



Historia Slavorum Occidentis
2024, R. 14, nr 2 (41)
ISSN 2084-1213
DOI: 10.15804/hso240207

SVITLANA ZYMNITSKA* (DNIPRO)

The image of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in Ukrainian historiography

Abstract: The image of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in Ukrainian historiography has followed the changes in history as an academic discipline. At the time when the Cossack myth was created, historians' romantic views of the Cossack past resulted in an image of the prince as a noble knight, the Cossack father-hetman, and the founder of the first Zaporozhian Sich. Once positivism made its way to historiography, the activities of the prince were subjected to a more critical analysis, and historians began to question his role of the founder of the first Sich. However, it was not denied that the fortress built by the prince could have served as a prototype for the Cossack Sich. During the Soviet era, three currents in Ukrainian historiography emerged: Soviet, Galician from the Interwar period, and foreign. An ideological confrontation took place between Soviet and foreign historiography, in relation to the assessment of the prince's activities and the view of the Cossacks. In the 1990s, censorship was lifted and Ukrainian historians gained access to archives. This resulted in a large number of works on the Cossacks. Again, just like 70 years before, there was a need for the emergence of national awareness (based on the Cossack myth), so in addition to purely academic investigations with a critical attitude towards the work of the predecessors and the involvement of new source material, amateur researchers produced a number of works. By the mid-1990s, the prince had been somewhat idealized in Ukrainian history which stemmed from a search for heroic figures among representatives of the Ukrainian elite in the young Ukrainian state. Since the early 2000s, Ukrainian researchers have been trying to assess Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's activities in a pan-European context, relying on newly available sources, particularly abroad.

* ORCID 0000-0001-7558-9778, dr, Dnipro University of Technology, Institute of Human and Social Sciences, Dmytra Yavornytskogo ave. 19, 49600 Dnipro, e-mail: zymnytska.s.p@nmu.one.

Artykuł nadesłany: 6 III 2023; nadesłany po poprawkach: 9 VII 2023; zaakceptowany: 20 XI 2023.

Keywords: Dmytro Vyshnevetsky; Khortytsia fortress; Moldavian campaign

Słowa kluczowe: Dymitr Wiśniowiecki; twierdza Chortycka; kampania mołdawska

1. Preliminary Remarks

Dmytro „Baida” Vyshnevetsky was undoubtedly one of the most interesting figures of the mid-16th century. He has always attracted the attention of historians and has passed into legend. The activity of the prince is well studied in historiography. While researchers have presented Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as an extraordinary and brave personality, his image in academic and popular literature in the last two centuries has been very different: a magnate-adventurer, a heroic leader of the Cossacks, the first hetman and the founder of the Zaporozhian Sich on Khortytsia, a fearless knight, etc. However, if some Ukrainian historians have seen him as an independent actor, others emphasized the fact that the prince was a subject of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and acted in accordance with its interests, although he often performed daring deeds.

When studying Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's life and activities, several stages can be distinguished. **At the first stage** (the first half of the 19th c.), the prince's activities were analyzed by scientists with a romantic bias. Ukrainian historiography was under a strong influence of „History of the Rus' People”. Historians would pay special attention to the heroic chapters in the nation's history, in particular the Cossack campaigns against the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate. According to Volodymyr Kravchenko, a Ukrainian historian and researcher of historiography, the Cossacks have undergone a noticeable idealization in romantic historiography. The main criterion in historical assessment was not as much loyalty to the nobility duty to the monarch but the memory to be preserved for posterity¹.

The second stage (the last quarter of the 19th c. – the first 30 years of the 20th c.) is characterized by works with attempts at a critical evaluation of the prince's achievements. With the spread of positivist historical methodology, historians tried to adhere to scientific principles in historiography and eliminate legendary elements. At this time, the first synthetic works were written, creating a coherent image of

¹ V. Kravčenko, *Narisi z ukraïns'koï ïstoriografii epohi nacional'nogo Vidrodžennâ (druga polovina XVIII–seredina XIX st.)*, Harkiv 1996, p. 202.

the Ukrainian past. The centre of academic and publishing activity moved from Dnieper Ukraine to Galicia which offered more favorable conditions for historians. V. Antonovych and M. Hrushevsky were among the brightest representatives of the populist („narodnytskyi”) direction in Ukrainian historiography. Its representatives understood the „people” as the broad masses of the people and sympathized with popular movements. The focus of historians’ attention shifted from the ruling elites, the state apparatus, to the struggle (in particular faced by the Cossacks) for social justice. In the first quarter of the 20th century, an alternative historiographic direction emerged. It was referred to as „statist” („derzhavnytskyi”), its founder being considered Viacheslav Lypynsky, a historian and political scientist. At the Centre of attention of statist historians was the state and its elites as the basis for the development of human communities. The historians attributed a great role in creating the nation history to prominent personalities. The ideas of the statist school in Ukrainian historiography have become widespread among emigrant and diasporic Ukrainian historians.

