history. Not only did he rule his kingdom wisely, but he was able to foresee future events. . . For this reason he is usually represented with two faces, as the emblem, which shows that he saw the future as well as the past. All the more so, it is necessary to know the history of one's state as well as one's neighbors. . . The Tatarian people are so closely connected with us that it is almost unpardonable not to have sufficient knowledge of them. . . On the contrary, I often had the occasion to hear wise and respected men who spoke of the Tatars as they would of a contemptible creature. . ." He wrote further that he only had "superficial information" about the Tatars, since he was in the Crimea "and other neighboring cities during the war." Therefore, he read "the various writings of foreign authors on this people, especially the histories of the past Russian wars with the Tatars . . . and a terrible and sad picture is presented to us: all Russia divided and swimming in its own blood."

After, Bezborod'ko describes in his own words the 800 years of wars with the "Tatar-Pechenegs," "the Tatar-Polovcians," and, finally, "the Mongolian Tatars." Later he writes about the "Kazan' Tatars."<sup>67</sup>

There are some similarities between the quoted material and *Istoriya Rusov*. The first is the conferring of a regal title to the Roman "two-faced Janus," although the explanation of the two-faced designation is correct. Similar "travesties" were typical of *Istoriya Rusov*. A second similarity is the expression: "swimming in its own blood." This hyperbole occurs a few times in *Istoriya Rusov*. For example, the author wrote in the Preface: "How this region (Little Russia) was ravaged in all ways, destroyed, and completely devastated, so to speak, reddened and *saturated with* human blood," and further "this people (Russian) was almost always in fire and swam in blood. . ." The third similarity: After

<sup>67</sup> *IRIO*, Vol. 26, appendix V.

describing the decline of the Kievan Principality, which was caused by princely dissensions, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* comments that "it was not difficult for the 'Mongolian Tatars' to defeat them." The memorandum of O. Bezborod'ko explains why the author of *Istoriya Rusov* used the term "Mongolian Tatars" for "Tatars." He used the word "Tatar" for Pechenegs, Polovcians, as well as for the real Tatars. The fourth similarity: O. Bezborod'ko comments that he often heard "wise and respected men, who spoke of the Tatars as they would of contemptible creatures." There is a similar idea in the expressions of the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, where he condemns the Muscovite habit of using derogatory appellations for foreign people: *Polyachishki*, *Niemchurki*, *Tatarishki*. He branded such treatment of other nations "contemptible haughtiness" and an "odious habit."

b) The author used the word "*Rusnak*" in a few places in *Istoriya Rusov*. For example: "Rusy or *Rusnaky*, according to the color of the hair."<sup>68</sup> Or: "A part of the Slavic territory from the Danube to the Dvina, from the Black Sea to the rivers Styry, Sluch, Berezhyna, and Dinets received the name "Rus'," and the people inhabiting it were called "Rus'" and "*Rusnaky*" in general."<sup>69</sup> O. Bezborod'ko used this same word, which is rarely used in historical texts, in his memorandum: "An Abridged Historical Description of Moldavia, Selected from Various Annalists."<sup>70</sup> For example, "Because of its fertility and fine climate, (Moldavia) beckoned to those who had fled to the mountains and to many from Poland, the *Rusnaky* in particular." Or, "He (Dragosh) did not find other inhabitants except *Rusnaky* in the region which later was inhabited and known as the Sochava district." Or, "Someone from the *Rusnaky*, Petrechenko by name, became a Moldavian." One could find the word *Rusnak* in Hrabtynka's *Chronicle*, which Bezborod'ko possessed and which was the main source of the *Short Chronicle*. Although he did not verify this, E. Borshak in his work, "The Historical Legend of the Ukraine,"<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 2.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>70</sup> *IRIO*, 26, pp. 386-394.

<sup>71</sup> "La Légende historique de l'Ukraine."

states that the word *Rusnak* was first used by Dobrov'sky and Bandtke in 1815-1816. This, as it were, indicated that *Istoriya Rusov* was written later than the above-mentioned dates.

c) The author of *Istoriya Rusov* describes the various army incidents, battles, campaigns, etc. in detail and with great pleasure. This indicates a predilection for the military, which he placed on a par with the nobility in regard to their legal rights and privileges. The same predilection is apparent in the works of Bezborod'ko. In his letters to Vorontsov, Bezborod'ko details various army dispositions and commands, often of his own making, which are suitable for both the army and the navy.

In *Istoriya Rusov* there is a detailed description of the Cossack campaigns against the Tatars and Turks in 1577,<sup>72</sup> under the command of Hetman Bohdan or Bohdanko. The author mentions the villages, fortresses, and regions of the Crimea: "Perekop or Or" (the Turkish name for Perekop is Or-kopi); Kinburg (the Turkish name is Kili-Burun); the stone bridge at Daria (near Kinburg); Syvash Sea; Bakhchysaray; Kozlov; a Crimean river, Salhir; the lands of the Don Cossacks; the Kuban' up to the Cherkassian boundaries; and cities in Bulgaria: Silistria, Varna, Kilia, and others. Hetman Bohdan's campaign is most aptly described. Only a man who had visited all these places could have written it. From Bezborod'ko's autobiography inserted in the petition to Paul I in 1799,<sup>73</sup> it is evident that O. Bezborod'ko, with his three Cossack regiments, took part in the battles between the rivers Buh and Dniestr, later in Moldavia, and both banks of the Danube, in attacking Silistria and other places up to the end of the war with Turkey. He visited the Crimea, the Don, Taman', and the Kuban'. In 1784 he conducted the peace negotiations with Turkey which concerned the union of the Crimea, Taman', and the Kuban' with Russia. Finally, in 1791 in Jassy, he conducted the preliminary negotiations with Turkey which culminated in the peace treaty. Therefore, only O. Bezborod'ko could have described these places, the battles, and the area in such detail. A good example is the description of the storming of Perekop.

<sup>72</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, pp. 24-26.

<sup>73</sup> *IRIO*, 29, pp. 641-642.

While in this area near Crimea, Taman', and Kuban', it is worthwhile to point out that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* tried to prove that these regions were within the old Rus' orbit. He wrote, "The ruins of ancient cities witnessed this. These cities bore Slavic names and the inscriptions on stones and statues were in the Cyrillic alphabet. Streams, lakes, and nomadic settlements, which are found in the Crimean steppe, on Taman' island, and in ancient Tmutorokan', also bore Slavic names." E. Borschak sees a link between the mention of Tmutorokan' and the so-called "Tmutorokan' stone," found on the island of Taman' in 1792. Musin-Pushkin published the first description of it in 1794. Although Professor Borschak does not recognize the authenticity of the stone itself,<sup>74</sup> he considers this date (1794) important, since the *Istoriya Rusov* could not have been written earlier. Later researches and excavation of the Taman'-Tmutorokan' cities and ancient sites, and the lower bank of the Don, confirm the fact that cities bearing Rus' names existed on the banks of the Don and at its mouth.<sup>75</sup> Near Sarkel', there is "Bila Vezha" [white tower] with its threatening white walls and "the towers of the fortresses of other cities could still be seen in the eighteenth century," Miller asserts.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, O. Bezborod'ko could have seen them when he visited these places. In addition to the "white tower," there was a "Rus' village" and a "Rus' port" at the mouth of the Don near Azov.<sup>77</sup> The Tmutorokan' stone had the following inscription in the Cyrillic alphabet: "In the year 6576 (1068), indicta 6, Prince Hlib measured the ice-covered sea from Tmutorokan' to Krchev 10,000 and 4,000 sazhen." Miller (p. 56) wrote that in the special expedition of 1930, he verified the measurements on the stone and found them to be correct. This is a good example of how time and scientific methods and researches unexpectedly verified the authenticity of certain passages of *Istoriya Rusov*, which severe critics had branded as false or the work of the author's imagination.

d) The author of *Istoriya Rusov* made Bohun speak these words

<sup>74</sup> Borschak, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

<sup>75</sup> M. Miller, *Naukovy zbirnyk UVAN*, Vol. I. 1952.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42 and 54-57.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

of protest against the sale of the enslaved peasantry: "In regard to the *pospolstvo*, they are considered as serfs, even though they come from the same people, as if they were bought from slaves or captives (this explanation was taken from the proposed Codex of 1743), and these serfs, or, as they call themselves 'peasants of both sexes' . . . contrary to all civilized laws and appropriations, are sold at markets by their rulers and masters as animals, and frequently, traded for dogs."<sup>78</sup>

How O. Bezborod'ko felt about this matter is evident in his "Memorandum on the Needs of the Russian Empire," written just before his death in 1799. In this "Memorandum" he proposes "to alleviate the peasants' burdens" by such measures: "Villages can only be sold with the land, and personal sale of peasants is prohibited as being essentially slavery. The same interdiction applied to the sale of recruits, since recruits must undergo military training according to the judgment of the community. It is permissible to re-settle peasants with the consent of the authorities and with their consent; after a certain length of service, household servants must be returned to farming or be given freedom in order that, during a new revision, they may have the right to choose their service or occupation. Thus, real freedom is created for the peasants."<sup>79</sup> In his last will, he instructed his brother to grant freedom to the household servants on all his estates.

e) With great indignation, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* describes the tortures of the people when questioned by the Chancellery of Ministerial Administration on matters relating to the tsar's person (the so-called "deed and word of the Sovereign"). He ended his description with this supposed folk saying: "If part of the land (where the Ministerial Chancellery stood) could be dug up by God's hand, a fountain of human blood, shed by ministerial hands, would gush forth."<sup>80</sup> In the "Memorandum" written by O. Bezborod'ko there are the following demands: "The higher courts will deal with all insults directed against His Majesty. In processing these affairs, all secret methods will be done with, where

<sup>78</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 98.

<sup>79</sup> *IRIO*, 29, appendix XVIII.

<sup>80</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 238.

the blood of human beings and citizens are oppressed, contrary to the laws which are promulgated for other criminal affairs."<sup>81</sup>

f) In another place the author of *Istoriya Rusov* speaks as if it were Polubotok speaking and reproaches Tsar Peter I thus: "In general, the laws governing all humanity and preserving them from evil are a perfect mirror of the duties and conduct for the tsars and masters. They are the first guardians and preservers (of these laws). Whence does it come that Thou, O Sovereign, placing yourself above the laws, rend us with thine absolute power?"<sup>82</sup>

In the "Memorandum" O. Bezborod'ko wrote as follows: "The sovereign-autocrat, if he is endowed with a quality worthy of his rank, must perceive that the power given to him is absolute, but not to govern according to his whims. Having established the law, he should be the first to respect and obey it."<sup>83</sup> Both quotations have the same idea: the absolute monarch is restricted by the laws which he himself has promulgated.

To supplement this exposition of Bezborod'ko's ideas and convictions I will refer to another excerpt from his "Memorandum on the Needs of the Russian Empire." He writes: "It will not be contrary to autocratic power if the Sovereign, after pronouncing the Creed [evidently at the coronation], would take a solemn oath in words which would convey to his people his immaculate intention to reign for the glory of the Empire and for the public good. Such an oath would have this meaning. In Russia there are three classes: the nobility, the townspeople, and the villagers. They all have different guarantees and privileges. However, their common guarantees are: 1) equal legal protection, 2) equality of personal safety and of private property, 3) participation in the government as prescribed by law."<sup>84</sup>

O. Bezborod'ko expressed the basic principle of constitutional monarchy very carefully, in the gentle form of a proposition, but, still, quite clearly: The absolute power of the monarch is restricted by his solemn oath to reign for the benefit of his people. His oath

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 646.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 229.

<sup>83</sup> *IRIO*, 29, p. 643.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 29, appendix XVIII, p. 644.

confirms the constitutional freedom: the protection of the law, the guarantee of personal safety and possessions, and the assurance, guaranteed by law, of participation in the government. After the French Revolution such ideas were common throughout Europe, but the first one to express them openly in Russia was the Ukrainian O. Bezborod'ko.

g) Some places in *Istoriya Rusov* can be explained only after admitting that the author was O. Bezborod'ko. For example:

1.) The author was favorably disposed toward those who ruled over the Ukraine during the reign of Empress Anna: Shakhovsky, Baryatynsky, Aleksander Rumyantsev ("the term of office of these generals was brief, just, and comforting to the Little Russians"). He favored Rumyantsev's son, Peter Rumyantsev, the Little Russian Governor-General. "The Little Russian nation in particular was delighted with its Governor-General, because they remembered his father . . . and he really justified the hopes of the people by his patriotic interest in their welfare."<sup>85</sup> The author of *Istoriya Rusov* praised the Little Russian College of 1765. "This College gained power as the dew covers the pasture, or, as hoarfrost, the fleece, that is, very quietly and gently."<sup>86</sup> The College stopped the extortions by the Muscovite garrisons in the Ukraine. He mentions that taxes had been levied of one ruble, two kopecks from each house instead of having to supply forage and provisions for the army. But he does not ignore the unsuccessful attempt to take a "General Census of the Ukraine" by the Muscovite officials. He gives some details which show that the author was either an eyewitness of the Census, or, at least, one who had primary evidence of the tragi-comic scenes which took place during it. His own humorous predilection was revealed when he witnessed such events.

The fact that O. Bezborod'ko held a position in the General Chancellery during the Rumyantsev's administration and that he was on friendly terms with them, explains his favorable attitude toward these administrators. O. Bezborod'ko began his service in the office of General P. Rumyantsev and he continued to use the sympathy and support of this man. Young Bezborod'ko cam-

<sup>85</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 255.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

pained with him in 1769 and he might have been an eyewitness of the Census with him.<sup>87</sup>

2) The antagonistic feeling toward Teplov of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* is similar to the feeling of Bezborod'ko toward Teplov and, partly, toward K. Rozumovsky, after the latter had abdicated the hetman's office. This was the result of the land disputes with Rozumovsky. These disputes centered chiefly on the estates which were the due of a Kievan colonel: the Kobyz and the Irzhav lands, the Kozar' mills, etc. According to Bezborod'ko, "these were stripped from him."<sup>88</sup> Under Rozumovsky the land administration was for a long time in the hands of Teplov.

The author of *Istoriya Rusov* described Teplov as a two-faced person and ended his description in this way: "Teplov, the cabinet minister and former advisor and favorite, met him (Rozumovsky) in one of the tsar's inner chambers and, during the usual greeting, kissed the hetman. Orlov, standing in the doorway of the opposing room, witnessed the kiss and affirmed the prophesy of the hetman's mother, who had said openly, 'And kissing, he betrayed him.'" When Bezborod'ko entered the service of the Empress, he found Teplov there and he might have heard about the "Judas' kiss" from eyewitnesses.

Teplov's complicity in the "treason" is connected with the compulsory abdication of Hetman Rozumovsky. In my work *Ukrainian-Muscovite Treaties*,<sup>89</sup> I explained on the basis of documentary data that a plan was composed during the General Rada of 1763 which was to be submitted to Catherine. In case of Hetman Rozumovsky's death, it provided that one of the Hetman's sons should be chosen in his place, "the most worthy one and selected on the same basis as the Hetman was." Only officers with the rank of colonel signed this document, but the chiefs of staff were divided and, therefore, did not sign. It remained only a plan and was not submitted to the Empress. However, she learned about it and of the tendentious statement which was affixed to it. H. Tep-

<sup>87</sup> N. Grigorovich, *Monografiya*, Vol. I, p. 240f.

<sup>88</sup> See his letter to his father from 1776 in *IRIO*, 26, p. 244.

<sup>89</sup> "Ukrayins'ko-Moskovs'ki dogovory," *Pratsi Ukr. Naukovoho Instytutu u Varshavi*, Vol. XIX, p. 172.

lov, who was then in the court service, gave the Empress "A Note on the Disorder in Little Russia," which contained many arguments on the troubles in the Ukraine and which was aimed against the hetman's government. There is no doubt that Teplov was largely instrumental in forcing his protector, K. Rozumovsky, to abdicate and that the "Judas' kiss" episode, described in *Istoriya Rusov*, really occurred.

Later, in a letter to his father in 1778, O. Bezborod'ko wrote: "Although Teplov is fading, he lies so much more in his old age that even the Count [Rozumovsky] does not believe him."<sup>90</sup>

3) In his monograph, M. Voznyak emphasized the similarity between some passages in *Istoriya Rusov* and the instructions given the delegates to the *Komissiya novavo ulozheniya*, who were the representatives of the nobility of Chernihiv regiment for 1767. General-Judge A. Bezborod'ko and his son O. Bezborod'ko, Officer of the Hetman's Suite, signed the instructions. Thus, Voznyak established a connection between the ideas and even expressions in *Istoriya Rusov* and these instructions. For example, the Governor-General, P. Rumyantsev, was praised for preventing the quartering of soldiers among the inhabitants, the pillaging of food and fuel, and from other plundering carried out by the Muscovite army. He was also praised for settling the complaints of the peasants who had been sent to fortress construction gangs and other governmental work; for comparing the Hetmans Khmelnytsky and Mnohohrishny, etc.<sup>91</sup>

By comparing point eight of the instructions to the deputies of the Chernihiv regiment, Ruban's *Short Chronicle*, and *Istoriya Rusov*, Voznyak explains why the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, contrary to historical documents, changed the fairly correct text of Ruban's *Short Chronicle* and wrote that Hetman Mnohohrishny died "from wounds in Baturyn" and was buried there with "the military and the church paying him high respects."<sup>92</sup>

h) The author of *Istoriya Rusov* was a great admirer of the military. *Istoriya Rusov* is full of descriptions of campaigns, battles

<sup>90</sup> *IRIO*, 26, p. 283.

<sup>91</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

(often there are detailed descriptions of the localities where the battles took place), plans for battles, and other details. Often, the exact number of the dead, the wounded, and the imprisoned are given. For example, after Nalyvayko's battle against the Poles "they were counted and, according to the Cossack notches, the Poles lost 17,330;<sup>93</sup> after Ostryanytsia's victory "the Cossacks counted 11,317 Polish dead and 4,737 of our own."

O. Bezborod'ko was also an ardent admirer of the military profession. At one time he actively participated in the battle against Turkey and the Crimea. His letters reveal this interest and his love for the military. He wrote in a letter of 1768 to his father before he went to war: "Near Cracow, General Apraksin defeated the confederates. Of 8,000 men, 4005 were killed and the rest were taken prisoner; 40 were killed on our side and more than 800 wounded."<sup>94</sup>

His letters also reveal the high value he placed on a military career. In a letter to M. Myklashevsky, dated 1786, he wrote: "Sharpen your sword, fix your musket, and step into battle. If I was in your place, I would cry if they did not let me go. I would leave everything just to have a look at a battle. . ."<sup>95</sup>

M. Voznyak quotes another letter written by O. Bezborod'ko to his friends in 1790. "The bearer of this note will be the child about whom you worried so much that he should never smell gunpowder. I admit that a similar thought does not occur to me. I am not a father, but at least I had a father who, at the beginning of the last Turkish war, did not prevent my leaving the court chair to go to war, rather he praised me for it. . . I have a brother, a successor to all my property. He had an important rank . . . but both he and I were ashamed to sit peacefully during the war. Therefore, he entered the army and now he considers himself fortunate. In one letter you wrote to Osyp Stepanovych (Sudienko) that you love the Cossacks and grieve for them. Do you know why the heroic Cossack spirit in Little Russia vanished? Because for some time schoolboys have taken the place of the Cossacks;

<sup>93</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 37.

<sup>94</sup> *IRIO*, 26, XVI.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

instead of Paliy Bilotserkovsky, Khrysta Senchansky, Lavro Ostap-sky and others, they were replaced by dandies and non-military people, who at first threw out their traditional clothes and then dressed up in German costume, and became, as the late, old Stepan Afendyk (commanding colonel at Pereyaslav) use to say: 'In battle, he is not a warrior, nor at home, a master.' I really do not know whether your child has any military ability. If he has, why not let him go? He has already been prepared for this in the Cadet Corps. He would have been a major a long time ago and a bearer of the cross but for your refusal. He could always be an assessor, but it is not so easy to attain military honor."<sup>96</sup>

i) All personal characteristics of language and style found in *Istoriya Rusov* are in Bezborod'ko writings. There are quotations from the Bible, humor, wit, puns at his and at others' expense, and so forth. I will mention a few. In a letter to M. Myklashevsky, Bezborod'ko writes: "In marriage I would advise you to adhere to the law given by Jacob in the Bible: 'Do not take to wife a woman of foreigners sons.'"<sup>97</sup> In another letter: "In him, the Scripture was fulfilled: I have not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed, begging bread."<sup>98</sup> And in many other instances. He enjoyed using Ukrainian words and expressions in his private correspondence. For example, in a letter to Kochubey, he wrote: "Your friend Ivan (Osterman) is a big, deaf fool. . . . He went to the village for ten days with his fat woman [*Repekha*]. Do not be insulted when I abuse him. Osyp Stepanovych (Sudienko) says: 'He deserved what he got.'"<sup>99</sup> Or in another letter: "According to our proverb: Thank the Lord for legs," and many others.<sup>100</sup>

j) Professor D. Čiževsky in his article "Beyond the Bounds of Beauty"<sup>101</sup> gives examples of the so-called "play on words." This

<sup>96</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-156.

<sup>97</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, II, p. 640.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 384.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 495.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 639.

<sup>101</sup> D. Čiževsky, "Poza mezhamy krasny," *Literaturno-naukovy zbirnyk, UVAN*, 1952.

is the use of words and expressions which "extend beyond the bounds of fine writing," as, for example, the use of wit, antithesis, the grotesque, caricatures, etc. The object was to attract the reader's attention and influence his feelings. D. Čiževsky relates this "play on words" to the Ukrainian Baroque style of the eighteenth century.

With this in mind, I studied the writings of O. Bezborod'ko and compared them to *Istoriya Rusov*. I found many examples of such "play on words." I will give some examples. In Bezborod'ko's letter to one of his friends written in 1790 and quoted above, there is this example of a play on words: "I was not a *father*, but at least I had a *father*." In a letter to Vorontsov, O. Bezborod'ko wrote: "Unfortunately, to satisfy the unworthy Poles (*v ugodu negodnym Polyakam*), it was necessary to adopt the bad plan of a vagabond, Altest, for the opening of a land customhouse." Or in a letter to Miloradovich we read: "In our time there are many such clerks (*pisar*) as there were in the olden days, that is, illiterate (*nepismenny*)." In another letter to the same Vorontsov, he wrote: "Of the army generals (*sukhoputny*) there are a few useful ones (*putny*)." O. Bezborod'ko described Kochubey: "He knew how to settle *four* affairs, but they thought it was too late to award him the *second* [grade] of the Vladimir [Order]."

In one letter to his father, he refuted the rumor that distillery rights will have to be adapted to the landowner's rank. He wrote: "One can travel by coach and have a livery which accords with one's rank, but for a distillery, one needs only grain, woods, and the freedom of Little Russia." O. Bezborod'ko wrote about his close friend, O. S. Sudienko, that he "will retire to comfort . . . and he will be fortunate, comparing himself to the Prussian captain of Frederick William's time who had a mouth full of bread, but nothing to chew it with, since his teeth had been knocked out." In a letter to Lopukhin in 1798, when Bezborod'ko was already ill, he wrote: "I rewarded my natural laziness by rapid labor and understanding, but now, only the natural remains, my memory and other gifts have utterly vanished." He wrote a year before his death: "I live without moving, hoping to leave society

and settle in the village, where I might find a haven for my final days. I mean: a home, a garden, a church, and a grave."<sup>102</sup>

This Baroque style, used to describe humorous and tragic incidents in particular, is widely used in *Istoriya Rusov*. For example, representatives of the clergy evaluate the Muscovites: "The Muscovite gifts are all in bast, and it is inevitable that even the people, who live with it, will be so impoverished that they will take shelter in the bast and under it."<sup>103</sup> The author of *Istoriya Rusov* described Biron's brother: "The inhabitants of Starodub and its surrounding territory shudder at the very mention of the rages of the brother of Biron, who was lame, almost without legs. Almost fully crippled, nevertheless, he held the Russian rank of a full general. . ." In describing the comic scenes of Rummyantsev's "Census," the author of *Istoriya Rusov* uses the same Baroque style. "The roar of the cattle and the crying of the children announced from afar the Commissars approach. . . Having done with the people and the cattle, they dealt with the landowners and possessors. They demand from them purchase deeds and the proof of their ownership of the estates and land, and shook loose the treasure boxes of everyone. Usually they required no cadastres or the Tsar's charter; but these were possessed only by priests, chiefly Archbishops. . ."

And here are examples of tragic events. In Polubotok's address to Peter I, we read: "It is well-known that we alone destroyed fully half of the Swedish army on our land, without using any flattery or temptation . . . but for this we were slandered and angered; instead of being thanked and rewarded, we were subject to inescapable slavery . . . and we must pay an unendurable and dishonorable [*nesnosnaya i ponosnaya*] tribute. . ."<sup>104</sup> And again, the author describes this incident: "Only the Little Russians and their armies were humiliated, a parable among peoples, that is, without reward and gratitude. And although, in defeating the Swedish army, they showed more zeal and diligence than the others . . . nevertheless, by the calumny and chicanery of the favorite of Menshikov, they were subject to contempt, insult, and

<sup>102</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, I, p. 441.

<sup>103</sup> Voznyak, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

<sup>104</sup> *Ist. Rus.*, p. 230.

persecutions; and their losses, the ruin, and devastation . . . almost unaccountably remained without any reward and appreciation. In short, they were paid evil for good and hatred for love.”<sup>105</sup>

Anyone who is used to expressing his thoughts in writing, whether he be a creative writer, an historian, or a lawyer, has his own specific way of expressing himself, his own style. To deliberately change this style, the various personal characteristics, is almost impossible. These personal characteristics will reappear in sentences, turn of phrase, and in vocabulary. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* concealed his identity by using the names of Konys’ky and Poletyka, but he could not conceal his style, which is reflected in his work. In addition to the other arguments, this style reveals that O. Bezborod’ko was the author because the same words, sentences and expressions are used in his other works. He was a prominent literary talent, and N. Grygorovich, in the monograph dedicated to him, says: “At times he states his thoughts with an attractive vivacity. Had he entered the literary field, he would have become a famous writer.”

#### IV

As to the date of writing, some chronological facts from the lives of the proposed author and some facts in the text itself, allow us to establish, if not the exact time, then the approximate time of writing. I will first of all outline the chronological dates of the proposed authors. Yu. Konys’ky died in 1795; Hryhory Poletyka in 1784; Vasyl’ Poletyka was born in 1765 and died in 1845; O. Bezborod’ko died in 1799; Lobysevych died in 1805. This is, therefore, a wide time range.

In the text of *Istoriya Rusov* there are these hints on the time of writing. The author concludes with these words: “At the beginning of 1769 the army undertook a general campaign and a war with the Turks broke out. And how it will end, God only knows!”<sup>106</sup>

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 257.

However, this date was not trustworthy, since facts and events are mentioned in the text which occurred after this date. In addition, while this date may indicate the completion of the manuscript, it does not indicate its period of preparation.