At the time of the Ukrainization policy in the Soviet Union, the activities of M. Hrushevsky, D. Bahalii, D. Yavornytsky, M. Slabchenko and others were of great importance to Ukrainian historiography. However, since the late 1920s, Ukrainian historians worked in extremely unfavorable conditions of the Bolshevik regime.

At the third stage (the 1930s–1990s), there was a distinction between studies in Ukrainian Soviet historiography and Ukrainian historiography abroad. There was an ideological confrontation between these two currents throughout the period. Ukrainian historians in the UkSSR did not have an opportunity to freely engage in academic research and played the role of advocates of the „ideological front”. While the study of the Cossack’ history did not stop completely, it could only take place in the context of the age-old desire for „reunification with the Russian people” and the class struggle against the „exploiters”. The academic work of the Ukrainian historians in Galicia in the Interwar period should be highlighted on a separate occasion. Their main center was the historical and philosophical department of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, headed by Ivan Krypyakevych. Some of the members of the department were engaged in researching the Cossacks and the Cossack Hetmanate history.

After WWII, Ukrainian historiography could develop freely only abroad, despite the fact that historians did not have access to primary sources located in the USSR and Poland. However, as the Ukrainian historian and archivist Oleksander Ohloblyn noted, „only émigré science could freely use foreign historiographical and documen-

tary materials, which until then remained little or completely unknown to Ukrainian historiography, and established contacts with Western European and world science, which was of inestimable importance for the future”².

The modern stage is characterized by a great variety of works dedicated to Dmytro Vyshnevetsky. Researchers have access to new sources and apply new approaches and methods to study the prince’s life and deeds. Along with academic works, popular science publications appear, which often idealize this historical figure. In the early 1990s, when control over the activities of researchers was relinquished, a majority of the former Soviet historians moved away from the Soviet methodology of historical research. Ukrainian scholars often identified the Cossacks as European knights and a leading state-forming force. Vitaly Yaremchuk, a contemporary Ukrainian researcher of the historiography, has singled out 2 currents in modern Ukrainian history: 1) former Ukrainian Soviet historians who retrained as national historians; 2) historians who wrote from national positions, and since the 1990s have been conventionally divided into „official” (research considering the opinion of the current government) and „national democrats” (promoting the Ukrainian vision of the past regardless of changes in the ideological climate)³. The new concept of the history of Ukraine included the ideas of Ukrainian classical and foreign historiography. The Ukrainian historical studies of the 21st c. include a revision of the emphasis placed in the research into the Cossacks. A number of researchers are trying to show that throughout their history, Ukrainians not only fought and struggled for their existence. An unbiased view of various aspects of the Cossack history in general, and the activities of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in particular, is presented in „The History of the Ukrainian Cossacks”⁴.

Since the work is historiographic in nature, the sources for this article are the published works of Ukrainian researchers from the 19th–21st centuries.

Given the wide array of sources and literature devoted to Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, as well as the limited scope of the article, I will consider only the most significant episodes of the prince’s life, in particular the construction of a fortress on Khortytsia island, participation in the struggle for the Moldavian throne, and his significance in Ukrainian history.

² O. Ogloblin, *Ukraïns’ka istoriografiâ. 1917–1956*, Kïiv 2003, p. 94.

³ V. Âremčuk, *Ukraïns’ka istoriografiâ: suspil’no-politična istoriâ: posibnik*, Ostrog 2017, pp. 249–250.

⁴ *Îstoriâ ukraïns’kogo kozactva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kïiv 2006, vol. 1, p. 800; vol. 2, p. 724.

Research into Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's life and work began in the mid-19th c. with the works by famous Ukrainian historians: V. Antonovych, M. Drahomanov, and others. In the early 20th c., M. Hrushevsky and M. Vasylenko made a significant contribution to the study of the issue. Their works were riddled with critical analyses of the work of their predecessors. Historiographic investigations of the 1930s–90s, represented by two currents: Ukrainian Soviet historians (in particular, V. Holobutsky and M. Kytsenko who were rather biased in their assessments of the pre-revolutionary works) and the works of the Ukrainian historians living abroad (D. Doroshenko, N. Polonska-Vasylenko, L. Vynar), offering thorough historiographical analyses.