There are clues in the text which contradict the date given by the author. On page 39 the author referred to Wagner, the historian. It is known that Daniel Ernst Wagner wrote the *History of Poland*. It was published for the first time in 1775, and a second edition in 1788. Some scholars, A. Yershov and E. Borschak, believe that the reference to the Slavic inscription on the Taman' and Tmutorokan' statues and stones marked the starting point of the writing of *Istoriya Rusov*, since the Tmutorokan' stone, with its Slavic inscription, was found in 1792, and a description of it published in 1794.

In the Preface to *Istoriya Rusov* we read: "Only when the Little Russian army supported Poland, was she powerful and fierce. As soon as they left her, she started an immediate decline, *and the consequences are known.*" The author undoubtedly meant Poland's partition, which took place in 1772, 1793, and 1795, by the word "consequences."

In another place, he wrote: "The monasteries, in pampering Menshikov, held them (Muscovite refugees, the Old Believers) forever in serfdom and lost control over them *only when their ruin had come.*"<sup>107</sup> This word "ruin" was the act of secularization which deprived the monasteries of their lands and subjects. This occurred in 1786.

Finally, the author of *Istoriya Rusov* used the word "revolution" twice.<sup>108</sup> This word was in use after the French Revolution 1789-1793. The author often used words like "patriot, patriotic"; expressions "a patriot of his nation"; and he used the term "national anti-patriot" once.<sup>109</sup>

A. Yershov and E. Borschak tried to prove that *Istoriya Rusov* was written in the second decade of the nineteenth century. They relied on the fact that the author used these words and expres-

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 223.

<sup>108</sup> *Istoriya Rusov*, pp. 151 and 188.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

sions: nation, national, ministers, ministry, the system of a national balance of power, neutral, neutrality, etc. It is difficult to agree with this. In the historical documents of the period of Hetman Rozumovsky, 1750-1763, the terms "nation, national," in the sense of nation and state, were used by the Ukrainian General Chancellery. For example, in the Proclamation of 1760, it is stated that "the national Little Russian seal" was affixed. In the Hetman's Order of 1755, national treasury and national sums are mentioned. In one of the instructions to the delegates to the *Komissiya novavo ulozheniya* of 1767 it is written: "they petitioned to retain the laws under which B. Khmelnytsky and the whole entity of the Little Russian Nation came under the Great Russian State."<sup>110</sup> These examples are evidence that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* did not have to wait for the Napoleonic Wars to learn to use these terms.

This can be applied to the usage of the words "minister" and "ministry," which, as Yershov stated, became "tangible concepts" from the time of Tsar Alexander I. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* was not only an historian, but also a politician. He was well acquainted with the history of the hetmanate and with the system of national administration in Western Europe. Ministers, such as the tsar's residents in the Ukraine, appeared during the reign of Peter I. The College, which was officially called "Little Russian College," and, later, "The Chancellery of Ministerial Administration," of which the author of *Istoriya Rusov* wrote so much, existed in the Ukraine from 1709 to 1749. There were ministers in Russia during the reign of Peter I, cabinet ministers during Anna's reign, and ministers during the reign of Catherine II. A "College of Foreign Affairs" was called the "Ministry of Foreign Affairs." As a member of this College, O. Bezborod'ko, in a letter to Rumyantsev in 1786, wrote in reference to himself: "As the Minister of Foreign Affairs, it is impossible to be without some type of representation."<sup>111</sup> During the reign of Tsar Alexander, only the number of cabinet ministers was increased, but there was

<sup>110</sup> I. Telichenko, *Soslovnnya nuzhdy . . .*, p. 391.

<sup>111</sup> *IRIO*, 26, p. 176.

no council of ministers in Russia as a college organ, headed by a prime minister, until the Revolution of 1905.

A. Yershov's and Professor E. Borschak's conclusion that the "system of national balance of power," which the author of *Istoriya Rusov* referred to, became known only after the "Congress of Vienna in 1815, is also in error. The author mentioned that in 1654 the system of political balance had only "begun to develop," while, at the Congress of Vienna, it had already been realized. In addition, during the reign of Catherine II, a project was elaborated with the aid of O. Bezborod'ko for an "armed neutrality." The idea of a political balance was the basis. O. Bezborod'ko drew up the final project and put it into effect during the English-American War.<sup>112</sup> He also formulated the "Act for the Defense of Free Trade and Navigation of the Neutral Nations" with Prussia in 1781. In the following year he was active in forming the naval agreement with Portugal to defend the freedom of neutral navigation.<sup>113</sup> This is proof that prior to the Congress of Vienna the idea of a political balance, neutrality, etc. were known in Russia.<sup>114</sup> These were even used in the national policies and much of the responsibility was in the hands of Bezborod'ko.

Why did the author of *Istoriya Rusov* end his narrative with the news of the outbreak of the war with Turkey? The answer is in the appendixes which Bezborod'ko affixed to the *Short Chronicle*. Here, Bezborod'ko wrote: "His (P. Rumyantsev, the Commander-in-Chief of the Russian-Ukrainian forces during the war with Turkey) famous deed and acts belong to the Russian history in general, and so this *Short Little Russian Chronicle* will end here on this point." The *Chronicle* really ended with the year 1769 as did the *Istoriya Rusov*. In the Preface to *Istoriya Rusov* the author explained that he was undertaking a "History of Little Russia," because the *General Russian History* passed over this.

Prior to this time, the literature on *Istoriya Rusov*, its author,

<sup>112</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 64-65.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 82-83.

<sup>114</sup> It is important to note that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* wrote the word *neutralitet* in this way *neutralitet*. O. Bezborod'ko did the same.

and the time of origin was written chiefly with a view to its unknown author and, only partially, to its contents. Scholars who believed H. Poletyka to be the author were hampered by the date of his death, 1784. Those who believed the Poletykas, father and son, to be co-authors, assumed that H. Poletyka started *Istoriya Rusov*, and, after his death, his son, Vasył', finished it, i.e., c. 1815-1816. Those who considered Vasył' Poletyka the sole author, reasoned in the same way. Professor O. Ohloblyn stated that Opanas Lobysevych wrote this work between 1802 and 1805. M. Voznyak thought that Bezborod'ko wrote *Istoriya Rusov* in 1778, saying, "it was written without interruptions with a youthful lack of criticism." In a letter of March 31, 1778 to his father, Bezborod'ko wrote that the "small publication (Ruban's *Chronicle*) now serves as a guide "for the proposed publication of a complete 'Little Russian History.'"

## V

In my article "On the Question of the Author of *Istoriya Rusov*," I opined that O. Bezborod'ko was the author. After reviewing the new works on this theme (M. Voznyak, Ohloblyn, Borschak), I re-examined my previous arguments and concluded that the author was O. Bezborod'ko. As to the problem of the date of his writing this work, the letter quoted by Voznyak is not so definitive that one could conclude that he had written it already in 1778. But two reservations are revealed in this letter; we must add these words to his quotation: "as soon as I collect all the necessary," and "*practicing this pleasant work in my leisure time after all other work is done.*" In these reservations, there is some basis for stating that, if he had begun to write *Istoriya Rusov*, then the civil service, his duty as the personal secretary to Catherine II, his participation in the College of Foreign Affairs, and his duties as a minister, took up all his "leisure time." National and political matters occupied his attention and made this talented young historian the most eminent politician and authority on international relations of the period. He later wrote to his father: "Matters pertaining to the Senate, Synod, Foreign College, including the most secret, the admiralty and lieutenantancy, pass through my hands

. . . and a large part of the personal affairs of the Empress."<sup>115</sup> In addition to this, diplomatic transactions, the drawing up of treaties, the partition of Poland, wars with Sweden, Turkey, and many other affairs, occupied much of his time. Bezborod'ko did not have "leisure time" to write *Istoriya Rusov*. He was free from this intensive work only in 1794-1796, when Count Zubov appeared at the Empress' court, the new and last favorite of Catherine. Bezborod'ko was the only one of the court officials who was allowed to enter Catherine's chamber to report important matters to her personally. Zubov demanded that Bezborod'ko report first to him and, then, he, Zubov, would act as the intermediary. The aged Catherine, completely under Zubov's spell, complied with these demands. Bezborod'ko was insulted, but, as it turned out, he had more leisure time. I believe that it was in this period, 1794-1796, that the preparation of the definitive text of *Istoriya Rusov* and its Preface took place. In the final redaction Bezborod'ko placed the Ukraine in the circle of European nations and introduced different ideas on the Ukraine's role in Eastern Europe. He included material and recollections which had occurred after 1778; he used diplomatic terminology which was familiar to him, and perhaps, emphasized the biting characteristics of the Muscovites and the Muscovite State.

O. Bezborod'ko was compelled to conceal his name because of his high position. The publisher of Ruban's *Short Chronicle* had written in his foreword that the basis of this book was the "Memoirs (Diary) from 1506 to 1734," which he had received from "His Grace, Georgy Konys'ky, Bishop of Mohyliv." O. Bezborod'ko, familiar with this fact, concealed his identity by using Konys'ky's name and by adding H. Poletyka's name for the sake of credibility, since he knew that both men were dead.

Oleksander Bezborod'ko died on April 4, 1799. The Muscovites described him thus: "Your friend," Count Rostopchin wrote to Vorontsov, "is nearing the end of his life. There is no hope. God be with him. His good deeds, which arise from a kind heart,

<sup>115</sup> *IRIO*, 29, p. 325.

surpass his weaknesses. Everyone is in tears. Russia will be proud of him; *but he did not love her as a son loves his mother.*"<sup>116</sup>

O. Bezborod'ko bequeathed all his personal and real property to his brother, Count Ilia Bezborod'ko, who died in 1816. The Bezborod'ko family name vanished with the latter's death, and, with it, the reason for keeping *Istoriya Rusov* from the public. Therefore, the appearance after 1816 of the first copies is explained. One of the copies in the library of the Taras Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv was dated 1818. Another copy, perhaps the original, was discovered around 1828 in "the Hryniv Library, Starodub district, on the estate which belonged to Ilia Bezborod'ko." It is important to point out that the judges transmitted the manuscript first of all to Stepan Shiray. It was not because he was the Marshal of the Chernihiv Nobility, but because the Shiray family was related to the Bezborod'kos. The wife of Ilia Bezborod'ko was the daughter of Ivan Shiray. Thereafter, *Istoriya Rusov* was widely circulated in the Ukraine in numerous copies. It was not known to the Poletykas before that time; had it been known, the grandson of H. Poletyka would not have needed to make a copy of it from the Hryniv manuscript.

In general, no evidence (excerpts, comments, or notebooks) could be found in the writings of the other candidates which could be adduced as proof that one of them was the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. However, the complete text was found in the library of the estate which had belonged to Bezborod'ko's brother and heir, Ilia. This fact shores up and supplements the other proof that the author was Oleksander Bezborod'ko, chancellor and Serene Prince of Russia, which he "did not love as a son loves his mother."

<sup>116</sup> Grigorovich, *op. cit.*, II, p. 433.

## WHERE WAS *ISTORIYA RUSOV* WRITTEN?

OLEXANDER OHLOBLYN

For all the lengthy labor of several generations of Ukrainian scholars, the real name of the author of the illustrious *Istoriya Rusov* still remains a mystery. Modern Ukrainian historiography has discarded both concepts of the authorship of Heorhy Konys'ky, as well as of Hryhory Poletyka.<sup>1</sup> The idea of Vasyl' Poletyka being the author also evoked serious rebuttal brought up again quite recently.<sup>2</sup> The authorship of Vasyl' Lukashevych has insufficient scientific basis.<sup>3</sup> The idea of its author being Prince Olexander Bezborod'ko did not gain general acceptance.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the concept of the authorship of Opanas Lobysevych, first proposed by this author in 1943, still remains only a *hypothesis*, albeit perhaps the most credible.<sup>5</sup>

There can be no doubt that the problem of the authorship of *Istoriya Rusov* could be definitely solved only in the event that historical science would have at its disposal *irrefutable* documentary data about the author, thus far lacking. The question therefore naturally arises, what *method* of research should be applied in order to at least come closer to the solution of this important problem.

<sup>1</sup> A. Yakovliv, "Do pytannya pro avtora *Istoriyi Rusiv*," *Zapysky naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka*, v. 154, pp. 77-92, Lviv, 1937. M. Voznyak, "Psevdo-Konys'ky i psevdo-Poletyka," *Istoriya Rusov v literaturi i nautsi*, Lviv-Kiev, 1939, pp. 34-134.

<sup>2</sup> E. Borschak, "*La légende historique de l'Ukraine, Istoriya Rusov*," Paris, 1949, pp. 176-191. See M. Horban, "Kilka uvah do pytannya pro avtora '*Istoriyi Rusov*,'" in *Chervony shlahk*, Kharkiv, 1923, VI-VII, 146-150.

<sup>3</sup> M. Petrovsky, "Do istoriyi derzhavnogo ustroyu Ukrainy XVII viku," *Zapysky nizhens'koho instytutu sotsialnoho vykhovannya*, XI, 90, note 2, 1931.

<sup>4</sup> M. Slabchenko, *Materiyaly do ekonomichno-sotsiyalnoyi istoriyi Ukrainy XIX stolittya*, v. I, Odessa, 1925, pp. 103-105; P. Klepatsky, "Lystuvannya O. A. Bezborod'ka z svoymim bat'kom, yak istorychne dzherelo," *Yuvileyny zbirnyk na poshanu akad. M. S. Hrushevs'koho*, v. I, Kiev, 1928, p. 284; A. Yakovliv, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-113; M. Voznyak, *op. cit.*, pp. 135-159.

<sup>5</sup> See this author's articles: "Khto buv avtorom *Istoriyi Rusov*" in *Nashi Dni*, Lviv, 1943, XI, 6-7; "Psevdo-Bezborod'ko proty Lobysevycha," *ibid.*, 1944, V, II; "Do pytannya pro avtorstvo *Istoriyi Rusov*," in *Ukraina*, Paris, 1949, No. 2, pp. 71-75; "The Ethical and Political Principles of '*Istoriya Rusov*,'" in *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* vol. II, No. 4 (6), pp. 388-400, New York, 1952.

Old methods of approach can obviously no longer be used. It would be futile to look for the author of *Istoriya Rusov* merely on the basis of his ideology and political views, or by picking out isolated biographical circumstances, or even solely by determining the time when the work originated (although this latter moment, still in dispute, will naturally be of great importance). Studying *Istoriya Rusov* as the most significant and impressive work of Ukrainian historiography of the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th century, we believe that in the matter of determining the authorship of this work, the only correct method will be that of *microanalysis*. Particular attention must be focussed on minute, often hardly noticeable details peculiar only to the given work, and only later can a broader analysis be undertaken, of autobiographical features, time of writing, its sources (and in the first place local sources), ideology, and so forth, that can bring us to a definite community-cultural milieu in which the author of *Istoriya Rusov* lived and worked.

From this viewpoint the problem to which due attention has not been paid thus far, and which assumes important proportions, is the problem of the *locale*, where *Istoriya Rusov* was written, or, at least, whence the author came, from what place, where he lived, and which place he was most interested in.

Two moments have here to be considered: first, what locality occupied a position of prominence in the author's consciousness, or so to say, occupied his personal interest; and second, to what extent does he know this locality, particularly in accuracy of *detail* (and not in general concept), which would be illustrated by various local features (such as events, place names, names of locally active people, and the like).

Turning to *Istoriya Rusov*, we have to concede that the author is mostly interested (of course, within the framework of his narrative) in the northern Left Bank of the Dnieper, or, to be more precise, in the area of *Novhorod-Siversk* (embracing the governorship of Novhorod-Siversk which existed between 1781 and 1796).

The author of *Istoriya Rusov* is especially interested in the history of the city of Novhorod-Siversk, and is very well acquainted with its environs, including topographical details. Thus, for exam-

ple, the story of Polish-Catholic rule in Novhorod-Siversk and the expedition of the first False Dmitri (pp. 42-44). In his account of "soboryshche Brestskoye" (the Church Synod of Berestya of 1596) in *Istoriya Rusov*, he mentions among three bishops "who did not fall under the apostasy of the Union and held high the dignity of their pastoral office with truly apostolic magnanimity and inflexibility, the bishop of Seversk, Ioann Lezhaysky, descendant of the Seversk princes," and "protopop of Novhorod Semen Pashynsky," who for their protest against the Union suffered indignities and were deprived of their "honors and dues" (p. 33).

This whole story is an invention of the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. No Siversk bishopric existed at the end of the 16th century; also nothing is known of a protopop Semen Pashynsky at the end of the 16th century.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, the Siversk region was then part of the Muscovite State and representatives of its clergy could not take part in the Synod of Berestya. There was, therefore, no protest as mentioned above of "Ioann Lezhaysky" nor "Semen Pashynsky." But it is noteworthy that among active opponents of the Union the author recited precisely the leaders of the Novhorod-Siversk clergy, although he could not ignore the fact that the entire episode was invented by him. But even more significant is the fact that the name Lezhaysky was well known in Novhorod-Siversk, although from a much later time. Lezhaysky, not Ioann, but Mykhailo, was for a long time Archimandrite of the Novhorod-Siversk Monastery of the Transfiguration in the latter half of the 17th

<sup>6</sup> The *Pashynskis* were a family of clergy and Cossack officers in Novhorod-Siversk in the 18th century. Lukian Pashynsky was *osaul* of the Novhorod *sotnya* in 1723, (*Kyyiv isentral'ny arkhiv starodavnikh aktiv, K.Ts.A.S.A.*, collection of the Archeographic Commission No. 393, p. 124) and in 1725 (*Trudy poltavskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komisii*, v. XIV, Poltava, 1916, p. 76). Antin Samonovych Pashynsky, Cossack from the village of Chulatov (Novhorod *sotnya*) is mentioned in the year 1767 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Rumyantsevskiy opys, v. 140). The register of the clergy of the Novhorod-Siversk governorship for 1784 mentions: pastor of the village of Yevdokol'e, Heorhiy Pashynsky (the verger and sexton there were also Pashynsky), son of the pastor of the village of Kamen', Ivan Pashynsky was then verger in the village of Len'kov (property of the Lobysevychs) near Novhorod-Siversk (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Book No. 5917).

century (1670-1699);<sup>7</sup> his portrait was preserved at the monastery as late as the 19th century.<sup>8</sup>

Calling Lezhaysky Bishop of Siversk would indicate the period of the end of the 18th century, when the Monastery of the Transfiguration, once under Archimandrite Mykhailo Lezhaysky, was then under Prior Ilarion Kondratkovsky (1785-1797), Bishop of Novhorod-Siversk and Hlukhiv.

It should be noted also that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* is in the habit of using known historical names, and endowing characters, whom he has created, with these names. Among the very participants of the Synod of Berestya, who allegedly opposed the Union, he mentions non-existent bishops: of Pereyaslav, Silvester *Yavorsky*, and of Podolia, Inokentiy *Tuptalsky*. This is an obvious borrowing of the names of the well-known Stefan Yavorsky (or, perhaps a hint at Melkhisedek Znachko-Yavorsky, who was Prior of Peter and Paul Monastery of Hlukhiv between 1786 and 1809<sup>9</sup>) and Dmytriy Tuptalo.<sup>10</sup> It is also remarkable that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* lists as an opponent of the Union a non-existent bishop of Chernihiv and Oster, Inokentiy *Borkovskiy* (of a noble

<sup>7</sup> With an interval between 1687 and 1688 when Ioannykiy Halyatovsky was Archimandrite. In 1690 M. Lezhaysky was one of the candidates for Kiev Metropolitan (Metropolitan Euheni Bolkhovytynov, *Opisaniye kievo-sofyskavo sobora y Kievskoi iyerarkhii*, Kiev, 1825, Supplement, p. 122. The universal decree of Hetman D. Mnohohrshny of April 3, 1670 describes Mykhailo Lezhaysky as "worthy of the Church of God and a man of merit and needed for our beloved fatherland" (A. Lazarevsky i N. Konstantynovych, *Obozreniye rummyantsovskoi opysy*, Chernihiv, 1866-1875, p. 845).

It should also be mentioned that the Lezhayskys were in the Novhorod-Siversk governorship and at the end of the 18th century Vasyl' Lezhaysky, a student of rhetoric of the Kiev Academy, was attached to the embassy in Constantinople; he was the son of a Cossack of Hlukhov. (V. Serebrennikov, *Kiev. akad.*, p. 76, note 7. Clipping from *Trudy kievskoyi dukhovnoyi akademii*, 1897).

<sup>8</sup> Arkhyepyskop Filaret, *Istoryko-statisticheskoye opisaniye chernigovskoi eparkhii*, v. III, *Chernihiv*, 1873, pp. 94-95.

<sup>9</sup> V. Modzalevsky, *Malorossiysky rodostloynyk*, v. II, Kiev, 1910, p. 168; *Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, No. I, v. II, Kiev, 1864; F. Lebedintsev, *Arkhimandryt Melkhisedek Znachko-Yavorsky*, pp. CCIX-CCX. At that, the Yavorskys were well-known in the Cossack nobility of Starodub in the 18th century. (A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye staroi Malorossii*, Vol. I, Kiev, 1888, p. 101.)

<sup>10</sup> Dmytriy Tuptalo was Archimandrite of the Novhorod-Siversk Monastery of the Transfiguration from 1699 to 1701 (Filaret, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 95-96).

family of Pohar). It is possible that in this latter case some personal family reasons of the author played a part.<sup>11</sup>

This literary manner is a general characteristic of *Istoriya Rusov*. In describing common occurrences of Ukrainian life the author has invented a multitude of names that never existed and applied them to similar pseudo-historical persons. It is most noteworthy, however, that in relating events in Siversk (real, or invented), he almost invariably employs *local* names, which did exist in reality. He obviously knew the names very well: the invention of new names was quite superfluous.

There is another reference to Lezhaysky and Pashynsky in *Istoriya Rusov* in the narrative of events of the beginning of the 17th century (p. 42).

The story in *Istoriya Rusov* about the seizure of Orthodox monasteries of Novhorod-Siversk by Catholics and Uniates is very interesting, despite its anachronisms. Two monasteries are mentioned: the male *Uspensky* (Assumption), "opposite the castle" (in this place there really was in the 17th and 18th century and later an *Uspenska* church), and the female cloister *Pokrovsky*, "on the Yaroslavl hill." As is known, there was a "Pokrovska" church in Novhorod-Siversk in the 17th to 19th centuries,<sup>12</sup> there is also a place named "Yaroslavska krynytsya" (Yaroslavl Well) (see below). It

<sup>11</sup> There were Borkovskys among the Cossacks, and later among the nobility of Pohar county. In 1774, among other Cossacks of the Pohar *sotnya*, Mykola Borkovsky "was dispatched to the Kazan' *guberniya*" (*K.Ts.A.S.S.*, Malor. kol., chern. vidd., 1776). There is mention of Mykyta Borkovsky in 1790, who lived in the village of Lukyn with five serfs (*K.Ts.A.S.S.* F. No. 280, register of the nobility of Pohar county for 1790). Compare also *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 41, ("Burkovsky from Burka"). Perhaps this is a reflection of the then popular tradition of Chernihiv, negative towards Vasyl' Borkovsky, Colonel of Chernihiv, later Quartermaster-General. (N. Markevych, *Obychai, poveriya, kukhnya i napytky malorossiyan*, Kiev, 1860, p. 79. See A. Lazarevsky, *Ocherki, zametki i dokumenty po istorii Malorossyi*, 2nd ed., Kiev, 1895, pp. 50-51.

<sup>12</sup> True, the tsar's Rescript of 1667 mentions "a city on a hill in Novhorodok-Seversk, where before stood a monastery of *Zhivonachal'nyya Troitsa* (the Living Trinity), and later a Dominican convent" (Filaret, *op. cit.*, III, 125-126), but the Pokrovska church had also been a monastery before (see letter of S. A. Taranushenko to V. L. Modzalevsky of Sept. 5, 1916, in the Archives of V. L. Modzalevsky). Evidently the Troitsky monastery was not restored since Khmelnytsky's time (see writ of Archbishop Lazar Baranovych of 1670, in Filaret, *op. cit.*, III, 135), all the more so, since Lazar Baranovych annexed the estates of the former Troitsk monastery to the Archbispocric of Chernihiv in 1673 (Filaret, *op. cit.*, III, 138), the annexation being approved by the universal rescript of Hetman I. Samoylovych of August 21, 1673 (*ibid.*, p. 140).

is also known that there was a Dominican convent in Novhorod-Siversk.<sup>13</sup>

The author of *Istoriya Rusov* obviously does not know that up to the time of the appearance of the False Dmitri, Novhorod-Siversk constituted part of the Muscovite State. His remark that the people of Novhorod-Siversk "had no . . . inclination whatever towards the Poles and their interests. It was opposed by an inborn affinity for co-believers and compatriots which always acted to make them incline to the Russian or Muscovite people" (p. 43) becomes an interesting characteristic.

The story in *Istoriya Rusov* of the expedition of the False Dmitri together with the Polish Army from Chernihiv to Novhorod-Siversk is very important. As usual, there is much confusion of historical details. The activities of Crown Hetman Kalynovsky belong to a later period (mainly to the times of Khmelnytsky). The name Ivan Zarutsky is historical, but his title "Colonel of Seversk . . . appointed by the king as assistant hetman over the Little Russian military" was, of course, an anachronism peculiar to the times of the Hetmancy. In reality the Zarutsky family was well-known in Novhorod-Siversk in the 17th and 18th centuries as clergymen and nobles.<sup>14</sup>

Topographical details contained in this story are of outstanding importance, as they attest indubitably to the circumstance that the author was well acquainted with the whole neighborhood of Novhorod-Siversk. "The Poles," says he, "approached Novhorod-Siversk and camped by the *Solene Ozero* (Salt Lake),<sup>15</sup> at the top of wide and deep gullies overgrown with woods, which sometimes filled with water and surrounded Novhorod. The right was

<sup>13</sup> A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 210.

<sup>14</sup> V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnnyk*, II, 140-143.

<sup>15</sup> ". . . in *Okopty*, a forest about 2 miles from the city (of Novhorod-Siversky — O.O.) near *Solene Ozero*; today completely dried out. . . ." (I. Sbytnyev, "Novgorod-Seversky", *Otechestvennyia zapiski*, 1828, No. 34, pp. 315, 316). See also next note.

"Towards the village of Forostovychi along the *Solonoie* river-bed (near Sheptaky)." A. Lazarevsky i H. Konstantynovych, *Obozreniye rummyantsevskoy opysy*, p. 766. See M. K. Chaly, *Vospominaniya* (1826-1844), Kiev, 1890, p. 11 (*Solonoie*).

called *Ladeyna prystan*<sup>16</sup> . . . and the left . . . Yaroslavl *potok* (Yaroslavy brook) by reason of its flowing from the Yaroslavy hill" (p. 43). Further on he mentions "the well-known road, hill and ferry near Novhorod" which are called *Putyul'sky* (p. 44).<sup>17</sup> All these names existed in Novhorod-Siversk in the 18th and 19th centuries, and exist to this day.

This story also contains a series of topographical data which indicate that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* knew this locality well. His remarks about the Monastery of the Transfiguration, the town of Hremyach, and others have the same weight.

The attempt of *Istoriya Rusov* to blot out the responsibility of Zarutsky for the massacre committed by the Poles in Novhorod-Siversky, indicates a desire on the author's part not only to rehabilitate the Ukrainian military, which at that time aided the Poles, but also the family name of Zarutsky known over the Novhorod-Siversk area.

The information contained in *Istoriya Rusov* on "*hradonachalnyk*

<sup>16</sup> In a document of 1691 there is mention of "*Okop*, lying beyond Lodeyna" in Novhorod-Siversk (*Trudy chernigovskoi gubernskoi arkhivnoi komissii*, v. X, p. 189). In a document of 1693 "a meadow, lying beyond Lodeyna" is mentioned (*ibid.*, p. 191).

<sup>17</sup> *Istoriya Rusov* indicates that as a result of the ruination of Novhorod-Siversk by the False Dmitri, "the neighboring population went to market customarily to the city of Putyvl" (p. 44). This information deserves comparison with oral reports of old inhabitants of the village of Spaske (Krolevets county), recorded in 1749: "they told of their grandfathers and fathers . . . going to market to Putyvl" (*Zapiski chernigovskavo gubernskavo statisticheskavo komiteta*, v. I, Chernihiv, 1866, p. 253, from the archives of the Baturyn Krupyt'sky monastery).

This story coincides textually with the information of *Istoriya Rusov* to that extent that a direct acquaintance of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* with it can permissibly be established. Considering that he was also acquainted with the Yuhniv story of 1721 of the murder of Wronski (see below), it seems quite possible that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* had access to the archives of the Novhorod-Siversk *Ekonomiya*, where these documents were kept between the years 1786 and 1797. They later found their way into the archives of *Chernihiv'ska Kazenna Palata* (see *Zapiski chern. gubern. statist. kom.*, I, 253, 254).

The "Putyvl road" and "Putyvl ferry" near Novhorod-Siversk (across the Desna river near Pyrohivka) are first mentioned in a decree of Tsar Ivan the Terrible to the Novhorod-Siversky Monastery of the Transfiguration of 1552 (Filaret, *Ist. stat. opis. chern. ep.*, III, 113-116). The "Putyvl ferry" in Novhorod-Siversk is mentioned in documents of the 17th c., e.g. in 1661 (*Trudy chern. gubern. arkh. kom.*, X, 153).

"On Novhorod land beyond the city, near the *Putyvl road*" (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Rummyantsivsky Opys, v. 141, "*vyedomost'*" of the clergy of the village of Len'kov, fol. 4).

"The Putyvl hill" is near Novhorod-Siversk (see *Pamyatnaya knyzhka chernigovskoi guberniyi*, Chernihiv, 1862, pp. 123, 124. P. Mayevsky, *Izvestkovyie zavody i kamenolomni po beregu reki Desny v Novgorod-Severskom uyezde*).

Berezovsky" of Novhorod-Siversk represents another interesting angle (p. 43), since it appears from the context he was a local man, not Polish. Here the author of *Istoriya Rusov* comes to contradict himself to a certain extent, where he previously maintained that Novhorod-Siversk was then part of the Polish State. The Berezovsky family was known during the 18th century in the Novhorod-Siversk area, and even in the entire Starodub colonelcy. Semen Berezovsky was recorder of the *sotnya* in Novhorod-Siversk (1700 to 1710), during the captaincy of Lukiyán Zhoravka, and later Captain of Novhorod (1710-1712) and regimental *Osaul* of Starodub (1714-1728).<sup>18</sup> Nil Berezovsky was Archimandrite of the Novhorod-Siversk Monastery of the Transfiguration between 1727 and 1733.<sup>19</sup>

Using the name of a *locally* known family in relating events of the olden days is simply a literary figure of expression employed by the author of *Istoriya Rusov*.

Novhorod-Siversk and its surrounding area are frequently mentioned in the succeeding pages of *Istoriya Rusov*: the year 1660 on page 151; around 1662, the Tartar attack and ruination of Novhorod-Siversk, Starodub, Mhlyn and Pohar on page 155, *n.b.* an invention of the author of *Istoriya Rusov*; on page 160, besides Novhorod-Siversk there is also mention of the village of Pyrohivka, with its ferry across the Desna river; on page 202, Novhorod-Siversk and to the town of Semionivka, the place of the camp of Hetman Mazepa in 1708, "in the place called to this day "*Shvedchyna*" (Swedes' place);<sup>20</sup> page 211, the village of Dehtyarivka "that lies on the Desna, near Novhorod-Siversk," etc.

<sup>18</sup> A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 101-102, 366-368; V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovyuk*, I, 47. There was a Cossack Prokip Berezovsky in Novhorod-Siversk in 1723 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, "Zbirka arkhografichnoyi komisiiyi," No. 393, fol. 361, top.).

<sup>19</sup> Filaret, *op. cit.*, III, 97-99. See *Trudy chernigovskoi gubernskoi arkhivnoi komisii*, v. III, 2nd ed. Chernihiv, 1913, part I, pp. 68-73.

<sup>20</sup> In "Rumyantsivsky opys" of 1767 a "Swedish estate by the river Slota" is mentioned (A. Lazarevsky i N. Konstantynovych, *Obozreniye Rumyantsovskoi opysy*, p. 771). *Opys Novhorod-Siverskoho namisnytstva* of 1781 notes a "winery, called Swedish, towards Sheptakovska volost" . . . in the woods by the river Slota" (*Opys novh. nam.*, 1779-1781, p. 361). Von-Hun, who travelled through these parts, wrote about "*khuir Shvedchyna*" (by the river Slota), "this forest is called Swedish, because during the time of the war against Sweden in the reign of Peter the Great, Swedes hid in it and finally settled there" (Von-Hun, *Poverkhnostnyie zamechaniya po doroge ot Moskvuy v Malorossiyyu v 1805 godu*, Moscow, 1806, v. II, p. 13. See A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, v. I, p. 193).

A very interesting episode is the expedition of General-Osaul Rodak across the river Prypyat' through Homel, Chernihiv, Horodnya, Starodub, and Hremyach to Novhorod-Siversk. This episode is, naturally, invented by the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. But he narrates it with such detail that could only interest a local resident, and some of the detail would only be known to the local populace.

Isolated events of this story in *Istoriya Rusov* are substantiated by documentary material. Novhorod-Siversk was captured by insurgent Cossacks around June 10, 1648, because on June 5, (June 15, of the new calendar) it was still in Polish hands, but already on June 15, the nobleman Kryshtof Sylych came running to Trubchevsk and related that "Lithuanian *Cherqasy* came to Novhorod-Siversk . . . and the townspeople living there surrendered Novhorod-Seversk to those *Cherqasy*, and the *Cherqasy* beat and slaughtered all nobles and gentlemen in Novhorod-Siversk."<sup>21</sup> The story of Sylych corroborates the basic part of *Istoriya Rusov*. In fact *Istoriya Rusov* relates that "the city was taken by Cossacks without any defense" (p. 76). Although the author of *Istoriya Rusov* gives here a broad and, probably, legendary story of the charge and capture of the Novhorod-Siversk castle by Cossacks, this does not detract from the veracity of his basic contention. The story in *Istoriya Rusov*, however, of the Cossacks' killing of Wronski and other nobles is attested by a report of an eye-witness of these events, K. Sylych. Moreover, the story of Wronski's death has all the features of local tradition, and is quite credible (see below).

Not only the whole story, but some details are quite accurate. This must primarily be said regarding the date of the capture of Novhorod-Siversk. The city was taken by Cossacks between June 5 and June 15, obviously around June 10. According to *Istoriya Rusov*, Khmelnytsky received news from Rodak about military operations in the Siversk region and the capture of Novhorod-Siversk on June 13. This date coincides with the documentary date to that extent that we must assume that the author made

<sup>21</sup> "Akty, odnosyashchiesya k istorii Yuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii," *A. Yu. i Z. R.*, III, 204, 225.

use of documentary sources available in Novhorod-Siversk (most likely, church chronicles).<sup>22</sup>

A very noteworthy reference in *Istoriya Rusov* is to the fact that in 1648 “there was an underground passage from the castle along the water to the river Desna itself” (p. 77). For truly, a description of Novhorod-Siversk composed in 1654, states that “in this mound city (i.e. castle — O.O.) a secret passage led to the water of the river Desna.”<sup>23</sup>

Finally, the Church of the Resurrection in Novhorod-Siversk certainly existed in 1648, although for some reason it was not mentioned in the description of Novhorod-Siversk of 1654.<sup>24</sup> It is possible that this church was damaged in 1648 or burnt. It is mentioned in documents of the end of the 17th and 18th century.<sup>25</sup>

*Istoriya Rusov* further furnishes very interesting names of some Novhorod-Siversky localities which are known only to the local population: “Yaroslavl brooks or streams,” “Zubrov ditch.” In Novhorod-Siversk such names as “Yaroslavova *krynytsya* (well)” in *Zaruch’yi* (*Zaruchay*) have been preserved to this day, it is the name of one of the largest springs in the city,<sup>26</sup> or ditches called “*Zubrovsky*” (or *Zubrytsky*).<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> That similar chronicles existed is proved by the following fact: in the town of Drokviv (Suraz’ky county) a breviary of the 17th century contains this note of a contemporary: “the king of Sweden went . . . through Mhlyn and Starodub in the year 1700 and eight, in the month of September, twenty third day” (*Chernigovskiya gubernskiya vedomosti*”, 1853, part 48 (unofficial), p. 449).

<sup>23</sup> *A. Yu. i Z. R.*, X, 831. The description of the Novhorod-Siversk governorship of 1781 mentions a “mound castle” in Novhorod-Siversk (*Opys novhorod-siverskoho namisnyistva*, 1779-1781, p. I).

<sup>24</sup> *A. Yu. i Z. R.*, X, 831. The description of 1654 lists in Novhorod-Siversk only *Uspenska* church and the Monastery of the Transfiguration, although there existed at the time undoubtedly other churches.

<sup>25</sup> According to Archbishop Filaret, the stone Church of the Resurrection was built in 1707 “in place of the rotted wooden one. The latter, according to tradition, existed in 1601.” (Filaret, *Istoriiko-statisticheskoye opisaniye chernigovskoi eparkhii*, v. VI, Chernihiv, 1874, p. 8, and pp. 17-18).

<sup>26</sup> M. Rklitsky, *Gorod Novgorod-Seversky, yevu proshloye i nastoyashcheye*, Chernihiv, 1900, pp. 1, 4. Another name for it is “*Zarucheyaska krynytsia*” (See I. Sbytnyev, *Novgorod-Seversky. Otechestvennyye zapiski*, 1828, IV, 108 (“*Zarucheyaska krynytsia*, sometimes called the well of Yaroslav”); D. Bahaley, *Istoriya severskoi zemli do poloviny XIV st.*, Kiev, 1882, pp. 89-90).

<sup>27</sup> They are mentioned by P. O. Kulish in a letter to O. M. Bodyansky of April 21, 1848 (Tula): “I myself went to school there (i.e. in Novhorod-Siversk — O.O.) and wandered through the *Zubrovsky ditches*, running away from algebra and rhetoric” (*Kievskaya starina*, 1898, II, 284).

If the name of the General-*Osaul* Rodak appears to be obviously invented by the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, his remark about the standard-bearer (*khorunzhy*) of Novhorod-Siversk, Fesko Kharkevych, is quite plausible. Among the Cossacks of Novhorod-Siversk in 1654 "*khorunzhy* Ivan Fedorov the son of Vorobey" is mentioned.<sup>28</sup> When we consider that according to *Istoriya Rusov* the Kharkevych wounded by Wronski "soon after died" (p. 77), it is not improbable that Ivan Fedorovych was made standard-bearer after the death of his father. The name Kharkevych (or Kharchenko) occurs quite frequently in the Novhorod-Siversk area.<sup>29</sup>

But probably by far the most interesting problem is, where did

<sup>28</sup> *A. Yu. i Z. R.*, X, 830.

<sup>29</sup> Kharyton (Kharko), and a son of his would be called either Kharchenko, or Kharkovych (Polonized version: Kharkevych). See, for example, V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnnyk*, III, 593, genealogy of Molyavkas. Among others, the *Kharchenkos* lived in the village of Yukhniv (near Novhorod-Siversk, the estate of the Khanenkos), (*Zapysky chern. gub. stat. kom.*, Vol. I, Chernihiv, 1866, p. 254. See *Ukrayins'ky arkhiv*, Kiev, 1929, I, 512). "Kharko Kondratovych, resident of Yukhniv" is mentioned in 1670, whose daughter was married to a clergyman of the Novhorod-Siversky Church of Christ's Nativity, Ioann (Lushko). A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye staroi Malorossii*, Kiev, 1893, II, 519. In the year 1721, Stepan Kharchenko, resident of the village of Yukhniv, said: "I, Stepan Kharchenko, know from my late *grandfather and father, who were born here and grew old here* where during the time of the Polish nobles the boundary line lay, and on this writing I truly admit: the Pole Wronski, who governed the village of Yukhniv, together with the white priests, made the boundary line. . . And since that time when there was ruin in our little Russian towns against the Poles, the priests of the state went away to Poland." (*Zapiski chern. gub. stat. kom.*, I, 254, 255). It is noteworthy that it was S. Kharchenko who mentioned the killing of Wronski (*ibid.*, p. 255, see below). This story is contained in a document of 1768 from the archives of the Novhorod-Siversk Monastery of the Transfiguration (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, No. 191, case No. 128, sheet 49, ord. -51). Stepan Kharchenko is the same Stepan Kharchenko (Kharchenok), who is entered in the list of the Starodub regiment in 1723, together with his sons Lazar and Andriy (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, *Zbirka arkhogr. kom.*, No. 393, f. 128, ord.). Besides, there was at that time in Yukhniv Yatsko Kharchenok among the Cossacks "who were unable to serve at all." (*ibid.*, f. 144, ord.).

There were also Kharchenkos in Novhorodok in 1723, "among the wealthier city-folk," Yakym Kharchenok is included (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, *Zb. arkh. kom.*, No. 393, 696f., ord.).

Andriy Stepanovych Kharchenko, Yukhniv Cossack is mentioned in 1768 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, No. 191, case No. 128, 26f., ord.). His children, nobles of Novhorod-Siversk county Ivan and Harasym Andriyevych Kharchenko, lived in the village of Yukhniv in 1790 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, No. 280, unreported cases).

Zakhar Kindratovych Kharchenko, "*Znatny viys'kovy tovarysh*" (prominent comrade-in-arms), received in 1671 permission to occupy the dam and erect a mill on the river Studenets', near the village of Yukhniv (*Chern. oblasny istorychny arkhiv*, F. Chernihivkoho Dvoryans'koho Zibrannya, No. 4241, 43f.). He is the ancestor of the Chernihiv noble Kharchenko, (Lukomsky, V. Modzalevsky, *Gerbovnik*, p. 194).

There were also Cossack (later gentry) Kharchenkos in the 18th century in the village

the author of *Istoriya Rusov* get the name of the "Seversk voievoda," Jan Wronski. Documents and Cossack chronicles known to this author do not mention his name as chief of the defense of Novhorod-Siversk from the attack by insurgent Cossacks. We know of Colonel Yu. Ponentowski, who was really in charge of troops of noblemen in Novhorod-Siversk in 1648,<sup>30</sup> and of the successor of O. Piasoczynski as Starosta of Novhorod — the Novhorod Zemsky judge, Jan Kunicki (1646-1648).<sup>31</sup>

But old people in the village of Yukhniv related in 1721 that under the rule of Poland Yukhniv belonged to the "Lakh (Pole) *Wronski*"; "and after the death of Wronski, *when he had been killed*, his serfs and all incomes and uses of his estate became the property of the City Hall of Novhorod."<sup>32</sup> This then indicates that Wronski (Jan) was a real historical person.<sup>33</sup>

of Dehtyarivka, of Novhorod *Sotnya* (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Zb. Arkh. Kom., No. 393, for 1723; *K.Ts.A.S.A.* f. No. 191, No. 145, sheet 6, for 1768; *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, f. No. 280, unreported cases, 1790).

But there were also Kharkevychs in the Novhorod-Siversk governorship in the 1780-ies. The register of the clergy for 1784 mentions in the village of Rozlity (Krolevets' area) the sexton Samiyo Kharkevych (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, book 5917, 6f.), and in the village of Pohoriltvy (Mashev Protopyy) son of a verger, Terenty Kharkevych (*ibid.*, 288f.).

*Istoriya Rusov* also mentions regimental *Osaul* Kharkevych, condemned along with Ostryanytsya, *Istoriya Rusov*, p. 56.

<sup>30</sup> *A. Yu. i Z. R.*, III, 204.

<sup>31</sup> A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 210, 246.

<sup>32</sup> *Zap. chern. gub. stat. kom.*, I, 254 (From documents of the Novhorod-Siversk Spaso-Preobrazhensky monastery).

<sup>33</sup> The noble Vronsky family of Chernihiv originates from Jan *Wronski* (1636) (H. Myloradovych, *Rodoslovnaya kniga*, No. VI, II, 29, 30; V. Lukomorsky and V. Modzalevsky, *Malorossiysky gerbovník*, St. Petersburg, 1914, p. 27), who is, of course, the same person as the Jan Wronski of *Istoriya Rusov*. Jan Wronski was supposed to have an estate in the village of Yukhniv (*Chern. oblas. istor. arkhiv.*, F. *Chern. dvor. zibr.*, No. 5282, fol. A11, p. 48). In reality, in the 18th century we find, in Yukhniv, Cossacks (later nobles) by the name of Vronsky. According to the computation of 1723, there were allegedly no Wronskis (Vronsky) in Yukhniv (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Zb. arkh. kom., No. 393), provided, naturally that such *name* had not been omitted. It is therefore possible that they made their appearance in Yukhniv somewhat later (or else there was an interval). Fedir Vronsky, Yukhniv Cossack, is mentioned in the 1760-ies (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, F. No. 191, case No. 128, fol. 26, ord.). Petro Vronsky (23 years old), Cossack of the Novhorod *Sotnya*, went to war against Turkey in 1769 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, f. *Maloros. kol.*, *chern.* part for year 1769). In the registers of the nobility of Novhorod-Siversk county for 1790 we find in the village of Yukhniv the following Vronsky: Petro, Stepan, and Oleksa Fedorovych and Yevdokym and Stepan Ivanovych (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, F. No. 280, unreported cases of 1790).

Mykola Petrovych Vronsky (son of Petro Fedorovych) is "Gubernial registrar in the Upper Court" (of Novhorod-Siversk — O.O.) (*ibid.*) There were also Vronsky in Novhorod-Siversk in the 19th century (see *Chern. gub. ved.*, 1852, 9, dept. I, p. 60).

It is clear, therefore, that when the author was writing *Istoriya Rusov* about 150 years after the above-mentioned event, he could find out about it only in the *place of the event*, either from local oral tradition, or, what is more certain, from local written sources (particularly church family documents), or perhaps he drew upon both these groups of sources.<sup>34</sup> This means that he lived somewhere near-by and not only visited here, because he not only knows Novhorod-Siversk and its vicinity well, but also takes especial interest in its past as a local patriot, devotes to these events of comparatively secondary importance his great attention, up to the inclusion of minute details. Even if he composes stories in his own way (having particular predilection for depicting scenes of battle), he does it with total veracity and accuracy of detail. This could obviously be done only by a local person. Consequently we must agree that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* lived either in Novhorod-Siversk or very close to it.

Only one episode of *Istoriya Rusov* has here been subjected to analysis, it nevertheless clearly shows the close connection the author of *Istoriya Rusov* had with the Novhorod-Siversk area, his particular interest in it, and his thorough acquaintance with this locality. But this episode is not the only one.

It is worthwhile to stop and consider another episode, which is chronologically closer to the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. It is the story of conditions in Novhorod-Siversk at the time of the Swedish attack in 1708 and deserves to be quoted in its entirety.

“Novhorod-Siversk was prepared by Mazepa for the first reception and bivouac of the Swedish king and his army. It was specially fortified and its castle contained considerable stores, and for the defense of the fort and military depot its garrison had added one *Serdyuk* (guard) regiment commanded by its Colonel Chechel, and two *Sotnyas* of registered Cossacks: of Novhorod and Topal under command of Novhorod Captain Lukian Zhoravka. And as usual the registered Cossacks always hated the *Serdyuks* for their disorderliness and temper and sought revenge on them for this.

<sup>34</sup> The Yukhniv story of 1721 about the killing of Wronski was preserved in the archives of the Novhorod-Siversk Spaso-Preobrazhensky monastery (later in the archives of the Chernihiv Kazenna Palata, *Zap. chern. gub. stat. kom.* I, 255). There is reason to believe that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* knew this story from its *documentary source*.

The tsar and his army were then approaching Novhorod and stood on the *opposite bank, on the river Desna, in the village of Pohrebky, while he himself was quartered in the home of a local Cossack Malchych*; then Captain Zhoravka, in agreement with the Novhorod protopop Lysovsky and the Cossack command, *through standard-bearer Pavlo Khudorbay*, informed the ruler in Pohrebky that they would surrender the city, if he would permit the sending of his troops to the city at night from the meadow side. After this announcement the ruler then ordered a considerable number of troops towards the city, and the captain and his command and citizens led and admitted them into the city *through the so-called Vodny Gate, which is between the castle and the cloister*. The tsar's soldiers, taking the *Serdyuks* by surprise in the city and castle, killed them all and took the city. The tsar visited the city within twenty-four hours and quartered in the *captain's stone house*, and intended to punish a few tens of the citizens for accepting the *Serdyuks* and to deter citizens of other cities, so they should not accept soldiers of the enemy; but a *boyaryn* who happened to be present, Count Sheremetev, interceded for the citizens and argued with the ruler that 'if Your Highness, who knew Mazepa much better than these people knew him, could misplace his confidence in him, giving him faith and unlimited honors, then how could these people have mistrusted him, when they are far from all political and ministerial matters, which are always concealed from them and impenetrable? And meanwhile Mazepa, who had been their commander-in-chief, gave them no sign of his conduct.' The ruler, considering such good reasons, and because, luckily, Menshikov was not present, forgave the citizens and rewarded the officers who collaborated in the surrender of the city: he made Captain Zhoravka colonel of Starodub, and protopop Lysovsky, captain of Novhorod, and this ordained protopop conducted services in church on Sundays wearing a stole, and on other days he officiated in the captaincy with a sword at his side, but just the same he never shaved his beard, and judged litigants, at the same time giving them benediction. But in this occurrence the highest praise goes to the deliverer of innocence, *boyaryn* Sheremetev. Memory of him will be lasting and respected in Novhorod from generation to generation" (pp. 207-208).

In this story a series of details is undeniably not in accord with historical truth. It is easily noticeable that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* transposed to Novhorod-Siversk some details tied with Baturyn: in particular the *Serdyuk* Colonel D. Chechel was then, as is well known, not in Novhorod-Siversk, but in Baturyn. *Istoriya Rusov* nevertheless quite correctly estimates the great importance of Novhorod-Siversk as a fortress and military depot, and also, in accord with local sources (chronicled and oral tradition); furnishes facts and information that are either irrefutable, or quite plausible. Peter I and Sheremetev were actually in the village of Pohrebky;<sup>35</sup> and the Novhorod Captain Lukyan Zhoravka really surrendered the city to the Russian army, and for that he was promoted to colonel of Starodub.<sup>36</sup> Very significant topographical details: the village of Pohrebky is really situated on the left bank of the Desna "on the meadow side" of Novhorod-Siversk. The name "Vodny Gate, between the castle and cloister" in Novhorod-Siversk is also interesting (historically and topographically quite correct).<sup>37</sup> It is also known that Captain Zhoravka had a stone house in Novhorod-Siversk, and Peter I could have stayed in it while in Novhorod-Siversk. The ruins of this house stood until 1852.<sup>38</sup> The evaluation of Sheremetev's role is also interesting, his name being, according to old tradition, very popular in Ukrainian circles,<sup>39</sup> which always held him high, and not without good reason, against the hated Menshikov.

<sup>35</sup> N. Kostomarov, *Sobraniye sochinenii*, St. Petersburg, 1905, VI, 632, 633.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 724-725; A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 38.

<sup>37</sup> "Vodny Gate, situated between the convent and castle" (I. Sbytnyev, "O proyezdye Gosudarya imperatora cherez Novgorod-Seversk," *Ukrainsky zhurnal*, 1825, No. VIII, 19-20, p. 97). "Vodniya (gate — O.O.) meshdu zamkom y klashtorom," (I. Sbytnyev, "Novgorod-Seversky," *Otyechestvenn. zapiski*, 1828, 34, p. 314).

<sup>38</sup> "Not far from this church (Uspensky sobor — O.O.), on the same street stands a stone house — today empty, with only the walls left, which was then Captain . . . Zhoravka's" (*Chern. gub. vyed.*, 1853, No. I, unofficial, p. 7). This building was already in ruins in 1816. A. Levshin, who was in Novhorod-Siversk at that time, saw the "remainders of this house in which the Great Peter observed the movements of the Swedes." (A. Levshin, *Pisma iz Malorossii*, Kharkiv, 1816, p. 186). See also M. K. Chaly, *Vospominaniya*, p. 6.

<sup>39</sup> It is worthwhile to compare *Istoriya Rusov's* opinion of Sheremetov with a corresponding opinion of the Lyzohub chronicler (*Sbornik letopisei, otnosyashchychhsya k istorii Yuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii*, Kiev, 1888, p. 53). See V. Shcherbyna, *Novi studiyi z istoriyi Kyeva*, pp. 78-79, 96. This story from *Istoriya Rusov* is generally corroborated by Swedish sources. The Quartermaster-General of the Swedish army, Gyllenkrook, tells of Sheremetev's

The story concerning the famous protopop, Captain Fedir Lysovsky, is not presented quite accurately. Somehow, Lysovsky really ingratiated himself with the Russian Government in 1708, for which he was made "Protopop" (chief parson) of Hadyach (not Novhorod-Siversk), and after his scandalous departure from there, he was given the office of captain of Novhorod-Siversk (1715-1721), where he became famous for great graft and violence, the tradition of which remained alive for a long time, but it assumed anecdotic interpretation in *Istoriya Rusov*.<sup>40</sup>

But the most salient is the report that Peter I stayed in Pohrebky "in the house of the local Cossack Malchych" (p. 207). It appears that in this case the author of *Istoriya Rusov* resorts to his usual method of employing actual local names. The Malchenkos (and there is no doubt that they are the same) were an old Cossack family in Pohrebky in the 18th century. "They, the Malchenkos, are Cossacks by ancestry" states "Rumyantsivsky opys" of 1767,<sup>41</sup> who towards the end of the century entered into the register of nobles.<sup>42</sup> A local researcher, S. V. Rklitsky, writes: "Concerning

movement towards Novhorod-Siversk. Joseph Cederhielm, secretary of Field Headquarters of Charles XII, wrote to his brother from Baturyn on November 10, 1708: "When the vanguard (of General Kreitz — O.O.) came to the village of Czeptaki (Sheptaky — O.O.) one mile from Novhorod, they encountered a small troop of Russians in a field, whom they dispersed and took some prisoners. Here they found out that the enemy had outdistanced our troops and had already thrown one detachment into the city (of Novhorod-Siversk — O.O.). They (the Swedes) were neither in a position to attack the city, nor did they have orders to do so. His Highness (Charles XII — O.O.) who had turned with his army in the same direction could not change anything without endangering his position. . . . In the meantime the enemy had an opportunity to withdraw from around Novhorod across the river, so that he stood before us on the opposite bank (across from the village of Horky — O.O.)." (B. Krupnytsky, *Mazepa i Shvedy v 1708 r.*, (based on memoirs and correspondence of participants), Symposium "Mazepa," v. II, *Pratsi Ukr. Nauk. Instytutu*, Warsaw, 1939, XLVII, 5, 7).

<sup>40</sup> A. Lazarevsky, "Ocherki iz byta Malorossii v XVIII veke," III. Sotnyky, *Russky Arkhiv*, 1873, book I, pp. 355-369; A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 197-206. See S. Moravsky, "Fedor Lysovsky," 1709-1722, *Kievskaya starina*, 1891, IX, X.

<sup>41</sup> *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, "Rumyantsivsky Opys," v. 140.

<sup>42</sup> Although the name Malchenko is not mentioned in the computation of 1723 (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Zb. arkh. kom., No. 393), it is nevertheless certain that ancestors of the Malchenkos were even then in Pohrebky. The mansion of Stepan Malchenko is described in "Rumyantsivsky Opys" as "old" (*Ibid.*, Rum. Op., v. 140). They were obviously the brothers "Kalmychky" mentioned in the computation of 1723: Lazar, Yosyp, and Kuz'ma (*Ibid.*, Zb. Arkh. Kom. No. 393, f.141 ord.). Ihnat Ospyovych Malchenko (Malchenok), "Cossack of the Novhorod Sotnya, resident of the village of Pohrebky" (1759), whose acquisition of land in the Drobyshev area are mentioned, beginning with the year 1726,

the Malchenko family, old residents of Pohrebky relate that on one beam of the house of Malchenko there was a carved inscription 'Peter I was here.' The house burned down in 1889."<sup>43</sup> This would very clearly indicate the presence of *local* tradition, which the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, in the absence of written sources, would have known only by reason of his being a *local* resident. Finally, of great weight is the "countrymanship" of the Malchenkos and Khudorbas (Khudorbays), and particularly the connection of these two names in *Istoriya Rusov*.

The interest of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* in the Novhorod-Siversk region was also manifested, as we have seen, in using, appropriately or inappropriately, local names, which he frequently ties in with real or invented events, with which these persons had no real connection. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* pays signal attention to one name, that of "Khudorba," not letting an opportunity go by without praising the real or fictitious merits of this family. This name is first mentioned in *Istoriya Rusov* in a narrative of the beginnings of the Khmelnytsky movement. After the fantastic battle near Kamyianets' and its capture by Cossacks, Khmelnytsky dispatched his aides to all corners of Ukraine for the purpose of fighting detachments of the Polish military and the local nobles.<sup>44</sup> Among those dispatched was volunteer cavalry Colonel "Kondrat Khudorbay," who along with another colonel, Yakov Hladky,<sup>45</sup> (*n.b.* also a well-known Cossack family in the Novhorod-Siversk area, see below) was ordered "beyond Chernihiv, into Polesye and Severya" (p. 68). Near Horodnya (North of Chernihiv), their

was certainly the son of Osyp Kalmychyk. At the time of the Rummyantsiv revision, there was in Pohrebky Stepan Malchenok (son of Ihnat), elected Cossack (age 35) (*Ibid.*, Rum. Op., v. 140), who, in 1769 went to war against Turkey (*Ibid.*, f. Mal. kol., Chern. vidd., 1770, No. 1088). In 1789 there is mention in Pohrebky of "Sotnya Osaul, nobleman Denys Malchenko", and "from the nobility, Cossack Fylyp Malchenko" (*Kievskaya starina*, 1901, I, 123, 124).

<sup>43</sup> S. Rklitsky, "Dogovory prikhozhan s svyashchennikami v staroi Malorossii (po povodu dogovornavo akta 1789 g.)" *Kievskaya starina*, 1901, I, 124, note 2.

<sup>44</sup> *Lvivs'ky rus'ky litopys* states that "Khmelnytsky sent his colonels to all parts, to Byelorussia, to Severshchina, to Polesye, to Ruska Podolia, to Volhynia. . ." (*Russki istoricheski sbornik*, Moscow, 1838, III, 262-263).

<sup>45</sup> *Istoriya Rusov* also mentions "Hladky, Colonel of Myrhorod" (p. 102). There was really a colonel of Myrhorod, Matviy Hladky (1649-1652). I. Krypyakevych, "Studiya nad derzhavoyu Bohdana Khmelnytskoho," VIII. — *ZNTSh.*, 151, 131. See below.

detachment was routed by Prince Radziwiłł; General-Standard-bearer Buynos, Colonel Hladky, regimental *Osaul* Podobay<sup>46</sup> and many Cossacks were killed, and “their saddlebags, stores and artillery were taken booty by the enemy” (p. 74). But Colonel Khudorbay preserved his troops, and joining forces with General-*Osaul* Rodak near Homel, annihilated Radziwiłł, proceeding thereafter to Novhorod-Siversk, which was captured by the Cossacks (p. 76).

*Istoriya Rusov* further mentions the name Khudorba in relating of the defeat of the Cossack army, under the command of “*Nakazny* Hetman” (Hetman-in-charge) Yakiv Tomylo, at the hands of the Tatar Khan on the river Samara in October 1655. Here again Colonel Khudorbay succeeded in rescuing part of the Cossack army from a tight spot: “Others, under the command of Colonel Khudorbay, hid in the Dnieper meadow in its reeds and brush, evaded them until nightfall, and at night made their way across the Dniepr on reed rafts, got into the Uman’ area and joined the Cossack military” (p. 129).

Colonel Khudorbay, this time from Uman’, appears for the third time in events taking place during the Hetmanate of Yuriy Khmelnytsky in 1660. “Hetman Khmelnytsky began his rule by expelling from Little Russia Poles, brought there by Vyhovsky; for this purpose he ordered a military corps under the command of colonels, Tsyutsyura of Pereyaslav, and Khudorbay of Uman’, who going through the cities of Nezhin, *Novgorod-Siversk*, Starodub, Chernygov, Kiev and their vicinities, rid them of all Polish soldiers who had garrisoned the cities and quartered in the settlements. . .” (pp. 151-152).

Finally the last time *Istoriya Rusov* mentions the Khudorbays in connection with Swedish events of 1708. The Novhorod standard-bearer Pavlo Khudorbay was the one who, delegated by Novhorod Captain Lukyan Zhoravka and protopop Lysovsky, informed Peter I in Pohrebky of the Cossacks’ readiness to surrender Novhorod-Siversk (p. 207).

It is remarkable that in all four instances, the Khudorbays (or

<sup>46</sup> This name suggests Stepan Pobodaylo, colonel of Chernihiv (1651-1654) (I. Krypyakevych, *op. cit.*, pp. 133, 134).

Khudorbas) play a *positive* role from the viewpoint of the author of *Istoriya Rusov*. This fact is significant of itself. Furthermore, almost all Khudorbays are tied with Novhorod-Siversk, one way or another. This ultimately poses the question, where did the author of *Istoriya Rusov* get that name from, and why does he taken an interest in a family, which had not played any significant role in the history of Ukraine? The Khudorbays (Khudorbas, Khudorbiys) were an old Cossack (later noble) family in the Novhorod-Siversk region, who descended from Mykhailo Kindratovych Khudorbiy, "prominent comrade-in-arms."<sup>47</sup>

In the computation of the Starodub regiment of 1723, there is an entry in the village of Koman' of Cossack Pavlo Khudorba with sons, Semen and Vasyl', who "live on one estate and in one house and serve by virtue of their father's land."<sup>48</sup> In 1767 in the village of Koman' there was a selected Cossack (one who has been a Cossack for many generations — *izdrevle Kozak*), Mykhailo Omelanenkiv Khudorba, "a native of this village," 50 years old.<sup>49</sup> He was still living in 1790, having the rank of retired comrade-in-arms, and by then admitted to the register of nobles of Novhorod-Siversk county.<sup>50</sup> This admission he must have owed to his sons, in the first place to the middle one, Arkhip Mykhailovych (born between 1748 and 1752, and living in 1790), who was Captain of Sheptaky (1777-1782), Officer of the Hetman's Suite (1783) and first major of the Starodub Carabinier regiment (1790), author of a patriotic *Istoriya Ukrainy*, which has not come down

<sup>47</sup> V. Lukomsky i V. Modzalevsky, *Gerbovník*, pp. 196-197, the Khudorbiy coat-of-arms, table XVII.

<sup>48</sup> *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Zb. Arkh. Kom. No. 393, fol. 127. The coincidence of the name Pavlo Khudorbay of *Istoriya Rusov* with the name of a historically known Cossack of Koman', Pavlo Khudorba is very significant.

Vasyl' Pavlovych Khudorba is, of course, that "Vasyl' Khudorbenko," Cossack of the village of Koman', who is mentioned in the record of the General Investigation of 1729 (*Heneralne sliďstvo pro mayetnosti starodubiv's'koho polku*, Kiev, 1929, pp. 511-512). It is also the same Cossack of the village of Koman', Vasyl Khudorba, mentioned in the revision of 1738 (see *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, "Rumyantsivsky Opys", v. 140).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, "Rum. Op.", v. 140, v. Koman', f. 10-12, ord., he was probably the son of Vasyl' Pavlovych Khudorba.

Besides M. Omelanenko-Khudorba, there were other Cossacks by the name of Khudorba in the village of Koman' in 1767 (*Ibid.*, "Rum. Op.", v. 140).

<sup>50</sup> *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, F. No. 280, unreported cases for 1790. Only this line of the Khudorba family was admitted to the nobility.

to us, but which most certainly served as one of the sources of *Istoriya Rusov*.<sup>51</sup> In 1799 the Heraldry certified the Khudorbiys to the rights of Russian nobility.<sup>52</sup>

The Khudorbiy family was known in those parts in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. S. V. Rklitsky, a native of the village of Pohrebky, wrote in 1901: "the lands of the Khudorbiys are even today in the estates of the village of Pohrebky" (the village of Pohrebky is near Koman').<sup>53</sup> Thus, the Khudorbiys (Khudorbas) are old residents of this region.

It must be stated in general that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* very often mentions real or invented occurrences or conditions in the Novhorod-Siversk area. He can be called not only a Ukrainian patriot, but also a patriot of his narrower fatherland, the Novhorod-Siversk region. From the very beginning almost to the end, *Istoriya Rusov* is saturated with this lively interest and attention to Novhorod-Siversk vicinity. A few examples:

1) Narrating, after *Povest vremennykh let*, the legendary journey of the Apostle Andrew to Kiev and Novhorod, *Istoriya Rusov* states: "This Apostle coming by the river Desna was then also in Novhorod-Siversk." *Istoriya Rusov* ties with this the known chronicle story about the Novhorod baths (p. 4).

2) In the story about the successful war of the Polish King Ladislas III (erroneously called II) against the Turks in 1439, *Istoriya Rusov* mentions, along with the Kievan Voievoda "Svietoldovych," the "Seversky (voievoda — O.O.) Olhovsky" (p. 12, an obvious hint at the Siversky Princes Olhovych). He is also mentioned in the story of the war of 1444.

3) Among the first Cossack regiments in Ukraine, allegedly introduced by "Hetman Ruzhynsky" during the reign of Sigis-

<sup>51</sup> Re: A. M. Khudorba and his work, see this author's "Istoriya Ukrainy Khudorby," (*Krakiv'ki visti*, 1943, Nos. 238, 239). Besides Arkhip, old Mykhailo Khudorba had the following sons: cornet Opanas Khudorba, flag-comrade Volodymyr, Fedir Khudorba, and daughter Malaniya, (*K.Ts.A.S.A.*, Rum. Op., v. 140; *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, F. No. 280, cases of 1790; *Kievskaya starina*, 1901, I, 123).

<sup>52</sup> The Khudorbiys were registered in the IV part of "Obshchi gerbovnik dvoryanskikh rodov rossiyskoi imperii" (*I Polnoye sobraniye zakonov*, v. XXV, No. 19238, Dec. 31, 1799). See A. Bobrinsky, *Dvoryanskiye rody*, Vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1890, pp. 432, 433.

<sup>53</sup> *Kievskaya starina*, 1901, I, 123.

mund I, *Istoriya Rusov* lists the "Seversky" regiment (along with the Kiev and Chernihiv, p. 15).<sup>54</sup>

4) The author of *Istoriya Rusov* is very hostile to the *Raskolniki*. "Their numerous sects or varied explanations do not agree with any Christian or deist sect, but are only simple, delirious peasant talk, taken from coarse language and multiplied by senseless superstition. . . They (*Raskolniki* — O.O.) filled with their refugees all Poland, Prussia, Moldavia and Bessarabia." But, "only the Little Russian landowners suffered for them, and the secular ones, at that" (pp. 222, 223). This could have been written only by a landowner of the Novhorok-Siversk region, where "settlements of the *Raskolnik*'" were becoming great competitors of the local landowners, and who hated them during the 18th,<sup>55</sup> and even in the 19th century. Suffice it to recall the opinion of H. V. Yesymontovsky of them in his 1844 *Opisaniye surazhskavo uyezda*.<sup>56</sup> The author of *Istoriya Rusov* appears to be not disinterestedly acquainted with anti-old-rite literature (e.g. he knows *Prashchitsa* by Archbishop Pitirim).<sup>57</sup>

5) A major clue towards the establishment of the person of the author of *Istoriya Rusov* is provided by the story of the battle in Hayman-Dolyna in 1738 in which General-*bunchuchny* Semen Haletsky was killed, and from the general information of the war of 1735-1739. This story is without question of Novhorod-Siversk origin.

Of special interest is the story of the rescue of Semen Haletsky's son, Petro, during the unfortunate battle in Hayman-Dolyna. "Haletsky called his son Petro, who was *Pohar captain in the Starodub regiment*, and permitted him to save himself as a young man man by all possible means, and as to himself he would act according to the duties of his oath and command. And thus these troops were routed by the Tatar Host to the man, and chief Haletsky

<sup>54</sup> "Seversk regiment" is also mentioned by *Istoriya Rusov* later, e.g. in 1650 (p. 104).

<sup>55</sup> A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 443-445.

<sup>56</sup> G. V. Yesymontovsky, *Opisaniye surazhskavo uyezda*, Chernihiv, 1845 and 1882, 2d ed., pp. 239, 240.

<sup>57</sup> There was a copy of *Prashchitsa* published in 1726 in the library of the Novhorod-Siversky Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery (Filaret, *op. cit.*, v. III, p. 152).

was cut in pieces, but his son with a few hundred Cossacks and dragoons saved themselves during the oncoming night among the dead bodies and empty wells" (pp. 240-241).

This story originated undoubtedly in the Haletsky family. In this connection, we might examine the interesting figures of Semen Yakovych and Petro Semenovych Haletsky. General-*bunchuchny* (1734-1738) Semen Yakovych Haletsky is a person closely tied with the Novhorod-Siversk region; he was, in particular both Novhorod-Siversk captain (1722-1723) and Starodub regimental captain (1724-1734). Between 1723 and 1725 he was imprisoned in Petersburg in connection with the case of Hetman Polubotok.<sup>58</sup>

Semen Haletsky's son, Petro Semenovych Haletsky, who succeeded his father to the captaincy of Starodub (1734-1738), was later colonel of Hadyach (1738-1754)<sup>59</sup> and, like his father, part of the Novhorod-Siversk area, where he possessed numerous relations and considerable estates. The author of *Istoriya Rusov* could have been informed by him, or more likely by his descendants, very influential landowners of the second half of the 18th century, about details of the battle in Hayman Dolyna.

6) The story about the "misdeeds" of Biron's brother, obviously General Karl Biron,<sup>60</sup> whose "knavery and depravities repulse the very imagination of a human being" (p. 243), contains unmistakable features of *Northern-Left-Bank* origin, and is indicative of the connection of *Istoriya Rusov's* author with the territory of the Novhorod-Siversk governorship. *Istoriya Rusov* says of K. Biron, not without reason, that "the memory of his misdeeds

<sup>58</sup> V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnnyk*, I, 234; A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 139-141.

<sup>59</sup> V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnnyk*, I, 235. It is to be noted that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* confuses the offices of father and son Haletsky. Not the father, but the son Haletsky was (later) colonel of Hadyach. In fact, Hryhoriy Hrabynka was colonel of Hadyach in 1738, and he perished ("Missing without trace") in the Hayman-Dolyna battle (V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnnyk*, I, 329). In 1738 the Poharsky captain was not the son of Semen Haletsky, but (some time before) Semen himself. This would indicate unquestionably that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* related this story from memory of other peoples' oral narratives of occurrences described much later. But at the same time this story tends to disprove the authorship of O. Bezborod'ko decidedly, inasmuch as biographical data of the Haletskys, close relatives of Bezborod'ko, as given in *Istoriya Rusov* are completely at variance with such data contained in one of O. Bezborod'ko's letters to Count A. Vorontsov, dated around 1780 (*Arkhiv kn. Vorontsova*, XIII, 197-198).

<sup>60</sup> See M. Khmyrov, *Istoriicheskiye stati*, St. Petersburg, 1873, p. 241, note 2 on p. 242.

makes the citizens of Starodub and its neighborhood shudder” (p. 243). There is also an interesting indication that K. Biron was “very lame and almost legless,” “a complete cripple” (p. 243).<sup>61</sup>

7) Another interesting story is of the sojourn of a Ukrainian deputation in Petersburg in the year 1745 (pp. 245-246), which most certainly comes from the Hudovych family, who were very influential in the Novhorod-Siversk governorship.<sup>62</sup>

8) The author of *Istoriya Rusov* repeatedly uses geographical names of the Novhorod-Siversk area,<sup>63</sup> as well as names of local families, or particular historical personages (besides those listed above: Hudym — p. 13,<sup>64</sup> Shevernyts’ky — p. 33,<sup>65</sup> Skobychevsky — p. 50,<sup>66</sup> Tomylo — p. 129,<sup>67</sup> Hladky — p. 68, 74,<sup>68</sup> and others,<sup>69</sup>

<sup>61</sup> This characteristic is in general accord with Manstein’s description of K. Biron: “This was a most brutal person; he was all disfigured from fights and tussles, into which he got when drunk and through his brutal behavior. He was feared and avoided in Russia” (*Zapiski Mansteina o Rossii 1727-1744*, St. Petersburg, 1875, p. 30).

<sup>62</sup> The very favorable attitude of *Istoriya Rusov* to General-Treasurer Vasyli’ Hudovych speaks against the authorship of O. Bezborod’ko, inasmuch as the relations between O. Bezborod’ko and the Hudovych family, in particular Andriy Vasylovych Hudovych, were quite bad.

<sup>63</sup> See “Ukazatel *Istoriyi Rusov*” (Index to the printed edition of “*Istoriya Rusov*”).

<sup>64</sup> *Hudyma* was an old Cossack family in the village of Drobyshev (near Novhorod-Siversk), the brothers Matviy and Dmytro Hudyma are registered in the computation of 1723 (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, Zbirka arkhheograf. komisii, No. 393, f. 127 ord.). The first of them is undoubtedly the Matviy Hudym, “an old resident of Drobyshev,” who is mentioned in 1729 (*Ukrainsky arkhiv*, I, 509). Opanas Hudym, “Cossack of the Novhorod *Sotnya*, resident of Drobyshev” is mentioned in 1759 (see *K. Ts. A. S. A.*, Rumiantsivsky opys, v. 140). Semen Petrovych Hudym, Cossack-aide of the village of Drobyshev, “Cossack by ancestry” (*ibid.*). See *K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. Mal. kol. chern. vidd., 1784 (data for 1776). Roman Hudymov, Cossack of Novhorod *Sotnya*, 1776 (*ibid.*, f. Mal. Kol. Chern. vidd. 1776). Vasyli’ Hudym served in the office of the Novhorod-Siversk government in 1786 (*ibid.*, f. No. 280, unreported cases of 1786). There were also Hudymy in the village of Obrazhnyiivka in Krolevets’ county in 1789 (*ibid.*, f. No. 280, unreported cases 1796).

<sup>65</sup> *Shevernytsky* is a family of clergy in Novhorod-Siversk region. Records for 1784 mention the verger of Holy Ghost Church in the village of Vytemli (Poharsky county) Ivan Shevernytsky (“Shevernetsky”) (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, book No. 5917). Subsequently one branch of this family became nobles. Mykhailo Davydovych Shevernytsky, staff-captain (1825) belongs to the nobles of Novhorod-Siversk in 1812 (*Trudy chern. gubern. arkh. kom.*, X, 177, see H. Myloradovych, *Rodoslovnaya kniga*, I, part 2, 609).

<sup>66</sup> Skobychevsky (Skabichevsky), a Novhorod-Siversk family of glass-makers, later officers and nobles, stem according to family tradition from Kuz’ma Skabichevsky (17th century). Vasyli’ Kuzmych Skabichevsky (1643-1741) was glassmaker of Mashev and Zhadovsky; his son Isay — glassmaker of Demenka; another son, Ivan, overseer of Popiv volost which formed part of Sheptaky *Sotnya* (1733-1741). The wife of the latter, Dominikiya Mykhailivna owned a tenure in Novhorod-Siversk, which she donated in 1750 to Blahovishchenska (Annunciation) Church (see Filaret, *op. cit.*, VI, 20). The third son of Vasyli’

Kuzmych Skabychevsky, Vasyľ had two estates in the Novhorod-Siversk area in the 1730-ies. A relative of the old Skabichevsky, Roman Hryhorovych Skabichevsky, who was *Sotnya Osaul* and later comrade-in-arms, had an estate near the village of Shatryshchy in Novhorod-Siversk county (years: 1781, 1788, 1798), which was called "Khutir Skabichevskoho" (V. Modzalevsky, *Huty na Chernyivshchyni*, Kiev, 1926, pp. 145-146; *Opys Novhorod-Siverskoho namisnytstva*, pp. 483-484; *Viddil rukopysiv biblioteky Ukraïns'koyi Akademiï Nauk*: "Spysok dvoryan Novhorod-Siverskoho namisnytstva 1788 r."). Thus, then, the name Skabichevsky was well known in Novhorod-Siversk and vicinity in the 18th century.

<sup>87</sup> *Tomylovsky* (Tamilovsky), a prominent urban family (later officer and landowner) of Novhorod-Siversk, which, among others, furnished several Novhorod mayors and burgo-masters. Opanas Illich Tomylovsky (Tamilovsky), Novhorod mayor (1734, 1743, 1752 — *K. Ts. A. S. A.*, Rum. Op., v. 140; A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 211, note 356), was the son of Novhorod mayor Illa Opanasovych (1723, *K. Ts. A. S. A.*, Zb. Arkh. Kom. No. 393, f. 363 ord. 696). Of O. I. Tomylovsky's sons: Ihnat Opanasovych, married Hanna Andriyivna Zaruts'ka, was pastor of the Novhorod-Siversky Sobor church (1748, A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 230-231), and Stepan Opanasovych was Novhorod burgomaster and comrade-in-arms (see V. Modzalevsky, *Rodoslovnyk*, I, 415); *K. Ts. A. S. A.*, F. No. 191, case No. 145.

Of the grandsons of Opanas Illich Tomylovsky: Yakiv Ihnatovych Tomylovsky was Officer of the Hetman's Suite (later collegiate assessor) and in 1783 county judge of Novhorod-Siversk (*Spysky chernihovskyykh dvoryan* 1783, Chern., 1890, p. 121; also 1787, *K.Ts.A.S.A.*, f. 280, case No. 14). It is noteworthy that *Istoriya Rusov* tells of Zolotarekno" (assistant) Hetman Yakiv Tomylo ("nominated by Khmelnytsky in place of Zolotarekno"), who was routed by the Tatars on the Samara river in October 1655 and killed in battle. But part of his detachment, under Colonel Khudorbay, managed to join the main Cossack forces, which were then in Uman' (p. 129). This entire episode is an invention of the author of *Istoriya Rusov*, but it is important for the use in it of the names of two Novhorod-Siversk families.

Another grandson of Opanas Illich Tomylovsky, Ivan Stepanovych Tomylovsky, comrade-in-arms (later collegiate assessor) was mayor of Novhorod in 1767 (*Sbornyk imp. russkavo istoricheskavo obshchestva*, 144, 67; A. Lazarevsky and N. Konstantynovych, *Obozreniye rummyantsovskoy opysy*, p. 821). In 1787 he was attorney of the Novhorod-Siversk Upper Zemsky Court ("criminal cases") (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. No. 280, case No. 14).

The third grandson of Opanas Illich, Stepan Aleksandrovych Tomylovsky, collegiate assessor, was in 1787 and 1788 assessor of the Novhorod-Siversk Criminal Court Chamber (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. No. 280, case No. 14; *Viddil rukopysiv biblioteky Ukraïns'koyi Akademiï Nauk*, "Spysky dvoryan Novhorod-Siverskoho namisnytstva 1788 r."). Besides that, a relative of Opanas Illich, collegiate assessor Vasyľ Vasylovych Tomylovsky, graduate of the Kiev Academy (1742), was in 1787 counselor of the Novhorod-Siversk County Court (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. No. 280, case No. 14).

It is possible that Hryhory Tomylovsky, ensign of the Starodub regiment and resident of the village of Semionivka, belonged to that same family (1750, *Trudy chernigovskavo preduvaritelnavo komiteta*, p. 54).

<sup>88</sup> *Hladky*, were Cossacks of the village of Chulativ (near Novhorod-Siversk). Ivan Hladky was Otaman of Chulativ in 1741. His son Musiy (or Mokiy) Ivanovych Hladky is mentioned in the Rummyantsivska Reviziya (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, Rum. Op. v. 140). A Cossack of the Novhorod *sotnya*, Artem Hladky, 32 years old, went to war against Turkey in 1769 (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. Malor. Kol. Chern. vidd., 1769). A Cossack of Novhorod *sotnya*, Ulas Hladky, is mentioned in 1776 (*ibid.*, for the year 1784). In the list of nobles of Novhorod-Siversk county for 1790, mention is made of the names of Artem and Vlas Hladky, both retired buglers in the village of Chulativ, and of Syron Hladky (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, f. No. 280, unreported cases of the year 1790).

There were also some Hladkys in the 18th century among the class of petty Cossack

while very frequently these places and family names get connected with fictitious events and legendary persons; the number of such examples could easily be multiplied<sup>70</sup>).

It might briefly be added that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* was acquainted with such historical sources as, e.g. *Opisaniye o Maloi Rossii* by Hryhoriy Pokas,<sup>71</sup> the famous *Razgovor Velikorossii s Malorossiyei* by Semen Divovych, unpublished (some to this day) works of Hryhoriy Poletyka;<sup>72</sup> all these are works of Novhorod-Siverians (people from the Novhorod-Siversk governorship).

What is most important is the fact that the author of *Istoriya Rusov* not only knows Novhorod-Siversk and its vicinity well, but his interest therein is so great, and he loves it so much that

officers of the Hlukhiv region (town of Voronizh) (*Viddil rukopysiv biblioteky Ukrains'koyi Akademiyi Nauk*, "Spysok dvoryan Novhorod-Siverskoho namisnytsva 1788 r.," part 2; see H. Myloradovych, *Rodoslovnaya kniga*, I, part I, 19).

Significantly, *Istoriya Rusov* mentions "Volunteer Cavalry Colonels" Yakiv Hladky and Kindrat Khudorbay together, as allegedly active in the Siversk region (pp. 68, 74).

<sup>69</sup> On page 5 (printed edition) of *Istoriya Rusov* a "Colonel Ladym" is mentioned. Lado-myrsky was a family of nobles who made their appearance in the Novhorod-Siversk area at the beginning of the 19th century (A. Lazarevsky, *Opisaniye*, I, 250. See *Russkaya starina*, 1887, III, 598; H. Myloradovych, *Rodoslovnaya kniga chernigovskavo dvoryanstva*, I, part 1, 54-55).

The "standard-bearer Zahnybida" mentioned in *Istoriya Rusov* (in the description of the punishment of Ostryanytsya and his command) reminds us of the name of the burgo-master of Mhlyn, later "*Gradskiy golova*" (city chief), the merchant Opanas Sahnybyeda ("Sahnybyedovsky") of the 1780-ies and 1790-ies (*K. Ts. A. S. A.*, fond No. 211, case No. 236; *ibid.*, fund of Novhorod-Siversky Kom. pravl., unreported cases).

There is also probably some tie-in between the name of Captain Sokalsky mentioned in *Istoriya Rusov* (also in connection with Ostryanytsya) (p. 56), and the name of the Archimandrite of Baturyn Krupyts'ky Monastery (1775-1790) and member of the Novhorod-Siversk Spiritual Consistory, Volodymyr Sokalsky, the last Archimandrite of the Zaporozhian Sich.

<sup>70</sup> See also *Istoriya Rusov* p. 123, the name of the Starodub regiment "was changed from Seversky." In general, the name Severia, (Siveria) occurs in *Istoriya Rusov* quite frequently. Remarks contained in *Istoriya Rusov* about local Novhorod-Siversk miraculous icons of the Holy Virgin are also of great interest. E. G. *Dehtyarivs'ka* (icon), (p. 211, the village of Dehtyarivska is in Novhorod-Siversky county. Filaret, *op. cit.*, VI, 31-34), and the *Balykin* (icon), (p. 211, the village of Balykino is 16 kilometers from Pohar, *ibid.*, VII, 61-63). See *Kartiny tserkovnoi zhizni chernigovskoi eparkhii iz XI-vekovoi yeya istorii*, Kiev, 1911, pp. 114, 115, 116, and this author's "Chudo Dehtyarivs'koyi Bozhoyi Materi v 'Istoriyi Rusov'" in *Nasha kulura*, Winnipeg, 1952, No. 12 (177), pp. 25-28, and No. I (178) pp. 25-30).

<sup>71</sup> See this author's study "Hryhoriy Pokas ta yoho 'Opysaniye o Maloy Rossii' (1751)" in *Naukovy Zbirnyk UVAN u S. Sh. A.*, v. I, New York, 1952, pp. 61-73.

<sup>72</sup> More details on this subject in this author's study "Studiya nad 'Istoriyei Rusov'" (ready for publication).

he invents (or falsifies), as we have seen, various fantastic stories in honor and for the glory of this city. We can therefore assert with complete certainty that *Istoriya Rusov* was written by a person, who not only originated in Novhorod-Siversk, but also lived there, either in Novhorod-Siversk or its vicinity, probably also at the time of the composition of his work. Moreover, the first documentary information about *Istoriya Rusov* came precisely from Novhorod-Siveria.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>73</sup> I. Sbytnyev, "O proyezde Gosudarya imperatora cherez Novgorod-Seversk" (pismo k redaktoru 'Ukrainskavo zhurnala'), *Ukrainski zhurnal*, 1825, part VIII, Nos. 19 & 20, pp. 96, 97. (The letter is dated November 12, 1825); V. Maslov, *Literaturnaya deyatelnost' K. F. Ryleyeva*, Kiev, 1912, addenda, pp. 97-98. See this author's "Persha drukovana zvistka pro "Istoriyu Rusov'," *Nasha kultura*, Winnipeg, 1951, No. 2/167, pp. 28-35).

## ON SLAVIC LINGUISTIC INTERRELATIONS

### UKRAINIAN INFLUENCE ON THE POLISH LANGUAGE IN THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES

YURY ŠERECH

Dedicated to Professor D. Čiževsky on his sixtieth birthday anniversary.

[Stefan Hrabec, *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI-XVII w.*, Toruń, 1949, p. 159. Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu, Prace Wydziału filologiczno-filozoficznego III, 2.]

Since the war Polish linguistics has been working actively on a detailed study of the language of Polish writers of the 16th century, endeavoring in this way to establish premises for a strictly scientific history of the Polish literary language and at the same time bring nearer the solution of intricate problems of Polish historical dialectology. In 1949 Stanisław Rospond's voluminous book (533 pages!), *Studia nad językiem polskim XVI wieku*, devoted to the language of four precursors of M. Rej — Jan Seklucjan, S. Murzynowski, J. Sandecki-Malecki and G. Orszak — was published. Hrabec' book, discussed here, is another result of investigations in this field.

Hrabec' book is smaller in size but more complicated because of the task which the author set himself. While Rospond gives a general account of the language of the writers whom he studied, collecting material for a history of literary language and historical dialectology, Hrabec poses one definite problem and considers the language of the authors examined by him only as material for the solution of this problem. This problem is Eastern influences on the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries, primarily Ukrainian (Ukr.) influences, but also Byelorussian (BR), Russian (Rus.), Rumanian, and Turko-Tatar. The problem of studying Slavic linguistic mutual interactions is particularly difficult. Strictly speaking it can even be considered insoluble until we have more or less complete dictionaries for individual epochs, or, at

least, general historical dictionaries of the individual Slavic languages. For the 16th-17th centuries there are no such dictionaries for either the Byelorussian or the Russian language; for the Ukrainian language there is only the first volume of Tymčenko's dictionary (A-Ž in the Cyrillic alphabet). Polish must content itself with Linde, who does not satisfy modern requirements for historical dictionaries, although he does present examples of 16th-17th century writers. Under such conditions it is impossible to expect anyone to succeed in an attempt to show Slavic linguistic mutual interactions during that period and it is even difficult to blame a writer for not succeeding. Works of this type can be evaluated only in terms of their partial results, without expecting completeness and thoroughness of them.

To go on, it must be stated, however, that Hrabec' book suffers from certain shortcomings which could have been avoided even under the present-day state of the study of the history of Slavic languages. Hrabec' work is arranged as a consecutive account of "kresy (areas of the Polish state with a predominantly non-Polish population) components" in the works of eight writers: Biernat from Lublin (c. 1480-c. 1529); Mikołaj Rej (1505-1569); Stanisław Orzechowski (1513-1566); Sebastian Fabian Klonowic (1545-1602); Mikołaj Sęp Szarzyński (c. 1550-1581); Szymon Szymonowic (1558-1629); Szymon Zimorowicz (1608-1629) and Bartłomiej Zimorowicz (1597-1677). A chapter is devoted to each writer. In each chapter the material is discussed in the following order (if, of course, the designated elements are present in the language of this writer): biographical facts which favored the appearance of "kresy elements" in the writer's language; Slavic "kresy components" with phonetic traits alien to the Polish language; Slavic "kresy components" with derivative elements, foreign to Polish, particularly diminutives; translated loan words; lexical borrowings; borrowed inflections; borrowings from Church Slavic (Ch.S.), insofar as they were used in kresy; Ukrainian and Byelorussian quotations; idioms; syntactical loan translations; names of persons and localities; orientalisms; and Rumanianisms. Following this there is a general evaluation of the "kresy elements" in the language of the given writer, mainly from the point of view of whether they

perform a positive or negative stylistic function, whether they are used in a lofty or vulgar style, or are stylistically neutral.

This survey of "*kresy* components" in the language of individual authors is preceded by an introduction devoted mainly to a review of the literature upon the problem discussed and an exposition of the tasks facing the author, and the whole work ends with broad general conclusions. The author does not give statistics but, taken roughly, he examines up to 500 words which he considers were introduced into the Polish literary language in the 16th-17th centuries from *kresy* or were affected, to some degree at least, by these influences. The author suggests that "*kresy* elements" appeared first as special military or shepherds' terms, then expressions of an emotional character with a negative coloration began to spread and then the use of "*kresy* components" started for creating *couleur local* (137). Their negative function gradually was replaced by a sentimental and even positive one, not unconnected with the development of the baroque style in literature (138, 142). This influence becomes apparent in an increase in the number of "*kresy* components" in Rej's late works as compared with his earlier ones, more strongly in Klonowic's work and with full force in the genre of the peasant idyll with Ukrainian background, which was cultivated by poets of the "Red-Ruthenian" school — Szymonowic and both Zimorowicz.

From this brief exposition of the structure of Hrabec' book some of its inescapable defects are already apparent. The book abounds in repetitions; if any word is encountered in all of the writers, it is cited in each chapter. Hrabec presents no generalizations from which it would be clear whether this or that word of *kresy* origin is the innovation of a given author or was in general use in this and perhaps even in the preceding period. His book is more a list of materials for characterizing the language of eight writers than the characteristics of the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries. True, it makes it possible to obtain information easily but the entire work still remains more on the level of a collection of raw materials than of synthesized research. The author records equally in a given author, for example, the word *duma* (pride) in general use in that period, and purely individual

borrowings of the type of *ptaszyna* (bird) and individual new formations in the *kresy* spirit of the type of *prachta* (See *infra*). Of course, the reader can draw conclusions concerning the degree to which one or another word was spread by the frequency with which Hrabec returns to it, but should not the author himself have done this work of synthesizing? The Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries as a common Polish language is actually absent from Hrabec's book — he deals exclusively with the language of individual writers.

To illustrate my thought, I shall take examples from "kresy elements" of P. Skarga. In *Synod Brzeski* he writes: ". . . z innemi duchownemi, *protopopami* y popami, *archimandryty* y *humienami*."<sup>1</sup> The italicized words were taken from the Church Slavic language in its Ukrainian usage, but they are not innovations of Skarga. When speaking of these orders of the Orthodox clergy, every Pole used these and not other words. It is a completely different matter when in "O jedności" Skarga writes: ". . . nas zochidzenia Greków heretykami y *chulę* (iako Słowieńskim językiem mówia) . . . mówiącemi zową."<sup>2</sup> Here the Ch.S. *xula* (detraction) is obviously a personal innovation of Skarga, which he uses in affective speech. Hrabec very rarely draws such a distinction.

In Hrabec there are, however, more vital and dangerous defects in the very presentation of the subject. One of the most important is inaccuracy in the conception itself of "kresy elements." *Kresy* were a political concept in Poland during the 16th-17th centuries, corresponding more or less to what would now be called colonies. They were to a certain degree also a linguistic concept, insofar as the literary language was concerned — the *kresy* for a long time used the Ruthenian (Ruth.) literary language, the use of which was, by the way, guaranteed even by a Lithuanian statute. But the presence of a single literary language should not hide from researchers the fact that it was a common written language for various peoples — Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Lithuanians — but this did not exclude the existence of these languages as spoken

<sup>1</sup> *Pamiętniki polemiczkiej literatury w Zapadnoy Rusi*, 2, SPB, 1882, p. 953 (Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka, 7).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

languages. This circumstance would have played a lesser role if Hrabec had compared the facts of the language of the 16th-17th century Polish writers with the Ruthenian literary language of that time. But he never does so. He ignores this language completely and compares Polish linguistic data of the 16th-17th centuries solely with contemporary East Slavic languages, chiefly with Ukrainian. However, there never existed a single Slavic language of *kręsy* and in this sense Hrabec is comparing Polish material with something fictitious.

On the one hand, this absence of a real object for comparison leads Hrabec to a lumping together of Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and Russian facts, which is methodologically crude and lacking in historical perspective. On the other hand, it makes it possible for him to draw comparisons, which are not at all supported by the facts, and to attribute to *kręsy* and, in fact, to the Ukrainian language, words and forms which never existed in it nor anywhere else. In fact, when a Polish author uses a word which defies explanation by the facts of the Polish language, Hrabec simply states that the given word is taken from *kręsy* and leaves it at that without even trying to find a prototype of the given word. I shall illustrate this with examples.

Hrabec cites *izmiennik* from Klonowic, stating that this word is not listed in Ukrainian dictionaries; however, Linde cites it from six writers (71). Thus the word was spread rather widely in Polish. One could only assume that it entered from Ukrainian Church Slavic (since it was certainly not used in the spoken language) provided the phonetic substitution of *e* for the Ukr. *i*, since at that time in Church Slavic texts *ě* was undoubtedly pronounced as *i*. This is hardly likely, considering the strong affectiveness of the word. Thus it is more likely that it is not a "*kręsy* element" but a Russianism; yet it would be interesting to trace when and how it penetrated into the Polish language.

This is not the only Russianism among Hrabec's "*kręsy* elements." *Pytka* in B. Zimorowicz (121) is unquestionably another. Its Byelorussian and Ukrainian origin is refuted not only by the fact that this root acquired the meaning 'to torture' in Russian,<sup>3</sup> but

<sup>3</sup> Although in his *Lexis* (in the new edition of Ja. Rudnyčyj, 1946, p. 12) Lavrentij Zizanj translates Church Slavic *istjazaju—pytaju*!

also by the use of the suffix *-k* (*a*) in the sense of a process.<sup>3a</sup> This means that there is no basis for considering this word a “*kresy* element.”

The problem is more complex with the words *derewnia* (village) in Zimorowicz, 118; *dziegi* || *denhy* (in Klonowic and Zimorowicz, pp. 73 and 123); and *posuly* (in Rej, 34). All of these words are unknown in contemporary Ukrainian and Byelorussian but are common in Russian. In their phonetic aspect the first two, however, give evidence at least of Ukrainian media (hardness of the consonants before *e*, *h*; I shall not discuss here whether there existed hard consonants before *e* in medieval Muscovite speech). In modern Ukrainian dialects *derevnja* means “timber for building” and more rarely “wooden building”; it is not used at all in the literary language. The meaning “village” developed only in Russian. Sreznevskij *s.v.*<sup>4</sup> gives all of the examples from Russian texts, beginning with 1359. The only previous example from the Kievan Rus’ period, “I вѣзгоша Стефанецъ манастырѣ, i derevně, i Gerъmany” (Hyp.) enables *derevni* to be understood as “wooden buildings” as well. Tymčenko *s.v.*<sup>5</sup> repeats this phrase but all of his subsequent examples indicate the modern Ukrainian meaning. If one turns to examples from Zimorowicz, they all also permit the interpretation “a wooden building.” It is characteristic that side by side with the phrase “*a naszego Symicha kochane derewnie?*” is the phrase “*Ogień wszystkie miasta, wsi, zamki poburzy*”<sup>6</sup> where the word *wsi* is used in the meaning of “village.” Thus it is possible that in Zimorowicz *derewnie* is a Ukrainianism with the meaning “wooden buildings.” If the word really means “village,” as Hrabec maintains, then this is either a contamination of the Russian meaning and Ukrainian form (A Lvov poet would hardly have known the Russian pronunciation) or an independent development of the meaning of the word in some Ciscarpathian dialect, parallel to Russian.

<sup>3a</sup> The type *przechadzka*, *ucieczka* is represented in Polish by rare examples. See Jan Łoś, *Gramatyka polska*, Lviv, 1925, p. 76.

<sup>4</sup> I. Sreznevskij, *Materiały dla słownika drevne-russkogo jazyka*, SPB, 1893-1912.

<sup>5</sup> *Istoričnyj slovnyk ukrajinś'koho jazyka*, I, Pid red. Je. Tymčenka, Kharkov-Kiev, 1930-1932.

<sup>6</sup> *Bartłomiej Zimorowica Sielanki*, Wydał Jan Łoś, BPP71, Kraków 1916, p. 141.

*Den'ha* — undoubtedly a Russianism and it meant not “money” in general but “Moscow money.” Tymčenko (694) quotes only one example from a deed of 1500 and his translation “small copper coin” is not accurate. Apparently the word got into Polish from Russian both directly and through Ukrainian, as is evidenced by its two forms, with *g* and with *h*, as cited above.

*Posuły* is completely unknown in modern Ukrainian. In Byelorussian the stem is represented by the rare word *pasulka*.<sup>7</sup> It could have been assumed that the word entered Polish from Russian, if it had not been used in the *Krexiv Books of the Apostles*,<sup>8</sup> where it corresponds to the Ch.S. *mъzda*, Pol. *pieniędzy*. However, inasmuch as the word is rare in Ukrainian of that time, and much more frequent in Polish, one can suppose that it penetrated into the Ukrainian from Polish. Thus its path was from Russian to Polish (and Byelorussian) and from Polish into Ukrainian. Therefore, like *izmiennik* and *dzięgi* and *pyżka*, it is not at all a *kręsy* element for the Polish language. From the historico-semantic point of view it is easy to justify the borrowing of these four words by the nature of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Poland. The author's general *kręsy* approach has obscured all of these interesting historical details.

In other instances the Ukrainian or Byelorussian origin of a “*kręsy* component” should have been differentiated. For example, *bies* in Orzechowski leads us to a Byelorussian source (I do not mean to say by this that Orzechowski himself borrowed the word from Byelorussian!) The borrowing from Ukrainian would have sounded *bis* (as it is once in Zimorowicz — see p. 117) and in the event of a substitution we would expect \**bias*. However, phonetic substitutions, quite normal in parallel usage of two related languages,<sup>9</sup> are not typical of affective expressions, where

<sup>7</sup> I. Nosovič, *Slovar' belorusškogo narečija*, SPB, 1870, p. 483.

<sup>8</sup> I. Ohijenko, “Ukrajins'ka literaturna mova XVI-ho st., I, Ukrajins'kyj Krexivs'kyj apostoł,” I-II, Warsaw, 1930, p. 100.

<sup>9</sup> Compare *kałik* cited by the author, p. 74 — a direct borrowing from Ukrainian (where it is from Turkish *qalyq* — cf. A. Zajączkowski, *Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego*, Wrocław 1953, p. 56), but in Cnapius and modern Polish already *kałeka*, with a secondary *e*, as usual corresponding to a Ukrainian *i* in an open syllable not before hard dentals. On the other hand, see hyper-substitutions in Ipatij Potij, who systematically replaces *e* in the endings of the perfect *-em* by *-om*: *ustupilom* (*Pamiętniki polemickiej literatury w Zapadnoj Rusi*, 3, SPB, 1903; *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka*, 19, 1005), *vydělom* (*Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Zapadnoj Rossii*, 4, SPB, 1851, p. 82).

unusualness of phonetic form is one of the factors which strengthen the emotional tone, as already mentioned above. It is interesting to note that the form with *e*, which has become common Polish, was used by Ipatij Potij in his Ruthenian works.<sup>10</sup>

*Zubr* (20), which later assumed the form *źubr*, evidently also leads to a Byelorussian source. With regard to nouns with the suffix *-ajl(o)* of the type *szukajło*, Hrabec disputes with Łoś, who sought its origins in Byelorussian, and suggests that this suffix can also be considered Ukrainian. There is no doubt that it is also used in contemporary Ukrainian, but it seems that it is more typical of Northern Ukrainian dialects.<sup>11</sup> As a rule, Northern Ukrainian dialects here go hand-in-hand with Southern Byelorussian. This would also be in line with the fact that Hrabec did not find this suffix in "Red-Ruthenian" poets, connected with South-Western Ukrainian dialects but in Klonowic, who lived where the Polish language is contiguous to North Ukrainian dialects, in Lublin. But the complex problems of the connections and crossing of dialects, which lie at the basis of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian literary languages, is completely beyond the range of Hrabec's interests. This is all the more to be regretted because these questions were interestingly elucidated in Pol. linguistics in the works of W. Kuraszkiwicz.

Hrabec's investigations of the words *Litwiniec*, *suwałka* and *wsrokoczywy* can serve as examples of his neglect of historical sources. *Litwiniec* was noted in Rej and explained as "Byelorussian-Great Russian" on the basis of BR. *lic'vin* and Rus. *litovec*. It is difficult to imagine that Rej would have used such a corrupt form of a Byelorussian and Russian word, to say nothing of the fact that in the Russian language *litovec* was a later formation and generally not used at that time. There is no word *\*lic'vinec* in contemporary Byelorussian which, like contemporary Ukrainian, knows only *lic'vin/lytvyn*. In Ukrainian interludes of the 18th century there is a regular hero, *Lytvyn*, in Dovhalevs'kyj for example, but I am not aware of instances of the form *lytvynec'*. Meanwhile, the problem can be solved simply by an elementary

<sup>10</sup> *Pamiętniki polemiczkiej literatury*, 3, 1069.

<sup>11</sup> For BR. examples see E. Karskij, *Belorussy II*, 2, Warsaw, 1911, 23f.

morphological analysis of the word: in names of nationalities the suffix *-ec* is added to the stem, designating a geographical concept. But here it is added to a stem which designates a person. This happens when the suffix has a diminutive meaning, like *chłop—chłopic*. Hrabec himself notes a pejorative nuance in the word's meaning but this is often connoted by diminutives.<sup>12</sup> Thus the author is avenged for attributing to Byelorussian a word without a Byelorussian prototype. In fact, to all appearances *Litwiniec* is not a *kresy element* but an individual innovation of Rej.<sup>13</sup>

The question of *suwałka* (Orzechowski 54) is less clear and in this case only an hypothesis is possible. The meaning of this word is "unorganized crowd of the military." Hrabec's connecting it with the BR. *súvalaka* (tow), Nosovič 621, is so fantastic that it can not be taken seriously. The words have nothing in common either phonetically (the author accepts the loss of the consonant after *l* without proofs) or in meaning. I could sooner suggest the Ukr. *valka* (string of tchoomacarts, now generally, string of carts); this meaning of the word is rather old, since it is noted in South-Russian dialects.<sup>14</sup> The prefix *su-* is frequent in Ukrainian in the sense of "concentration, that is movement toward a single center or a state of nearness"<sup>15</sup> and was undoubtedly productive during this period. In this case the word might mean the "concentrated strings of carts," which corresponds precisely to its meaning in Orzechowski's phrase. Geographically it is also more natural to expect a Ukrainianism and not a Byelorussianism

<sup>12</sup> This, by the way, also relates to the words *pohaniec*, *bisurmaniec* (p. 141), which according to Hrabec should demonstrate "kresy" use of the suffix *-ec* in the sense of nationality. Hrabec refers to H. Ułaszyn, *Pochodzenie etniczne nazwy Ukrainiec*, Łódź 1947, but in Ułaszyn he could read that in these instances a stem designating a country or city is primary (type III in Ułaszyn; *pohaniec* from the adjective stem belongs to type I). As for the form *pohanyń*, it was attested as early as in Ukrainian-Moldavian writs, see V. Jarošenko, "Ukrajins'ka mova v moldavs'kyx hramotax XIV-XV vv.," *Zbirnyk komisiji dlja doslidžennja istoriji ukrajins'koji movy*, I, Kiev, 1931, p. 335. Cf. also Sreznjevskij, *op. cit.*, II, 1011.

<sup>13</sup> I shall not go into a study of the single *litvinec* in a Russian deed of 1529. See B. Unbegaun. *La langue russe au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, I. Paris 1935, p. 270. Concerning the suffix *-ec* in Polish see also J. Ramberg, "Dzieje przyrostków *-ec* i *-ca* w nazwach osobowych," *Prace Filologiczne*, XI (1927).

<sup>14</sup> V. Dal', *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka*, II, 1880-1882. See I, 164.

<sup>15</sup> Oleksa Synjavs'kyj, *Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Lviv, 1941, p. 140f. Examples: *suvertok*, *sukrajok*, *suprjaha*, *suzirja*.

from Orzechowski, who was a resident of Peremyśl'. Brückner's idea (provided with a question-mark) on the matter of a connection with *suwanie*<sup>16</sup> is, of course, implausible. Formations with *-alka* have connotations of instruments or localities but not that of collectivity.

As for the word *wsrokoćczywy* (32f, Rej), it is encountered once; its meaning is unclear from the context ("Pospolicie lichy bywa wsrokoćczywy"), and the idea of a corruption of the text suggests itself. Hrabec' comparison with Ukr. *rokoťaty* || *rokoťity*, Rus. *rokoť*, denoting a soft, melodious sound, has no basis and, as often happens to Hrabec, is built on a fortuitous phonetic proximity. One could rather connect it with the word *stroskaťy* (Cf., *I frasunky ne malyje mene stroskajut*, "Slovo o zburjenju pekla"<sup>17</sup>), the undistorted form of the word would then be */w/stroskoćczywy*, or with *stropotnyj*/Cf. ". . . *mnoho stropotnyx slov*" — The writ of the Kievan Metropolitan Michael, 1590<sup>18</sup>): the final *-t* of the root and *č* of the suffix must then be assimilated but it would have to be assumed that *t* had dropped out and *p* replaced graphically by *k*: */w/stropoť/czywy* > *wsrokoćczywy*. Both of these conjectures are insufficiently convincing but they at least have this advantage that they come closer to the meaning and are based on words which were used in the 16th century! In either case *wsrokoćczywy* is unclear for the time being and can not be used as material for ascertaining Ukrainian or Byelorussian influences on Polish.<sup>19</sup>

The inclusion among "kresy elements" of Rumanianisms and orientalisms assumes that all of them entered Polish through

<sup>16</sup> A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków 1927, s.v.

<sup>17</sup> Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenko 81, 1908, p. 16.

<sup>18</sup> *Akty . . . k istorii Zap. Rossii* 4, 33.

<sup>19</sup> I mention still another possibility, phonetically the simplest but with chronological difficulties. In modern Ukrainian *strokaťyj* < *srokaťyj* means "variegated": but Hrinčenko gives a marginal meaning "whimsical" from Kotljarev's'kyj. This meaning suits the text perfectly. Like the modern Polish form, the old Ukrainian does not have *t* after *s*. And in Linde (S. Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego*, Lwów 1854-1860), V, 419 we find the meaning "*unruhig im Kopfe*," with an example, however, also from the end of the 18th century (Trębiecki, 1780): "*Jeśli będzie miał w głowie trochę mniej srokaťo. . .*" If one had succeeded in discovering this meaning earlier, the mystery of the word *wsrokoćczywy* could have been solved.

Ukrainian media. There is no doubt that most orientalisms and Rumanianisms penetrated into the Polish language through Ukrainian, but to generalize this to such a degree is just as untrue as Šelud'ko's generalization was that all German elements entered Ukrainian via Polish. Rumanian elements could have penetrated into Polish directly through the Rumanian shepherds who reached Moravia, as is known. *Maczuga* (stick) (43f, from the Rumanian *maciuca*), frequent in Rej, quoted from three more writers by Linde, overgrown with many word formations and having developed a number of figurative meanings but yet unknown to me either in Ukrainian or in Byelorussian probably is of that nature.

This is particularly clear in respect to such Turko-Tatar loan-words as *korbacz* || *karbacz* and *wojłok*. *Woj/d/łok* (43, Rej) is unknown both in Ukrainian and in Byelorussian. Giving the etymology of the word, Vasmer<sup>20</sup> shows that the word was used only in Russian and Polish. If even in Pol. this is a loan-word from Rus. then in order to connect it with "*kresy*" it would be necessary to find examples of this word in Old-Byelorussian.

*Korbacz* (74, Klonowic) 'leather lash' according to Brückner, Sł. Et. 256, came into Polish from Turkish via the Hungarian *korbacs*. Hrabec criticizes Brückner and assumes Ukrainian as the medium — without any proofs. Brückner nevertheless was undoubtedly right and this is proven by the geography of the word. The word is quite widely known in Polish and from here it came into Western Ukrainian and Western Byelorussian (Dal' II, 92 gives it with the mark *zap.* but no *już.*!). The word is unknown in the Central and Eastern Ukraine and in Central Byelorussia. It is obvious that the word entered Ukrainian and Byelorussian from the west as an element of landlord-peasant relations. If it had spread from Tatar to the West then its geography would have been completely different.

In regard to *szarańcza*, Brückner *s.v.* and Kowalski<sup>21</sup> assumed that the word spread in Polish via Ukrainian and Hrabec agrees with them. However, the question is not completely clear. According to Kowalski 52, the word was verified for the first time in

<sup>20</sup> M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1950 . . . , I, 215.

<sup>21</sup> T. Kowalski, *Szarańcza, język polski* 1947, 2.

Polish in 1549; but in Mączyński's dictionary, 1564, this word has not only supplanted the old *kożytki*, but has already acquired a great deal of figurative meanings and this means that it probably had been used in the Polish language for a long time. The word apparently had a strong emotional coloration in the language, since Małecki, in the translation of the Gospel of 1551, revised it as *kożytki*.<sup>22</sup> For Ukrainian Kowalski assumes the borrowing as early as the 11th-12th centuries (for the word is attested in Codex Cumanicus) but the word has not been verified for this period. Modern Ukrainian knows *sarana*, which obviously cannot go back to the Turk. *sarynča*, *sarynža* or *saryža*. Lavrentij Zizaniij still has no knowledge of this word in his Lexis of 1596 and translates Ch.S. *pruzi* as *kożytky* (17). It is true that Krexiv Books of the Apostles 114 knows *saranča* as corresponding to the Ch.S. *prusi*, Pol. *szarańcza*, but one must not forget that this translation rests on the Polish text! The word *saranča* is attested also in *Synonima slavenorosskaja*,<sup>23</sup> where it can also be a Polonism, however. Thus it is possible that Pol. *szarańcza* and Ukr. *sarana* can be traced back to different Turko-Tatar sources and were borrowed independently. In this case the dialectal Ukr. *saranča* would itself be a borrowing from Polish. It is possible, too, that the Ukr. *sarana* is a later borrowing. Meanwhile it is better to leave this matter unresolved.

If Hrabec had not only treated modern Ukrainian data but also materials of the 16th-17th centuries, this would, in some instances, have reinforced his arguments. In others it would have compelled him to reject them no less absolutely. The words *blaho*, *blahy* (33 in Rej, 52 in Orzechowski) can be taken as an example of the first. The word was in wide use in the Pol. language of the 16th century — cf. in Górnicki “Wedle mego blahaego zdania.”<sup>24</sup> The use of the word in the same meaning “insignificant, cad” in Ukr. can be illustrated by an example from Ipatij Potij: “zaledve nakońec do jakoho prystanyšča i to blahaoho pryblukaetsja.”<sup>25</sup> But

<sup>22</sup> Rospond, *op. cit.*, 251.

<sup>23</sup> P. Žytec'kyj, *Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII vici*, L'viv, 1941, p. 183.

<sup>24</sup> Lukasz Górnicki, *Dworzanin polski*, Warszawa, s.a. (Biblioteka polska), p. 28.

<sup>25</sup> *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury*, 3, 1051.

the word continued to be used in lofty styles with a Church Slavic coloring in the sense of "kind, good," cf. in Ivan Vyšens'kyj: "Skudno bo jest' blahoe, i malo spasaemyx."<sup>26</sup> Of course, it is precisely this semantic contrast — which existed in Old Czech, as well — that imparted a special pungency to the use of the word and furthered its dissemination. The dropping of the positive meaning weakened the emotional aspect of the word and became the basis for its being gradually eliminated. The word has only a negative meaning in modern Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Polish but does not belong to the number of those which are frequently used and is fairly neutral.<sup>27</sup>

An example of the second could be Hrabec' deliberations regarding the word *popudny* (112, Zimorowicz): "Teraz wszystko pokryły popioły popudne." Citing Brückner's nearly true explanation as "brzydkie," Hrabec prefers to turn to a completely fantastic explanation with the aid of modern Rus. *popudnyj*, saying that *popioły popudne* could mean "heavy ashes." To say nothing of the absurdity of the image, how can a word with the distributive meaning of "by the pood" take the meaning "heavy"? To this must be added that at this time pood was used generally as a measure in Russia but not in the Ukraine. Yet it is not difficult to explain the word *popudnyj* with the aid of the Polish and Ukrainian language of the 16th-17th centuries. This word was completely normal in 16th-17th century Ukrainian, only with the suffix *-lyv*. Here are several examples: "I rozhněvalsja popudlyvost'ju velykoju Hospod' na Izrailja" — *Otpis* of the Ostroh cleric, 1598;<sup>28</sup> "Terplyvost', často obražánaja, v popudlyvost' zvykla sja preměnjaty" — *Apokrysys* 1597-99;<sup>29</sup> "S. popudlyvosty vsě spa porvaly, kyi pobraly" — *Ljament* of Ostroh.<sup>30</sup> The *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translates *popudlyvyj* by the Ch.S. *zělnyj*.<sup>31</sup> Finally, in *Krexiv Books of the Apostles*, 97, *popudlyvost'* corresponds to the Ch.S.

<sup>26</sup> P. Golubev. *Kievskij mitropolit Petr Mogila*, I. Kiew 1883. Appendix, p. 112.

<sup>27</sup> It is curious that Tymčenko's *Ist. slounyk* does not take note of *blah* in the negative meaning.

<sup>28</sup> *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 388.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 2, 1800.

<sup>30</sup> *ZNTŠ*, 51, 1903, 20.

<sup>31</sup> *Žytec'kyj, op. cit.*, p. 175.

*jarost'*, Pol. *popędliwość*. And here is the real key to the problem. In the 16th-17th centuries Ukr. *popudlyvost'* was a Polonism but it was absolutely no "kresy element" in Pol. Although *pudyty* is a common Slavic word, and has been verified in East Slavic territory no later than the 14th century,<sup>32</sup> but restrictedly, and it is doubtful whether it was used in Ukrainian territory.<sup>33</sup> It spread in Ukrainian and Byelorussian only in the 16th-17th centuries and evidently under Polish influence. It is easy to document its use in Polish texts of that time. Here are some examples from many possibilities: "Ujęły ich gniew i popędliwość onę ubłagały" (Górnicki 218); "Umysłu swego za popędliwością odmienić nie chcieli" (*Ibid.* 219); in Małecky — see Rospond 282. The word is also used in this sense in modern Polish.

Zimorowicz's innovation consisted only in replacing the suffix *-liv-* by *-n-*, possibly according to the requirement of the verse and possibly, also, in order to give the adjective more animation, to bring it closer to a participle. In Zimorowicz the word *popudne* means "those who arouse fury," which very well suits a text which speaks of the annihilation of the population as the result of an enemy raid. Of "kresy" nature, that is, Ukrainian, may only be the use of the *u* in the root instead of a nasal vowel, if the word is not simply taken from Old Czech *popudný*.

In general, Hrabec's book shows some knowledge of Polish literature but a complete ignorance of Ukrainian literature. In his bibliography Hrabec lists the dictionaries of Hrinčenko, Hrycak and Kysilevs'kyj, Kuzela and Rudnyc'kyj (Želexivs'kyj is not even used!) and the grammars of Simovyc', S. Smal-Stoc'kyj and Gartner, and Zahrods'kyj — all concerned with modern language and all the grammars in addition obsolete or (Zahrods'kyj) generally without any scientific orientation. Of literature on the history of the Ukrainian language only Žytec'kyj is named, but only named, since even the *Synonima slavenorosskaja*, printed, as is known, in the appendix to Žytec'kyj's book, is not used. Tym-

<sup>32</sup> Sreznevskij, *Materialy II*, 1198, 1723.

<sup>33</sup> Only with the prefix *ros-* the word is attested also in the Ukraine from the 11th century by a great number of examples, but in the wholly concrete sense "to disperse." Incidentally, I note a completely fantastic statement by J. Holub — F. Kopečný, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha, 1592 s.v. *puditi* that the word is known only in Polish and Czech!

čenko's historical dictionary of the Ukrainian language is not used at all, nor are the important glossaries in the appendices to Ohijenko's study of the Krexiv Books of the Apostles, Yarošenko's on the language of Ukrainian-Moldavian deeds, Lavrentij Zizanič's Lexis, to say nothing of Pamva Berynda's Lexicon, etc. The author is unacquainted with articles by I. Zilyn's'kyj, "Vzajemovidnosyny miž ukrajins'koju ta pol's'koju movoju," *ZNTŠ* 155, 1937, I. Šarovol's'kyj's "Rumuns'ki zapożyčennja v ukrajins'kij movi," *Zbirnyk Zaxodoznaustva*, I, Kiev 1929, D. Šelud'ko's "Rumänische Elementare im Ukrainischen," *Balkan Archiv*, 2, 1926, etc. The author undertook to study one of the most difficult subjects in the history of Slavic languages without equipping himself sufficiently. It is not surprising that this is also apparent in the results of his researches which are often erroneous and sometimes even fantastic. I shall dwell on certain of them from this point of view — in addition to what has already been analyzed.

*Duszycza* (31, Rej) — from Ukr. *dušycja*. But *dušycja* does not exist in Ukrainian, neither in modern Ukrainian nor in old Ukrainian. The diminutive of *duša* is verified only in the form *duška* (Tymčenko, *s.v.*) True, the suffix *-yc/ja/* is used in Ukrainian in a diminutive sense, cf. "Štož za požytok z toe dočasnoe slavycy," Ivan Vyšens'kyj, "Oblyčeniye dyavola myroderžca,"<sup>34</sup> cf. also in Polish in Zimorowicz, 129, *ziemica*, but Hrabec does not consider this form a Ukrainianism. But this does not mean that this suffix can be added to any word. However, one has only to glance through Gebauer<sup>35</sup> to be convinced of the pervasion of this form in old Czech. Thus *duszycza* of Rej is a Czechism and not a Ukrainianism.

*Filoret* (125, Zimorowicz) from Ukr. \**Filoret*. The author places an asterisk above this Ukrainian form, while actually there is no such Ukrainian form. Why should this name generally be considered a Ukrainianism? Because of the use of *o* after *l*? But in

<sup>34</sup> *Kievskaja starina*, 1889, 8 (Vol. XXV). In *Arxiv Jugo-zapadnoj Rossii* I, 7, p. 22 (Kiev 1887) the text reads: "Čto ž za požytok toj dočasnoj slavy," but in this publication peculiarities of the language are not rendered, and the spelling is that of modern Russian. Cf. also "tščuju slavicu" in another text by Vyšens'kyj in *Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Južnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*, II. SPB 1865, p. 233.

<sup>35</sup> Jan Gebauer, *Slovník staročeský*, I-II. Praha, 1901-13. S.v.

names of such a type, Ukrainian authors of the 16th century use *a(ja)*, for example often *Filjaret*, which Ipatij Potij sometimes turns into *Filjapsevd* in the form of a pun, sometimes into *Filjaplet*,<sup>36</sup> but never into *\*Filolet*. This, of course has nothing to do with Ukrainian, the *o* appeared here under the influence of such words, used in Polish, as *filozof*, etc.

Hrabec deduces *kušz* (119, Zimorowicz) from the Ukr. *ktivš*. Actually, in Zimorowicz *u* corresponds to modern Ukr. *i* from *o*, as the examples *hultaj* (118), *probuh* (123), *Samujlo* (126)<sup>37</sup> indicate, which together with well-known material from Gavatovyč's interludes (*buhme, vud, pyruch*, etc.) indicates that in Lvov even in the 17th century one could hear Ukrainian dialects which have *u < o* in newly-closed syllables. Thus *ktivš* must then have been pronounced *\*kuvš*. What particularly confirms the idea of Hrabec is the conformity of the Ukrainian and Polish text of the *Otpys* of Ipatij Potij to the Ostroh cleric, which was not known by Hrabec. The Ukrainian phrase "vryxle natečēt s kov<sup>b</sup>šom na brahu" has its correspondence in Polish text "wrychle nabieży s kuszem na brahu."<sup>38</sup>

Despite all this it would be wiser not to eliminate also the other explanation of the Pol. form *kušz* as derived from *kuša / kuchwa*, from which come the modern Ukr. *kuxol'* and Pol. *kušel*. This Germanism<sup>39</sup> was widely spread throughout all Ukrainian and from there entered into South Russian dialects (See Dal' II, 232). The alternation of *x: š* is quite normal in Ukrainian as it is also in Polish. Cf. *kuška* still in modern Ukrainian — a kind of wooden cup into which a whetstone is put by mowers; in Ekaterinoslav province it is a bucket in which the whetstone lies in water during the mowing (Hrinčenko, *s.v.*) This explanation is supported by the retention of *v* in the modern Ukr. *ktivš*, as well as in the form *kovš*, quoted in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* (with the translation

<sup>36</sup> *Pamjatniki pol. lit.* 3, 1115, 757.

<sup>37</sup> But Hrabec is mistaken here in adding *od kul*, where *u* has a different origin. Cf. A. Krymskij, *Ukrainskaja grammatika*, Moscow, 1907, p. 156.

<sup>38</sup> *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1115.

<sup>39</sup> D. Šelud'ko, "Nimec'ki elementy v ukrajins'kij movi," *Zbirnyk komisij . . .*, I, Kiev, 1931, 35.

*počerpaló*).<sup>40</sup> With the dropping of *v* the word would then coincide with *kiš*—*koša* which was in wide usage at that time. (Cf. in Ipatij Potij: "*A ja-m . . . na košu zostal*").<sup>41</sup> For these reasons one could make certain of the correctness of comparing *kusz* with *kivš* only if one could find either Polish spellings with *w* (*\*kuwsz*) or other examples of *w* being changed into *u* at that time. The spelling *putora*, *putrzeci*, *pułopi* in deeds of the Cracow Archive of 1588, which Z. Stieber mentions (*Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego*, Warsaw 1952, p. 77) are of a somewhat different type, since *u* here is from *ł* and, mainly, the dropping of *u* occurs there at the boundary of parts of a compound. For the time being both of the explanations are equally possible. It would be interesting to compare Rus. *kuvšyn* with this — in Lavrentij Zizanij 13 it is quoted and translated *zban*. But in this case *kuksin* from Domostroj would have to be considered a word of different origin.<sup>42</sup>

According to Hrabec *lachawica* (37, Rej) is a loan word from Ruthenian. I am unfamiliar with this form either in Ukrainian or Byelorussian. In these languages it could hardly have been the designation of a person — cf. Ukrainian words of such type as *blyskavycja* (lightning), *trjasavycja* (fever), *dychavycja* (asthma), etc.<sup>43</sup>

*Pecała* (52, Orzechowski) Hrabec interprets as a Ukrainianism — from Ukr. *pečal'* (grief) with Little Polish *mazurzenie* resulting in the substitution of *č* by *c*. It remains unexplained why the final *-l'* became hard and why the word was converted into *-a*-stems. The difficulties regarding the spread and meaning of the word are not less. In modern Ukr. the word *pečal'* is rare, relating to poetic language. Its synonyms *sum*, *smutoł*, *żurba* are normally used. Apparently in Ukrainian it is a loan word from Russian or Church Slavic. The material quoted in Sreznevskij also indicates either Church Slavic or Russian texts, but not Ukrainian. Lavrentij Zizanij cites the word as Church Slavic and gives the translation

<sup>40</sup> Žytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, 156.

<sup>41</sup> *Akty . . . Zapadnoj Rossii*, IV, 85.

<sup>42</sup> Vasmer, *Russ. Etym. Wörterbuch*, 679.

<sup>43</sup> Synjavs'kyj, *Normy*. . ., 122. This meaning is standard for Polish, too, cf. Łoś, 72f.

*outysk*, *outrapenja* (16). If we turn to the 16th-17th century texts, we find this stem but only in the meaning of "care"; cf. *peča*, *pečalovatysja*, *pečalowanie* (concerning the church) in Krexiv 87. *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translates *pečalowanie*-*popečenie*, *opasenie*; *pečalovytyj*-*popečitel'nyj*. This stem also has the same meaning in the Polish of that time, for example: "Pilnie strzegła swych rzeczy: Jam też swe miała na pieczy" (Rej):<sup>44</sup> "Natura ni o czym większej pieczy niema, jako iżby każda rzecz w istności swej zachowała" (Górnicki 205) — cf. Rospond 129, 242f, also with the *mazurzenie-piecolowanie* 321. The author took the meaning "grief" from the modern Russian language but, as we see, it is difficult to apply it to a work which appeared in 1564. But what is most important is that the abstract meaning "grief" fits Orzechowski's text very poorly. He speaks of the robber crucified together with Christ: "Ten święty łotr urodził w księstwie, to jest w niewoli djabelskiej, z której pragnął wybawionym być do swobody bożej, której nigdzie nie widział, jedno w królestwie Panu Chrystusowi poddanem, które królestwo ma kapłana olejem świętym pomazanego, i króla cierzniem, to jest z drogich kamieni koroną, pecały pełną w królestwie swem koronowanego."<sup>45</sup> It is quite difficult to imagine a crown full of grief!

Thus, Orzechowski's *pecała* probably has no relation to Ukr. *pečał*, and thereby does not come into "kresy elements." The word's origin is unclear and here one can only conjecture. Hrabec used the 1919 edition by Łoś. This edition, like the first edition, is not accessible to me. But in the 1858 edition it was printed not *pecały*, but *pecały*. If this is not a misprint then it would be tempting to compare this word with the root *peč-*, allowing that in this case *c* is in place of *č*, just as in *pecał*.<sup>46</sup>

*Pomarlica* (85, Szymonowic, 112, Zimorowicz) (cattle plague). I know the word neither in Ukrainian nor in Byelorussian, neither in the modern nor in the old language. However, the word was evidently in circulation in the vicinity of Lvov, since two authors

<sup>44</sup> *Mikołaja Reja Kupiec*, Kraków, 1924 (BPP77), p. 53.

<sup>45</sup> S. Orzechowski, *Quicunx, to jest: wzór korony polskiej na cynku wystawiony*, Kraków, 1858, p. 69.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Brückner, *Sł. Et.* 403.

use it more than once. But why is it necessary to trace it to a hypothetical Ukr. *pomerlycja*? One can with no less justification consider it as having originated in Polish; this is corroborated by the fact that Szymonowicz used it as the title of one of his *sielanki* and ordinarily we do not find Ukrainian words in his titles. It is possible that the word was known to Linde from spoken usage: at the very time when he quotes the word *pomarlica* only with one example from Szymonowicz, he himself uses this word in his explanation of the word *pomorek*.

*Prachta* (55, Orzechowski) in the expression *ni prachty* (nothing at all, not a drop). Hrabec traces the root of the word to the Ch.S. *prax*<sup>b</sup>, well-known in the usage, e.g. of Ipatij Potij, where it corresponds to Pol. *proch*; the word is explained in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* by *porox*.<sup>47</sup> However, this root can also be Czech and the very formation, with the suffix -t(a), possibly an innovation by Orzechowski, must be connected in all probability not with the Ukrainian language, which has no *\*poroxta* (Ukr. *porošyna*), but with Cz. *drobty*.<sup>48</sup> Cf. the Pol. expression *ni krzty*, and in Zimorowicz 16 *szczypta*, not noted by Hrabec.

(*w*) *przejmy* (88, Szymonowicz) Hrabec traces to a "hypothetical Ukr." *v perejmy*. This expression is not hypothetical at all in Ukrainian, it exists even now in the adverb *navperejmy* (to intercept). Nevertheless, one can not be sure of the Ukrainian nature of the Polish expression. It is closely connected with *przejmować* and belongs to a quite ordinary type of adverbs. There is too much data in Linde to suspect it of a "*kresy*" character. Incidentally, I shall note that the meaning of the expression is not "*na przemian; z przerwami*," but as above. The meaning of the word is the same in Byelorussian, (Nosovič 403).

*Przewodnia* (69, Klonowicz) (carrying across the border). There is no basis at all for comparing it with Ukr. *perevodnja* (degenerated species). In addition to its literal meaning "to transfer," *perevodyty* in the 16th century Ukrainian can mean action in general (to proceed), cf. Krex. 86. In relation to processes the suffix *-n(ja)* indicates "hasty, disorderly and not too effective, al-

<sup>47</sup> *Pamiętniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1075; Zytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

<sup>48</sup> Gebauer, *Slovník*, I, 338, *s.v. drobtek, drobnik*.

though intensive processes."<sup>49</sup> All of this scarcely fits the meaning suggested by Hrabec. The most common meaning of the suffix in Polish is local. It seems that this meaning fits perfectly both examples which Hrabec quotes from Klonowic: "Łowi żrzóbki, trzymając u Nestrzu przewodnią" and "Tym. . . , co kradną i z złodziejmi trzymają przewodnią." The meaning of the word would be "passage near the border" or "place for hiding near the border." If this is so, it is difficult to say where this word originated with this meaning — in Ukrainian or in Polish, inasmuch as the history of Ukr. *argot* has not been studied at all.

*s/z/udamno* (35, Rej) "*zgrabnie, elegancko*" is difficult to consider a Ukrainianism, since no Ukrainian parallel has been offered either by Brückner, Klich or Hrabec, who all seem to refer to Ukrainian origin only to avoid the obscurity of the word in Polish. Connection with Russ. *ssudit'* "to lend" which Brückner 525 suggests with a question mark, is not warranted either semantically, phonetically, historically, or geographically.

*wataski* (18, Biernat) (Rumanian). Hrabec' explanation that it is a contamination of the Balkan *vlast* and Ukr. *volox* has little probability, if only because it does not explain the first *a*. Vasmer's explanation 166 (and Brückner's) that it is from the German *Walach*, which is allegedly from the "Russian" *volox* is also unlikely, — a new German borrowing would not have reached Astrakhan, as pointed out by Dal' (I, 163). In addition, it developed a secondary meaning "castrated ram, ox," with the South Russian verb *valóšit'* (a beast) and subst. *valóšen'e* was derived from it. It was Chaloupecký who pointed out that the first *a* in *vlast* is due to the changes that South Slavic *vlast* obtained when passing through Hungarian media.<sup>49a</sup> It is easy to imagine the confusion of the meanings "Rumanian," "shepherd," "castrator of sheep," under conditions of the Carpathian sheep raising economy, but the spread of this meaning to the Lower Volga and Kaluga (while lacking in Byelorussia<sup>2</sup>) can not be accounted for by its Carpathian origin.

<sup>49</sup> Jury Šerech, *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Munich, 1951, p. 211. Rarely used in Polish in the sense of a process (*klótnia*), cf. Łoś, 33.

<sup>49a</sup> V. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*, Prague, 1947, p. 16f. But cf. P. Skok, *Dolazak slovena na Mediteran*, Split, 1934, p. 89.

When we turn to 16th-17th century Ukrainian, we shall see that Italy was designated by the Polonism *Vloxy*<sup>50</sup> and Rumania — *Voloxy*. The latter designation was also adopted from Ukrainian into the Russian language of that time.<sup>51</sup> Krex. 19 gives *Vloxove* (Italy) and it knows *valax* only in the meaning “castrated male” (“evnux što sja rozumeeť rėzanec’ to jest valax” —13); in the epistle of Constantine of Ostroh, 1593, we read: “Potreba i do Moskovskoho, i do Volox poslaty,” — this relates to orthodox countries.<sup>52</sup> *Synonima slavenorosskaja* 139 explains *valax*—*kaženyk*, *evnux*, *škopec*; *valašenyj*—*trebnyj*. Thus, still at that time, *volox* (Rumanian) and *valax* (castrated male) are clearly differentiated. The other meaning “castrated ram” has not been verified later than 1529.<sup>53</sup> Pol. *walach* has the same meaning in the 16th century, e.g., in Rej, *Kupiec* 110, in Orszak, see Rospond 297.

From this brief survey it is clear that in the 16th century *volox* and *valax* were different words, and if they were fused, then this was later. The adjective *walaski*, used by Biernat with the noun *cap* (ram) is probably connected more with the meaning “castrated” than “Rumanian.” If one can speak of *volox* in Polish as a Ukrainianism, one can not say this of *valax*. It is in all probability a Slavic formation from the root *val-* (*valit'*), as Dal' suggested, *ibid.*, although this was considered hitherto as a folk etymology; later on in Carpathian area this word phonetically coincided with the South Slavic *vľax* which was transformed into *valax* in Hungarian.<sup>53a</sup>

*wiaduk* || *wiaduch* (27f Rej, Orzechowski). Hrabec considers *wiaduk* as the primary form with the Ukrainian suffix *-uk*, while the form *wiaduch* is, in his opinion, a hyper-correct one, which originated from the Little Polish change of final *-x* > *-k*. However, the forms *\*wiaduk* — *veduk* are unknown either in modern or old Ukrainian and Byelorussian. What is more they are quite improbable, since the suffix *-uk* is not used in Ukrainian with verbal

<sup>50</sup> E.g., Ipatij Potij — *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1071.

<sup>51</sup> E.g., Antyryzys, *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 823; as to Russian see Unbegaun 171.

<sup>52</sup> *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.*, 4, 66.

<sup>53</sup> *Śelud'ko*, 24.

<sup>53a</sup> Cf., R. Jakobson in *Word*, 7, 2 (1951), p. 190.

stems.<sup>54</sup> On the other hand, the suffix *-ux* is possible, although rare, in Ukrainian with these stems (*spljux*, *zmerzljux*). However, the prototype of *wiaduk* || *wiaduch* was probably not a Ukrainian word of this type (I do not know such examples from 16th century texts), but the Czech *padouch* (swindler, cheat)<sup>55</sup> which figured in Rej, *Kupiec*, 215, in the form *paduch*: "Spatnieć nas ten paduch straszy." Thus *wiaduk* in Rej is rather a Czechism than a Ukrainianism. However, Hrabec, 28, is evidently correct when he finds a Ukrainian suffix in *ziemiańczuk* in Rej, although I do not know such a formation from Ukrainian texts.

*wielmi* (52, 69, 96, Orzechowski, Klonowic, Zimorowicz). Hrabec does not consider it a Ukrainianism in Polish but, referring to Brückner's opinion concerning its going out of use in the 16th century, suggests that its usage in 16th-17th century texts was supported by a Ukrainian influence. This is completely possible. But if this is so, then it is all the more interesting to turn our attention to another aspect of the question, which Hrabec has not taken note of. The crux of the matter is that *vel'my* is actually very frequently in Ukrainian of the 16th-17th century, but it is used not in the Ukrainian form but in the Polish. For Ukrainian we would expect the theoretical form *\*vil'my* with the normal development *i < e* in a newly closed syllable. And such a form has indeed been stated several times with the "new *ě*" in 14th century Ukrainian texts. We read *vě' mi* in the Pandects of Antiochus, 1307, and in deeds of 1349 and 1352.<sup>56</sup> If the form *vel'my*, known from numerous texts of Kievan Rus', appears anew in subsequent texts, then in essence it does not continue the old form directly but is a Polonism. This word is very typical of the extraordinary complexity of those mutual interactions which existed between Polish and Ukrainian.

Hrabec evolves *wierzę* (33, Rej) (indeed, in truth) from the old

<sup>54</sup> Synjavs'kyj, 128.

<sup>55</sup> Brückner, *Sł. etym.*, 390. The suffix *-uch* is frequent in Old Polish, also in such words as *wiaduch*, *paduch*; cf. Łoś, 94, where other examples are cited, as well.

<sup>56</sup> I cite the example from Pandects of Antiochus from A. Kočubinskij's review of *Očerĭk literaturnoj istorii malorusskogo narečija* by P. Žytec'kyj in *Otčet o 32 prisuždenii nagrad grafa Uvarova*, SPB 1892, p. 52. The deeds are quoted from Sreznevskij, *Materialy*, I, 240 and Tymčenko, *Ist. slovnyk*, 484. It is possible that this is the same example. Unfortunately, the edition of 14th-15th century deeds of V. Rosov is unavailable now to me and therefore I can not collate the text.

acc. /*na mą/ wiare*, which the Ukrainians, having lost the soft *r*, took as the first person singular; in conformity with this they introduced a change into the Pol. form — *wierzę*. Actually it is hardly necessary to accept Ukrainian instrumentality in this case. We find the form *wierzę* in Górnicki,<sup>57</sup> for example, not related biographically at all to the Ukraine. In addition, one can dispute whether, at that time, *r* had become hard in Ukrainian south-western dialects (its early hardening in north Ukrainian dialects is without question). Meanwhile it is easy to explain the appearance of the form *wierzę* from Polish itself. As is well known, fluctuation in *ě* reflexes after labials was observed for a long time in Polish and 'a||'e appeared simultaneously, see Rej, *Kupiec, powieasz* 44, 60 and *powiadaj*. Under these conditions the form *wierę* was normally used together with *wiare*. When the form *wiara-wiare* triumphed in the paradigm of the noun, it appeared necessary to give the form *wierę* a new meaning structurally; it was understood as the first person singular of a verb and, consequently, reshaped as *wierzę*. In Górnicki, there are the forms *wiare* (33) and *wierę* (34). The Czech influence could have been a contributing factor.

*zbroja* (weapon), 16 Biernat and others, is one of those words which etymologists like to get rid of by ascribing them to any other language but their own, since it is difficult to explain these words with the history of a single language. Bulaxovs'kyj traced Rus. *sbruja* from Polish; Hrabec assumes, on the contrary, that Pol. *zbroja* was borrowed from "Ruthenian" (Ukrainian? Byelorussian?). One can also mention that C'vjatkov<sup>58</sup> tried to trace Ukr. and BR. *zbroja* phonetically from Pol. *broń* as the result of *ń* changing to *j* before *n* in the adjective \**zbrońny* > *zbrojny* from which, they say a new subst *zbroja* was derived. It is impossible to agree with this view since, by the 16th century, *zbroja* was a very widely used and the changing *ń* > *j* occurred later; it is also not understandable why this process did not embrace all adjec-

<sup>57</sup> Górnicki, 118, 211, 319, etc.

<sup>58</sup> L. C'vjatkov, "Nekatoryja rysy inšaslavjanskaj fonëtyki w belaruskim leksyčnym matarjale," Instytut belaruskaj kul'tury, *Zapiski Adžzelu humanitarnyx navuk*, 2, Minsk 1928, p. 77.

tives with "double" *n*- for the first *n* was soft everywhere after the following *o* was dropped.

Il'inskij solved the problem, however, by providing quite convincingly that *zbroja* is related to *briti* just as *boj* is to *biti*. *briti* had as its original meaning "to cut, to strike."<sup>59</sup> Thus *zbroja* was neither a borrowing from Ukrainian to Polish nor vice versa, and the explanation is required only by *u* in Rus. *sbruja*, which actually can lead to a Polish or Ukrainian source. However the problem of *sbruja* does not belong to our subject.

The suggested concept of the origin of *zbroja* in Polish and Ukrainian is verified by the use of the word and its synonyms in both languages in the 16th-17th centuries. Ukrainian texts in this period know the synonyms *zbroja*, *oružie*, *bron'*. The word *oružie* has the most abstract character. Ipatij Potij writes: "Samy sebe oružyem svoym poražaete."<sup>60</sup> In "Slovo o zburjenju pekla" *Ljucy per* speaks to his servants, ordering them to distribute the *g o n f a l o n s*: "V rukax svoyx oružye mocno deržete."<sup>61</sup> Lavrentij Zizanij gives *oružye* as a Church Slavic word and translates it *bron'*, *zbroja*. *Zbroja* can appear in the same abstract meaning, e.g., "Oboločymsja v zbroju svētlosty,"<sup>62</sup> as well as in a completely concrete sense, e.g.: "Kozak, ne majučy ně zbroj, ně šyška, Styhaet tatar" (Verses on the burial of Sahajdačnyj).<sup>63</sup> Finally *bron'* is more rarely used, being felt, very likely, as a Polonism. The word is used only once in *Krex*. ("Vzjavšy bron' pravry," 12) but the compiler of *Synonima slavenorosskaja* considered it a Church Slavicism and gave it as a Church Slavic translation of the word *zbroja*.<sup>64</sup> The adjective is used mainly as *zbrojnyj*.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>59</sup> G. Il'inskij, "Slavjanskije ètimologii," *IORJaS* 23, 1918, p. 163. Compare in Rej: "Jerzy mieczem, koniem broi" (*Kupiec* 218). F. Stawski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków 1952 *s.v.* cites another similar example of Rej's use of *broi* in the same sense.

<sup>60</sup> *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1091.

<sup>61</sup> *ZNTŠ* 81, 1908, 29.

<sup>62</sup> Ohijenko, *Krexiv.*, p. 42.

<sup>63</sup> Xv. Titov, *Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Ukrajinі v 16-18 vv.*, Kiev 1924, p. 39. True, *oružie* is used in the same sense in the further part of this work: "Mnoho tam pobytyx i rannyx Zostalo oružiem Turčynov pohanyx." (See *Istoričeskie pesni malorusskogo naroda*, V. Antonovič i M. Dragomanov, II, 1, Kiev 1875, p. 132.)

<sup>64</sup> *Žytec'kyj*, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

<sup>65</sup> E.g. *Pamjatniki pol. lit.* 3, 187f; *ZNTŠ* 81, p. 21.

In Polish, on the contrary, the difference between *zbroja* and *broń* was apparently not stylistic but semantic. *Broń* meant "weapon," *zbroja* "armament, armor" (from which, by the way, it is easier to trace Rus. *zbrujaj*). Cf. in Górnicki: "We zbroi . . . barzo z nią (the beard) źle" (105); "Wesoła a świetna barwa tak na zbroi, jako pod tarczą przystoi" (106); "W.M. dał się czyścić tłustem namazać, a wespołek ze zbroją" (34), but ". . . umiał dobrze z każdą bronią, tak pieszo, jako i na koniu" (38). Cf. also in Rej: "Bo w swem wojsku dziwy broi, Biegając w zupełnej zbroi" (*Kupiec* 35). Cf. also material in Rospond 308, 354. In regard to *oręż*, it is less typical of the language of the epoch (but: "Oręża na rajtary dobywajcie" — Orzechowski, *Quicunx* 5).

Ukrainian examples point to the fact that Ukr. *zbroja* had the feeling of its own word, while *oružye* and *bron'* were somewhat foreign; in Polish both *zbroja* and *broń* were completely Polish. Thus the theory of the Ukrainian origin of Pol. *zbroja* crumbles.

I shall mention only two more problems. Adverbs in *-o* (*-no*?) Hrabec considers (*piłno, bujno* etc.) Ukrainianisms in Polish (83, 104). However, the matter is not so simple. On the one hand, there were Polish forms with *-o* and on the other, forms with *-e*, *-ě* were used very often in Ukrainian. Unfortunately the author did not avail himself of J. Šemlej's useful work, "Pryslivnyky na *-o, -e v ukrajins'kij movi*," *Ridna mova*, 1934, 2-5.

It is also too risky to consider as Ukrainian the diminutives with the suffix *-uchn-* (65, 94, 106). They were widespread among writers, who had no connection biographically with "*kresy*," cf. *częściuchno, niziuchny* in Górnicki 27, 30.

Having attributed to the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries many "Ukrainianisms" which actually were not Ukrainianisms, Hrabec, on the other hand, far from exhausts the real Ukrainianisms or that which could be a Ukrainianism in the language of the writers he has studied. I shall cite several words from Rej's *Kupiec*. I do not contend absolutely that they are Ukrainianisms but in any case they would be worthy of analysis:

*chobot* (221) — Ukr. *xobot*. However, it might also be a Czechism — cf. Gebauer I, 541.

*chocia* (32) — Ukr. dialectal *xotja*, literary *xoč*. If one even assumes that the root is Polish, taking as a basis episodic words with *choc-* || *chocz-* stem from 14th century texts, it is easier to explain the final vowel from Ukrainian or Czech (by a hypercorrect substitution). But the meaning of the Cz. *chotě* || *chotie* (willing) does not fit the Polish word, whereas the meaning of the Ukrainian word does.

*chuć* (19, strictly Seklucjan's text, but Rej himself also uses the word, cf. also in Orzechowski, Quicunx 3, Zimorowicz 20) — identified on phonetic grounds by Sławski, Sł. Et. 88 as either a Czechism or Ukrainianism. The extraordinary frequency of the word's use in Ukrainian 16th-17th century texts,<sup>66</sup> exceeding by far the frequency of its use in Polish and Czech texts, speaks more in favor of the second. Later on the word went out of use in Ukrainian, probably for reasons of a euphemistic order, but it was retained in Byelorussian (Nosovič 685).

*czerwony* (217) — Ukr. *červonyj*. See my statement in *Word* 8, 4, 1952, p. 340f.

*gorze* (53) — Ukr. *hore*, in the expression *na swe gorze*. Usually known as an interjection in Old Polish, while in Ukrainian and Old Czech it is used both as a substantive and an interjection. This already suggests the possibility of a certain influence, especially here in the substantive usage. But cf. Gebauer I, 462.

*lada* (59) — against the background of the Ukr. *leda*, Cz. *leda* can best be explained as a manifestation of hyper-correctness. Connection with BR. *ljada* (by virtue of *aķan'e*, when used in compounds) is hardly likely.

*łuczyć* (139), cf. *łuczny* in Zimorowicz 128, Ukr. *vlučyty* "to hit the mark."

*nieborak* (54) — Ukr. *neborak*. Brückner Sł. Et., 34, assumed that in Pol. *r* was deliberately (euphemistically) substituted for *ż* in *niebożak* (same in Old Czech). It coincides strangely with the Serb. *nebore*, where *r* < *ž* has a number of parallels in other words. The suffix *-ak* with an augmentative nuance is more widespread, it seems, in Ukrainian than in Polish: *parubčak*, *holjak*, *pyś-*

<sup>66</sup> See, e.g., *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.* 4, pp. 64, 65, 71; *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 2, 471; *Ibid.*, 3, 1029, 1103, etc.

*mak*. . . It would be tempting to attribute the word to Ukrainian-Balkan connections in the Carpathians, but the matter requires study, of course. Serbian and Czech also have other suffixes: *nebožac*, *nebožatko*.

*nielza* (31, 47 etc.) Cf. in *Apokrysys* in Old Ukr.: "Nelza . . . terplyve znosyty."<sup>67</sup> It is retained in modern Byelorussian. In Polish, it is a peculiarity of Rej's language, according to Brückner (*Sł. Et.*, 293) but certain others also have it (e.g., Górnicki, 12). In Czech, however, it is typical.

*pieszki* (224) — Ukr. *pišky*. Also in Czech.

*pogotowie* (98) — Ukr. *pohotiv*, is used also in Byelorussian, everywhere with the meaning "all the more." Also in Czech.

*potwora*, fem. (304) while in Polish, masc. — Ukr. *potwora*. For BR. *patwora* Nosovič gives the inaccurate translation "stub-born person." In Czech it is also feminine.

*przystaw* (323) — cf. *prystav* in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translated into ChS. (!) *pristavnyk*, *pestun*.<sup>68</sup>

*put(em)* (234) — can be a Ukrainianism as well as a Czechism. Brückner contends the latter in his commentary on *Kupiec*, 323.

*serce* (313) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 340.

*smucić* (316) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 331ff.

*szybalec* (142) — cf. *šybala* in *Synonima slavenorosskaja*<sup>69</sup> with the peculiar translation *prezor* "pride, scorn"?

*wesoły* (*weseli*, nom. pl. 229) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 340.

This list could be increased, but it would grow even more if other books by Rej and his contemporaries and successors were studied. Here are some examples at random from Zimorowicz: *sołowij* (3), *drobiazg* (11), *szaraj* (20), *opończa* (125), *sadowina* (13), *huczny* (25) etc. Of course, many of those named here entered the Polish language before Rej, but Hrabec also includes in his investigation e.g. *bojarzyn*, known to have been borrowed long before the 16th century. This indicates that what have been defined by Hrabec as Ukrainianisms in the language of the 16th-

<sup>67</sup> *Pam. pol. lit.*, 2, 1510.

<sup>68</sup> Żytec'kyj, 179, Brückner, *Sł. etym.*, 514, quotes parallels from non-Slavic languages.

<sup>69</sup> Żytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, 196.

17th century writers, whom he studied, are not only often classified incorrectly, but they do not at all cover all of the material.

We have now to take a look at Hrabec's evaluation of the role of Ukrainianisms. As I pointed out at the beginning, Hrabec suggests that in the 16th century the chief function of "kresy elements" was to lower the style. Here he is correct in many instances, but sometimes he groundlessly ascribes this negative shading to "kresy elements" with a purely nominative function. Thus Hrabec is correct when he analyzes the doublets *sorom* || *srom* or *Węgrzy* || *Wuhrzy* in Orzechowski 50, 51). It would be worth pointing out that the lack of differentiation between Byelorussian and Ukrainian, which Hrabec notes in the direct speech of peasants in Rej (37) and partly Klonowic (72), indicates a general scornful attitude toward "kresy" language as such. However, the seeking for indications of a low style in *bukłak* in Rej is unconvincing. True, the word is used in Rej with a degrading epithet, but by itself it had a purely nominative function, as is evident from examples quoted *s.v.* *bołłag* (39).

On the other hand, Hrabec finds positive shade of estimation in some "kresy elements" of this period, but he fails to explain this. He refers, primarily, to these words — *duma*, *bojarzyn*, *bohater*, *krynica*.

In Polish, as is known, the meaning of *duma* evolved from "idea" to "pride, arrogance." Hrabec establishes the second meaning, beginning with Szymonowic (1593-1614),<sup>70</sup> but it probably had originated somewhat earlier. It can be established at least as early as Górnicki 36: "/Anaksarch/ z Demokrytowej, preceptora swego, dumy powieiał być niezliczoną liczbę światów." In Ukrainian the meaning "arrogance" appears later and remains secondary, without ever supplanting the meaning "idea" and, finally, disappears completely. Thus, if *duma* was actually borrowed from Eastern Slavic into Polish, as Hrabec suggests (I leave this question without investigation), then the new meaning developed in Polish, was borrowed in Ukrainian from Polish but was not retained there. It is easy to ascertain this from material collected by Tym-

<sup>70</sup> Incidentally, this chronology would have excluded the possibility that the change in the meaning occurred through the expression *dumni bojar*, as Hrabec suggests.

ženko, *Ist. slovn.*, 839f. To this I add that Lavrentij Zizanij does not know *duma*, but only *pyxa* (9). Yet even when *duma* (arrogance) was used, *pyxa* was predominant.<sup>71</sup> For this reason there is no basis whatever for tracing *dumny* (proud) in Szymonowic to Ukrainian (86). But turning to the emotional nature of the word: the very development of its meaning in Polish indicates that if, at first, it had positive nature, it lost it later. But this important feature generally escapes Hrabec's attention: words borrowed from Ukrainian in Polish in the previous period, — before the 16th century — have a positive coloration. New loan words either bear a negative estimation, or have a playfully familiar character, or are limited to a nominative function.

Both *bojarzyn*, and *bohater* were borrowed earlier and this is decisive. Hrabec's considerations concerning the fact that a connection was felt between *bohater* and *bóg*, if it ever existed, are unconvincing. Generally, in relating borrowed words to one or another stylistic plane, social appraisal of the environment from which they came has much greater importance than the procedure of etymologizing. This also pertains to *krynica*. If it is a borrowing from Ukrainian (which I doubt because Ukrainian forms with *-ry- < -rb-* are of more recent origin in West Ukr. dialects, and one can assume the borrowing only if one assumes for Old Ukr. two parallel forms *krinica* and *krōnica*), it is also from an older period, and this is important, but not a comparison with the Gr. κρήνη which only a few scholars could have known.

Hrabec could not have comprehended changes in the emotional estimation of Ukrainian borrowings, since he studied them without any connection with historical processes. Rus' could command Poland's respect before the 14th century, but in the 16th, when it depended upon Poland politically and lagged far behind her culturally, it could not. Ukrainianisms appeared in the Polish language of that time, since the Ukraine was part of Poland and a great number of Ukrainians joined the ranks of the Polish *szlachta*, bringing their own habits of speech. But with this hierarchy of social and national values which was established at that time, borrowings from Ukrainian could be either neutral (nominative

<sup>71</sup> Cf., *Pam. pol. lit.*, 3, 1017; Ohijenko, *Krexiv.*, 88; *Žytec'kyj*, 180.

function, names of objects of everyday life, different from Polish) or negative in various shades and gradations. And although Hrabec does not take note of this, his material clearly indicates a difference in the evaluation of borrowings of the previous period and borrowings of the period which he studied.

From this standpoint it is necessary to review also Hrabec's opinion that, beginning with the 17th century, Ukrainianisms again obtain a positive function. This opinion confuses the historico-literary point of view with the linguistic. Hrabec takes a definite genre of Baroque literature, the pastoral-peasant idyll of the poets of the "Red Ruthenian" school, which was part of what was wittily called *höfische Dorfpoesie*. Baroque poetics actually permitted in this genre a certain number of expressions of low character, socially and stylistically, but thoroughly sifted and neutralized by means of a general lofty style and numerous mythological images and names like those in the pastorales "Aminta" by Tasso (1572) or "Pastor fido" by Guarini (1590). As a result there was supposed to appear a certain pathos, typical of this rather conventional genre, which Zimorowicz himself called "*padwany Ruskie*" (5).<sup>72</sup>

But there is absolutely no basis for transferring this transformation within a genre to the general function of the linguistic means as they were used in the literary and spoken language as a whole. It remained low, base. This was precisely the reason for the interest in using them in a definite literary genre: the cult of contrasts in baroque found its expression in such "lofty" uses of "low" means. But if these means had really become lofty, then the genre itself would have lost its charm and even the right to exist. And, indeed, if Hrabec had taken the works of 17th century Polish writers who did not write in the genre of the idyll or not only in this genre (e.g. W. Potocki) he would have found that, as a rule, their Ukrainianisms were devoid of lofty coloration and positive shading.

<sup>72</sup> Ukrainianisms and even the use of Ukrainian texts in the erotic and sentimental lyrics that K. Badecki calls (not always well-grounded) bourgeois poetry have the same characteristics. Cf. "Ruthenian" songs in his *Polska liryka mieszczańska*. Pieśni-Tańce-Padwany. Lviv, 1936 (the list on p. 480f), and in *Z badań nad literaturą mieszczańsko-ludową XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1951, p. 46.

In order to support his thesis that the role of Ukrainianisms, at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century, has been reappraised, Hrabec tries to use the opinions of contemporaries about Ruthenian and Church Slavic. Let us look at these statements. Hrabec refers to Kromer and Górnicki, who both, allegedly, maintained that the "Ruthenian language" was the oldest Slavic language. Because of this, according to Hrabec 138, "Ruthenian lost its character as a culturally lower language, as it was considered originally." The tradition, among Ukrainians, of using old Church Slavic books and some features of their language, which resembled Czech, favored this.

Alas, these assertions are based partly on accidental quotations and, partly, have no basis at all. True, there were voices in 16th century Polish literature which suggested that Ruthenian words be incorporated into the Polish standard language. But this was only a reflection in philology of the idea of a supranational (*universitas polska*, Orzechowski 43) Polish kingdom and even such a radical publicist as Szymon Budny recommended the use of Great Polish, Cracow, Mazur, Podlachie, Sandomierz and also Ruthenian words.<sup>73</sup> The very listing of Ruthenian words side by side with Polish dialecticisms indicates that the evaluation of the first was not high. The epithet which Orzechowski used in relation to himself, *hruby Rusin* (Quicunx, 38), was not, of course, original but repeated a common, current expression. As is usual in such cases, declarations about Slavic brotherhood, in Kromer or M. Bielski, for example, in the field of practical linguistic policy signified nothing more, at best, than permitting foreign Slavic words in Polish for notions not yet designated by Polish words. In fact it went no further than such curiosities as examples of a Cyrillic writing and several Ch.S. prayers with Latin letters in *Dzieje tatarskie, kozackie i tureckie* by M. Paszkowski (1615) or the words *kniha, hlawa* quoted by Orzechowski in his *Policja*. . .<sup>74</sup>

Views on linguistic policy, set forth by Górnicki, also do not leave this circle of ideas. Górnicki proceeds from a necessary concern for Polish and protests against excessive foreign borrowings,

<sup>73</sup> I. Pervol'f, *Slavjane, ix vzaimnye otnošenija i svjazi*, II, Warsaw 1888, p. 153.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 151.

although he makes no objections to the use of Czech or Latin words, if there is no corresponding Polish word or if the foreign word is generally accepted. The author's alter ego, Kryski, asserts that Polish, like other Slavic languages, is comparatively young and they all evolved from the Slavic tongue. The idea that "naród i język ruski miałyby być najstarszy" (52) is put forth only as the opinion of "certain people," but this idea is rejected immediately since, first, it can not be verified because of the remoteness in time and second, there is no need to discuss it. Putting aside this opinion *ad acta*, Kryski-Górnicki insists that, be that as it may, the first Slavic language must have been *grubym* "crude." On the contrary, Bulgarian was noted for its richness, because translations were made into it from Greek and Latin: "Tu już ten język dobrze obfitszy, niż nasz, być musi, a to stąd, iż dawniej w nim pismo, niż w naszym" (53). But by now Czech was "polerowańszy" and richer, for the Czechs lived near cultured peoples and had Latin letters. For this reason Czech is the main source of borrowings, but it is possible to prefer individual words "*ruskie, abo charwackie, abo serbskie,*" if they are more comprehensible, and one can use "i pruskie, kaszubskie słowa, z których się więc śmiejemy" (54). Thus the Ruthenian language here is only slightly higher in the hierarchy of appraisals than the openly despised Kashubian, but in the interests of Polish "Panslavism" neither the one nor the other, however, can be renounced. This characteristic is topped off by a famous phrase "ruski (language) zasię (is) surowy" (55). Kryski-Górnicki wishes to approach problems of linguistic policy calmly and purely rationally, in the spirit of the Renaissance. However, behind this is concealed the common opinion which regards the language of Rus' in a haughty manner — that same common opinion which forced Orzechowski to call himself *hruby Rusin*. And although in Orzechowski "Ruthenians" are treated as the Pole's equals (Quicunx, 74) they are equal thanks to Poland. Only this turns "niewolą w swobodę, hańbę w cześć, głupotę w mądrość, a hrubość . . . w ćwiczoną naturę polską" (Quicunx 73). These words, spoken of Lithuania (with her Rus' culture!) must be applied also to the entire Ukraine before her annexation by Poland. It is obvious that such a formulation of the question eliminates a high evaluation of the language

although, of course, it does not presuppose straightforward persecutions of the language.

Górnicki *Dworzamin polski* was published in 1566. P. Skarga's famous treatise bears the date of 1577, disclaiming not only a popular Ukrainian language but also Church Slavic, thus going further in this direction than Górnicki: "K temu wielce cię oszukali Grekowie, narodzie Ruski, iż ci, wiarę ś. podając, językać swego Greckiego nie podali. Aleć na tym Słowieńskim przestać kazali, abyś nigdy do prawego rozumienia y nauki nie przyszedł. . . Z Słowiańskiego języka nigdy żaden uczonym być nie może . . . Stąd nieumiejętność y błędy bez końca powstają, gdy ślepi ślepe wodzą."<sup>75</sup>

These ideas were so influential and widespread that when adherents of Church Slavic took up the cudgels for it, they searched for arguments in appeals to Latin. Thus, Meletij Smotryč'kyj, referring to Strykowski in the chapter "On the Prosody of Verse" in his Church Slavic grammar (1619), says: "Ovidia onaho slavnaho latinskaho poetu v sarmatskix narod zatočenyi byvša i jazyku ix soveršenstvę navykša, slavjanskym dialektom za čystoe echo krasnoe i ljubopriemnoe stixy ily věršy pysavša."<sup>76</sup>

The increasingly disdainful attitude toward Ruthenian parallels to the "elevation" of the Polish literary language, purifying it of archaisms, dialecticisms, etc., the other aspect of the same process. Thus, when in 1564 Marcin Siennik published *Lekarstwa doświadczone*, which had been written in 1501-1506, he edited the language of the book accordingly.<sup>77</sup> This process was cut short by the new wave of Latinization in the 17th century, but this does not enter into our subject.

If Hrabec had analyzed these and similar statements against the historical background of Polish-Cossack struggle, he would not have come to his conclusion concerning the revaluation of the role of Ukrainianisms at the beginning of the 17th century. Even in Zimorowicz, who very actively used Ukrainianisms, there ap-

<sup>75</sup> *Pam. pol. lit.*, 2, 485f.

<sup>76</sup> Quoted from O. Bilec'kyj. *Xrestomatija davn'oji ukrajin'skoji literatury (Doba feodalizmu)*. Kiev 1949, p. 143.

<sup>77</sup> A. Brückner, *Dzieje języka polskiego*, II, Kraków 1913, 95.

peared, under the influence of the wars led by Khmelnytsky against the Poles, such unflattering epithets concerning the Cossacks as "zbójcy domowi" (113), "nasi własni najmici, smrodliwi gnoj-kowie" (115), "nam dojadły ukraińskie muchy" (117). But even earlier, before such sharp conflicts had arisen, Zimorowicz spoke with scorn about those who remain "prostym Hrycem" (6). Of course, this attitude can not be carried over directly to appraisal of the Cossacks' language, but one can not assume that it was completely cut off in the appraisals. But Hrabec, on the whole, does not go into a historico-linguistic evaluation of data. When he leaves the historico-literary position, he turns to the biographical. However, a very large number of Ukrainianisms in Rej, Klonowic, and others are explained not by their biographical data but by the general system of the Polish language of the period. In the foregoing exposition I have deliberately used examples from Górnicki — he was not from *kręsy*, but in the main the same Ukrainianisms can be found in him as in Rej and, partly, in Orzechowski. The problem of Ukrainian elements and Ukrainian linguistic influences was the problem of all Poland and not only of her *kręsy* and this is the second reason why the use of the term *kręsy* fails in the theme elaborated by Hrabec. If Hrabec had really wished to indicate the connection between the writers' use of Ukrainianisms and their biographies, he should, first of all, have eliminated the common Ukrainianisms, used by all of them, and then spoken about original ones introduced precisely by given writers.

\* \* \*

In my review I have dwelt almost exclusively on the shortcomings in Hrabec's work. It was necessary to do this since he has come forward as a pioneer in the difficult field of the study of linguistic interrelations among Slavs and it is necessary that his successors should not repeat his mistakes. However, Hrabec's work is also somewhat useful. First, because of the very formulation of the problem; second, because of the collection of a great deal of material which, however, is lacking strict critical examination. Hrabec rightly corrected certain errors which Brückner had put into scientific circulation, for example, about the existence of

a primordial Pol. *h*, and the lack of Ukrainianisms in Rej. He collected material of value to the history of many Polish words. Important for the history of the Ukrainian language is his treatment of the poets of the "Red-Ruthenian" school. They have significance as one of the sources not written in the traditional alphabet and orthography. Their works confirm the fact that at that time in the environs of Lvov *o* in the new closed syllables was pronounced like *u* and not as *i*;<sup>78</sup> that unaccented *e*, *y* were merged, that *a* after soft consonants had already changed into *e*, etc. I shall end this review of Hrabec's book with a brief analysis of one peculiarity, which is related to Ukrainian, in the language of the poets of this school which he cites but disregards.

Both Zimorowicz have the adjective *rosiejski* (96, 113) although there is only *rosijs'kyj* in Ukrainian now. Where does the *e* before *j* come from in this case? It is impossible to see the influence of the Russian pronunciation on the Zimorowicz of Lvov. Closer analysis shows, however, analogous spellings also in Ukrainian texts of the period, e.g.: *oleksandrejskyj* side by side with *oleksandrějskaja* (Krex., 507); *Florentejskom* (Ipatij Potij, *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury*, 3, 991, cf. also 1035); *Aleksan<sup>б</sup>drejskyj*, *An<sup>б</sup>tyoxejskyj*, *Neokesarejskoho* (Ibid., 1079, 1089) — though — *Floren<sup>б</sup>cyja* (1111). The form *Florentskyj* is also used,<sup>79</sup> but not *florentijskyj*. Apparently this was an artificial pronunciation among the Ukrainian intelligentsia, which appeared partly under the influence of Ch.S. forms like *galilejskyi*, but mainly under the influence of spellings with *ě*, it subsequently being replaced by *e*. Thus, here one can see an artificial pronunciation arising under the influence of orthography — a phenomenon which is found not only in our time but also in the 16th century.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>78</sup> But this does not mean that it was so everywhere and that there was not yet a pronunciation *i*. In a literary work one could deliberately select a more archaic, but at the same time more characteristic or more traditional, rendering of peasant speech.

<sup>79</sup> *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.*, 4, 84.

<sup>80</sup> I am indebted to D. Čiževsky, R. Jakobson and W. Weintraub for the interesting discussions of some points of this article in manuscript.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Władysław Pobóg-Malinowski, *Najnowsza Historia Polityczna Polski, 1864-1945* [*The Recent Political History of Poland, 1864-1945*], Vol. I, Paris, 1953, vii + 398 pages.

Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski is the first author to undertake the ambitious project of presenting a synthesis of the recent political history of Poland, from the aftermath of the tragic Insurrection of 1863 to the end of World War II. The first volume, of the two proposed, has now appeared. It brings us to the beginning of 1919, when the reborn Polish Republic was beginning to take shape.

Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski's work is certainly one of great merit. Clear in outline, systematic in presentation, and crowded with factual information, it will be indispensable to every serious student of Polish affairs.

It is therefore the more regrettable that the book does not have the technical finish which is expected of a scholarly work. It is true that the author promises a bibliography and index at the end of the second volume, but at least the sources of the quotations cited in the text should be given.

The problem of the restoration of Polish independence is the crux of the first volume, the major portion of which is devoted to the fateful years immediately preceding and during World War I. The decades from 1846 to 1905 are treated only in a succinct sketch. Perhaps this perspective fails to do justice to the "positivist" generation of the later 19th century, whose "organic" work, unspectacular, constructive everyday efforts, helped to heal the wounds left by the disastrous insurrectionist policy of their fathers.

The hero of Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski's work is clearly Joseph Piłsudski. It is not necessary to share the author's hero-worship in order to be awed by Piłsudski's record as a revolutionary and political leader. The book conveys the impact of his personality, intrepid, shrewd, large in vision, and unconditionally devoted to his task and to his "star."

This book opens new vistas on many aspects of Polish history which are little known or half-forgotten. For instance Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski demonstrates that during the first World War the Polish problem was given international significance by the Central Powers ("The Proclamation of the Two Emperors," Nov. 5, 1916), whereas until 1917 the Entente continued to regard Poland as an internal concern of the Russian Empire.

Another interesting fact brought to light is the strongly pro-Russian attitude of the majority of the Russian Poles. It would appear that the centralistic, oppressive and humiliating, openly Russifying regime, introduced in the Congress Kingdom after 1863, achieved a moral success, while the earlier

liberal and autonomistic experiments of Alexander I and Alexander II had only led to trouble. The examples given by Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski are numerous and striking. When Nicholas II first visited Warsaw in 1897, the Polish population voluntarily (there is no evidence of governmental pressure) subscribed a gift of one million rubles, which the tsar used for the foundation of a *Russian* technological institute in Warsaw (p. 59). After the ejection of the Russians from Congress Poland by the forces of the Central Powers in the summer of 1915, the Poles did not wish, for quite a long time, to remove the signs with the names of the streets in Russian, or to interrupt the instruction of the Russian language in the schools (p. 286). Under the able leadership of Roman Dmowski, the National Democratic Party, unquestionable the strongest in Russian Poland, openly advocated a program of the unification of the Austrian and Prussian parts of Poland with Congress Poland within the framework of the Russian Empire.

The author fails to give an adequate explanation of these curious facts. One wonders whether the solution of the riddle does not lie in the significant economic advantages which the relatively highly industrialized Congress Kingdom derived from the large Russian markets. But at least Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski offers, probably without being aware of it, a key to the understanding of Piłsudski's later development. It is well known that as the dictator of Poland Piłsudski demonstrated a unique contempt for his compatriots, which was the delight of foreign correspondents and a mortification to Polish patriots. In all probability this attitude was conditioned by the years of bitter struggle in which Piłsudski felt himself isolated, except for a small band of followers devoted to his personal *charisma*, misunderstood, and often slandered and humiliated by his fellow countrymen. In a letter of 1908, explaining the "expropriations" of his organization, Piłsudski wrote: "I prefer to take money in combat than to beg it from our society, which cowardice has turned into an infant (p. 192)."

Finally let us correct one mistake which Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski makes in treating Ukrainian matters. He states (pp. 360-62) that the Ukrainian *coup* in Eastern (i.e. ethnically, predominantly Ukrainian) Galicia on November 1, 1918, was prepared with the connivance of the Austrian authorities. The reiterated claim that the Austrians supported the emergence of Ukrainian statehood in Eastern Galicia was widely used by Polish propagandists abroad during the Polish-Ukrainian war and at the Paris Peace Conference, and did the Ukrainian cause a great disservice in the eyes of the West, although it lacked any foundation in fact. It seems that this false statement, circulated for propaganda purposes, has found its way into serious Polish literature, and, having been passed from one author to another, has reached Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski as a commonplace.

Looking forward to the publication of the second volume of Mr. Pobóg-Malinowski's work, we hope that it will maintain the high standard established by the first.

The author's task will be rather more delicate since his subject will be not the heroic period of the struggle for independence, but the period of independence itself, not the promise but the fulfillment, including its disappointing features.

Ivan L. Rudnytsky

Michael T. Florinsky, *Russia: a History and an Interpretation*. In two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953, 1511 pp.

Professor Florinsky, who is perhaps best known for his study *The End of the Russian Empire*, has now, after several years of careful research, brought forth a most comprehensive history of Russia. The author's task is an ambitious one — to trace the development of the Russian state from its origins in the 8th century Slavs and the Kievan principality through the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks in 1917-1918, devoting attention not only to political, but to economic, social, and cultural developments as well. Especially noteworthy is the author's treatment of Russia's foreign relations and policies, especially in the late 18th and the 19th centuries. His periodization of Russian history follows the familiar pattern of the Kievan state, the rise of Muscovy, and the St. Petersburg period. A fourth section, dealing with "The Second Moscow" (Soviet) period was postponed. Within each of these major period divisions, the material is presented in connection with each of the several important reigns of the Tsars, a scheme which reflects the importance which the author attaches to the personalities of the Tsars in determining the course of Russia's history. Of great value are the brief historiographical discussions concerning several of the moot problems in Russian history which the author inserts at the appropriate moments in his study.

Those who have read extensively in Russian history will welcome Professor Florinsky's inclusion of some of the recent monographic studies and interpretations from the juridical and sociological schools of Russian historical writing. Thus, in his treatment of the consolidation of the Muscovite state, Prof. Florinsky relies upon the studies of Kliuchevsky, Platonov, and Presniakov, while in discussing the condition of the peasantry in this period, he shows his reliance upon D'iakonov and Sergeevich. Prof. Florinsky finds that Ivan IV did not, by himself, destroy the power of the feudal nobility, but rather he completed this process which had been begun by Ivan III and Basil III. He also sees the enservment of the peasantry beginning in the 15th and 16th centuries, with the revocation of their right to transfer their service and their growing indebtedness, rather than with the publication of the Code of 1649. The reign of Peter I is put into its proper perspective, his

individual policies being judged on the basis of need and alternatives rather than from any current political considerations. Likewise, much of the "enlightenment" in the reigns of Catherine II and Alexander I is reduced to its proper proportions.

In some instances, however, the author has failed to treat adequately certain basic problems. Thus, for example, there is no explanation for the disintegration of the monarchist circles from the eve of the 1917 revolutions until the Kornilov episode and the organization of the Volunteer Army. In this respect, it is difficult to agree with Prof. Florinsky that the liberals and the socialists are chiefly to blame for the successes of the Bolsheviks since they failed to correctly gauge the temper of the soldier and the peasant. For he fails to point out that the monarchists, when they finally were able to assert themselves, refused to admit that a revolution had taken place, and instead, sought refuge behind men on white horses.

Much to be regretted is the author's all too cursory treatment of the problem of the non-Russian peoples in the Russian Empire. Though some attention is given to the relations between Russia on the one hand, and Poland and Finland on the other, little is said of the status of the Jews and Ukrainians, and next to nothing is said of the situation of the Trans-Caucasian, Central Asian, and Volga-Ural peoples. Even the few statements regarding the Jews and Ukrainians must be questioned. Thus, the author fails to see the social and political implications of the anti-Jewish pogroms of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, reducing these outbursts solely to religious differences. In treating the growth of Ukrainian national consciousness, he refuses to recognize the influence which this movement had upon the large sections of the peasantry, although he does point out in another context that by 1912, twelve Ukrainian periodicals were being published and that in 1917 the Provisional Government found it expedient to organize a Ukrainian, as one of several, national units. It is also, therefore, difficult to accept Prof. Florinsky's contention that "the resurgence of Ukrainian nationalism took the Russians by surprise." The author feels that since many Russians never regarded (or perhaps refused to regard) the Ukrainians and their language as a separate entity, that the latter was merely an "artificial" creation, a judgment which is best refuted by his own allusion to the organization of the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius in Kiev, the Russification policies of the government in the Ukraine, and the growing national movement in spite of these policies. Nor is the author justified in questioning the origin of the Central Rada, especially when the social unrest and political disorganization of the period, the rather nebulous origins of the soviets and the quasi-representative character of the Provisional Government are recalled. Finally, a more detailed account of the relations between the White generals and the Central Rada would undoubtedly have shown that the former, in refusing to recognize the revolution which was then taking place, were as

reprehensible as the other anti-Bolshevik forces in their failure to achieve a united front.

In spite of these few shortcomings, Prof. Florinsky has presented a very readable and informative history of Russia which will be of great value to all those students and specialists concerned with Russian and general world affairs.

Michael Luther

## OBITUARIES

### VALENTYNA RADZIMOVSKY

Professor Valentyna Vasylivna Radzimovsky, a full member of the Academy, died on December 22, 1953 in Champaign, Illinois, after a long illness. She was a prominent specialist in physiological and biological chemistry, a brilliant scholar with a creative imagination, initiative, and an enormous efficiency. Valentyna Radzimovsky left over 60 publications in Ukrainian, Russian, and German.

V. Radzimovsky was born on October 1, 1886 at Lubny, Poltava government in the family of a nobleman and landowner, Vasyl Yanovsky. Her mother was a popular Ukrainian author, Lubov Yanovska. V. Radzimovsky studied medicine in the University of St. Vladimir of Kiev and in the University of Petersburg. While studying, V. Radzimovsky manifested a keen interest in physiological chemistry and worked at the university laboratory. In 1913, after graduating from St. Vladimir University, she got a position as an assistant in the department of physiological chemistry of this university. In 1920 the young scholar became the head of the Department of Physiology in Kiev University. This position was rather unusual for women in that time and V. Radzimovsky got this position because of her remarkable abilities. In 1924 she got a degree of Doctor of Medical and Physiological Sciences for her dissertation "The Influence of H<sup>+</sup> Iones on the Life of Tissue Cells of Vertebrata." Her scientific interests were diverse and wide. Her purposefulness and initiative attracted younger scholars and soon "Radzimovsky's School in Physiology" was formed in Kiev and became widely known not only in the Ukraine, but far beyond its boundaries. Unfortunately, her scientific and teaching activities were suddenly interrupted in 1929 by her arrest by the GPU (State Political Administration). She was imprisoned for one year, then released with a label of a "politically unreliable person." Then V. Radzimovsky had trouble in finding occupation and was forced rather often to change her place of work. A few times she was dismissed without any reasons. These annoyances, however, did not prevent her from working on further discoveries and investigations. Compelled to change her field of research, Radzimovsky worked on the problems of tuberculosis, psycho-neurology, physiological chemistry, and physiology. She published numerous papers on her findings.

After World War II, V. Radzimovsky took an active part in the work of the Ukrainian scientific institutions in exile. She was one of the founders of the International UNRRA University in Munich. In 1945 she was elected a full professor of physiology of this university. She was also elected a professor of the Ukrainian Technical Husbandry Institute (Munich and Regensburg) and taught physiology in the veterinary and pharmacy departments.

In 1950 V. Radzimovsky came to the U.S. and participated in the activities of the Academy, the Shevchenko Scientific Society, and the American Ukrainian Medical Society.

The brilliant works of the late Valentyna Radzimovsky richly contributed to the development of physiological chemistry.

## YURIY TYSHCHENKO

Yuriy Pylypovych Tyshchenko, a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., died on November 28, 1953 in New York. A prominent specialist in the field of Ukrainian bibliography and one of the leaders of the Bibliography Section of the Academy, he devoted all his life to writing, publishing, and distribution of Ukrainian books.

Yuriy Tyshchenko was born on April 22, 1880 near Berdyansk, South Ukraine. After graduating from the Teachers' Seminary, he taught in a grammar school at Dolhinzevo, which is near Kryvy Rih. And, at the same time, he participated in revolutionary activities, having joined the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party. In 1907 he was arrested and tried; he fled from the court's jurisdiction and crossed the boundary into the Western Ukraine, which was part of Austro-Hungary. Contacting Professor M. Hrushevs'ky in Lviv, he journeyed to Kiev illegally and started his activity as an editor and journalist. This was upon the advice of Professor Hrushevs'ky. He worked for the editorial board of the *Literaturno-naukovy visnyk* and then he started the first popular Ukrainian newspaper *Selo*. Tyshchenko also founded many Ukrainian bookstores throughout the Ukraine.

During the period of the Ukrainian People's Republic, Tyshchenko was busy organizing the publishing business in the newly formed state. He was very interested in the preparation of textbooks for the Ukrainian schools. After the occupation of the Ukraine by the Communists, Tyshchenko lived in Vienna and Czechoslovakia and continued his publishing activities. After World War II he settled in Western Germany and here published Ukrainian textbooks. Tyshchenko came to this country in 1950 and co-operated with the Academy until his death.

Yu. Tyshchenko was the author of many books and articles. The latter were published in the Ukrainian press during the last fifty years. He also left valuable memoirs on Ukrainian cultural life around the beginning of the century. The thousands of books published by Tyshchenko have influenced generations of Ukrainians and have immortalized him in the history of Ukrainian culture.

## NYKYFOR HRYHORIEV

Nykyfor Yakovych Hryhoriev, a prominent Ukrainian politician in exile, died in August 1953 in New York. He was born in February 1883 in the town of Burty in the Ukraine.

While only a youth he took an active part in the Ukrainian liberation movement and, after the Revolution of 1917, he became a member of the first Ukrainian parliament, the Central Rada. Hryhoriev was appointed the Secretary of Education after the independence of the Ukrainian National Republic was proclaimed. In 1919 he was elected a member of the Ukrainian Congress of Toilers. After the occupation of the Ukraine by the Red Army in 1920, he was forced to emigrate and, finally, settled in Prague. N. Hryhoriev was acquainted with President T. G. Masaryk, Doctors Benes and Girsá and with their assistance he helped organize the Ukrainian Emigrant Committee, the Ukrainian Husbandry Academy, the Ukrainian Pedagogical Institute, and the Ukrainian Sociological Institute. While working for the latter institute, he studied the nationalities problem and published several works on this question. He also participated in the editing of the political magazines *Nova Ukraïna* and *Trudova Ukraïna* in Prague.

Before the German invasion of Czechoslovakia, N. Hryhoriev emigrated to the U.S.A. and worked for the Ukrainian newspaper *Narodna volya*, published in Scranton. He also lectured in the Ukrainian centers of the United States and Canada. In 1945 he published *The War and Ukrainian Democracy: a compilation of documents from the past and the present*, Toronto.

N. Hryhoriev was the Chief of the Ukrainian unit of the Voice of America since its inception in December 1949.

N. Hryhoriev co-operated with the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. very closely.

## IVAN DUBYNETZ

Ivan Varfolomiyovych Dubynetz, a member of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., died on January 30, 1954 in New York. An experienced geologist-researcher, he was also an active participant in Ukrainian political and cultural life.

Ivan Dubynetz, a representative of the new generation of Ukrainian intelligentsia which had its roots in the village and which was brought to life by the Ukrainian national revolution of 1917, was born in April 1903 in a peasant's family in the village of Medvyn. When only sixteen years of age, he took an active part in the anti-communist revolt in the village of Medvyn and was later imprisoned for this.

Ivan Dubynetz graduated in 1930 from the University of Kiev and started

his work as a field geologist for the Ukrainian Geological Trust. Working in many regions of the Ukraine, he was able to publish several papers on his findings. He also wrote a book on the graphite deposits of the Ukraine. He lectured on geology and mineralogy at the higher educational institutions of Kiev.

After World War II, Ivan Dubynetz was an active participant in the political and cultural life of the Ukrainian emigration in Western Europe and, later, in America. He was one of the founders of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Democratic Party and of the Democratic Association of Ukrainians who had been oppressed by the Soviets. During the last few years he was busy collecting materials on the Ukrainian famine of 1933. Last December he delivered a report to a conference of the Academy on certain aspects of this work.

Ivan Dubynetz was a very active man and his untimely death is a great loss to Ukrainian culture.

## CHRONICLE

All plenary sessions were held under the chairmanship of Professor Michael Vetukhiv, President of the Academy. No conferences were held during the summer vacation from July 1 to September 1st.

During the period from September 1, to December 31, 1953 the following lectures were delivered before the plenary session of the Academy:

- 19 October 1953 —Lecture at the Ukrainian Club of Literature and Arts by Professor M. Vetukhiv: *7th International Congress of Genetics in Italy and Impressions of Europe.*
- 7 November 1953 —Lecture by Professor L. Chikalenko: *An Important Psychological Moment in the Activities of Primitive Artists* (vivification).
- 14 November 1953 Grand Conference in Honor of the 35th Anniversary of the foundation of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, November 14, 1918.  
—Professor M. Vetukhiv: *On the 35th Anniversary of the Foundation of the Ukrainian Academy in Kiev.*  
—Professor O. Ohloblyn: *The Development of Industry in the Right-Bank Ukraine in the 18th Century.*
- 5 December 1953 —Lecture by Professor M. Vetukhiv: *New Theories in Genetics.*
- 26-28 Dec. 1953 Conference commemorating the 35th anniversary of the founding in Kiev of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the 80th anniversary of the founding in Lviv of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.  
The president of the conference were: Prof. A. Yakovliv, Prof. M. Vetukhiv, Prof. R. Smal-Stocki. Prof. Ph. Moseley was a honorary member of the presidium.  
—Prof. M. Vetukhiv spoke in Ukrainian and English on *The 35th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences.*  
The members of our Academy held at this conference 38 lectures in the field of history, philology, archeology, arts, mathematics, physics, chemistry, mineralogy, geology, economics, social sciences, law.  
The plenary sessions and meetings of sections were held at Columbia University.

The following Lectures and Seminars were held under the auspices of the Sections and Commissions of the Academy:

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION:

- 27 September 1953 —Ivan Sweet: *Ukrainian Press in Asia*.  
 28 November 1953 —A. Trachuk: *Press in the Reichskommissariat Ukraine*.

THE COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY  
OF THE UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION IN THE U.S.

- 23 October 1953 —Dr. S. Demydchuk: *Early Stage of the History of the Ukrainian Fraternal Organizations in the U.S.A.*  
 31 October 1953 —E. Pyziur: *Soviet Nationalities' Policy after Stalin's Death*.  
 7 November 1953 —B. Podolyak: *The Last Stage of Yezhov's Terror in the Ukraine*.  
 21 November 1953 —Prof. G. Lucky (Toronto University): *New Material for Studies in Ukrainian Literature*.  
 12 December 1953 Grand Conference at the Ukrainian Club of Literature and Arts, devoted to the theme: "Famine in the Ukraine in 1932-33."  
 —I. Dubynetz: *Struggle in the Ukraine Against the Kolkhoz System*.  
 —M. Rudnycka: *International Response on the Famine in the Ukraine*.

## BIOLOGICAL SECTION:

- 18 October 1953 —Prof. N. Efremov: *Between Cosmos and Earth*.  
 14 November 1953 —In Detroit, Prof. I. Rozhin: *Academician O. Bohomolets*.  
 —Prof. F. Ukradyha: *A New Theory of Kladney's Function*, (read by Dr. I. Volynets).  
 21 November 1953 —In New York, Prof. V. Horodetzky: *The Laws of Efficiency of Factors of the Development of Agricultural Plants*.  
 22 November 1953 —In New York, Prof. I. Hryhoranko: *Ice Formations in the Lakes of Ukraine*.

- 28 November 1953 —In Detroit, Prof. I. Rozhin: *The 35th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Academy.*  
 —Prof. M. Ovchynnyk: *Bones and Scale of Coregonus clupeaformis as Factors for Definition of age of fishes.*
- 19 December 1953 —In New York, N. Ossadcha-Janata: *Herbs and their Application in the Folk Medicine in the Ukraine.*

## FINE ARTS GROUP:

- 25 October 1953 Conference in honor of composer Nestor Nyzhankivsky. —Ihor Sonevytzky: *N. Nyzhankivsky Against the Background of West Ukrainian Music.*  
 Pianist Dariya Karanovych played works of the composer. Chairman: Prof. D. Horniatkevych.  
 The relatives of the late composer Z. Nyzhankivsky brought in a motion to collect the musical heritage of the composer. The Museum and Library continued its work.

## A NOTE ON transliteration

The following simplified system is used in the transliteration of Ukrainian:

а	—	a	н	—	n
б	—	b	о	—	o
в	—	v	п	—	p
г	—	h	р	—	r
ґ	—	g	с	—	s
д	—	d	т	—	t
е	—	e	у	—	u
є	—	ye	ф	—	f
ж	—	zh	х	—	kh
з	—	z	ц	—	ts
и	—	y	ч	—	ch
і	—	i	ш	—	sh
ї	—	yi	щ	—	shch
н	—	y	ю	—	yu
к	—	k	я	—	ya
л	—	l	ь	—	'
м	—	m			

The spelling of proper names, place names, and special terms generally accepted in English usage will retain that accepted form (e.g. Kiev, Kharkiv, Dnieper, chernozem). Russian and Polish proper names will retain their respective forms (e.g. Trubeckoj, Zaleski), but Ukrainian proper names and place names will keep their Ukrainian form even if occurring in Russian or Polish sources (e.g. Bila Cerkva, not Biala Cerkiew).

In articles on comparative philology the "international" transliteration (see *Annals*, Vol. I, No. 2, 1951, p. 188) will continue to be used.

## CONTRIBUTORS

Vyacheslav Lypynsky, famous Ukrainian historian, advocate of the State Theory, which is well-known in history and political science; died in 1931.

Andriy Yakovliv, former rector of the Ukrainian Free University in Prague; one of the leading historians of Ukrainian law; now in this country.

Olexander Ohloblyn, historian, former professor at Kiev University and the Ukrainian Free University in Munich; now in this country.

Yury Šerech, philologist, literary historian and critic; at present on the staff of the Slavic Department, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Ivan L. Rudnytsky, graduate of the Institute of International Affairs in Geneva; now on the staff of the University of Wisconsin.

Michael Luther, at present a student in the Russian Institute, Columbia University, New York City.