The 1990s saw a revision of the study of the life and activities of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as well as the related historiography. „Mykhailo Hrushevsky about Baida-Vyshnevetsky and modern historiography” by Volodymyr Serhiychuk appeared first, including brief historiography of Dmytro „Baida”⁵. The historian compared the assessments of the prince's personality by researchers in the 19th and the first half of the 20th centuries, paying special attention to the work of M. Hrushevsky. From researches of the second half of the 20th c. V. Serhiychuk singled out and analyzed only the works of V. Holobutsky and L. Vynar. The historian criticized Soviet historiography for denying the role of Dmytro „Baida” in the founding of the Zaporozhian Sich. V. Serhiychuk also referred to a brief description of the historiography of the issue in his work „Dmytro Vyshnevetsky”⁶.

The Ukrainian historiography of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky is analyzed most thoroughly in a number of articles by Natalia Romantsova⁷. The researcher has investigated the Ukrainian diasporic historiography and the modern historiography of the prince's life, and has showed how his anti-Tatar activity and identity with the Cossack Baida have been highlighted in the historiography.

The historiographical study of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky has also been carried out in a number of articles by Viacheslav Kovbasa⁸. He has examined how the prince's

⁵ V. Sergijčuk, *Mihajlo Gruševs'kij pro Bajdu-Višnevec'kogo i sučasna istoriografiâ*, *Ukrans'kij istorik* 110–115 (1991–1992), vol. 28–29, pp. 235–241.

⁶ Idem, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, Kiiŭ 2003, p. 189.

⁷ N. Romancova, *Knâz' D. Višnevec'kij ukozac'ko-tatars'komu protistoânni seredini XVI st.: istoriografijnyj aspekt problemi*, *Īstorični i politologični doslidžennâ: naukovej žurnal*. Vidannâ Donec'kogo nacional'nogo universitetu, *istoričnij fakul'tet* 3/4 (2011), pp. 28–33; eadem, *Knâz' D. Višnevec'kij u sučasnij ukrains'kij istoriografii*, *Visnik Mariupol's'kogo deržavnogo universitetu*. Seria: *Īstoriâ, politologiâ* 1 (2011), pp. 67–72; eadem, *Postat' knâzâ Dmitra Višnevec'kogo u visvitlenni Īstoriki vukrains'koï diaspori*, *Shid* 7 (2010), pp. 119–122.

⁸ V. Kovbasa, *Knâz' Dmitro Višnevec'kij i kozactvo*, *Siverâns'kij litopis* 3–4 (2012),

connections with the Cossacks were depicted in literature, for instance, the image of Dmytro „Baida” in the Ukrainian epic, as well as certain aspects of the history of the Khortytsia fortress, in particular, the destruction of the fortification in 1557. The researcher’s conclusions are based on a wide range of sources, domestic and foreign alike.

2. Was Vyshnevetsky castle on Khortytsia Island the first Zaporozhian Sich?

There are conflicting views regarding the founding of the Khortytsia fortress by Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, in particular, its location, the reasons for construction thereof, and its military and political significance for the Ukrainian lands. According to the sources, the construction of the castle on Khortytsia was carried out in the name of the „ruler” (the grand duke) and was considered by the latter primarily a means of protecting the state borders from „evil people”⁹.

Dmytro Bantysh-Kamensky, a Ukrainian historian and archeographer was the first to describe the acts of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky on Khortytsia. According to the historian, the prince lived on the island and built a fortress in the same way as on Tomakivka island. However, the author did not specify the time of its foundation¹⁰. The scientist’s views reflected the ideology of Russian noble historiography of the first half and the mid- 19th c., so he was rather skeptical of the Zaporozhians, seeing them as mere robbers. Historian and ethnographer Mykola Kostomarov claimed that the idea of keeping a permanent Cossack guard on the Dnipro islands was first voiced by Ostap Dashkevych in 1533, but it was Dmytro Vyshnevetsky who built the first fortifications on Khortytsia island in approximately the 1550s.¹¹ M. Kostomarov substantiated the idea of the particularity of the Ukrainian people, their right to their own state. This is the reason why Dmytro Vyshnevetsky is presented not just as the leader of armed Cossack units, but as the head of an organized social class – the Cossacks.

pp. 3–8; idem, *Novi dani do istorii Hortic’kogo zamku D. Višnevec’kogo*, Novi doslidžennâ pam’âtok kozac’koï dobi v Ukraïni 21 (2012), part 2, pp. 55–62.

⁹ *Akty, otnosâšiesâ k istorii Ūžnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii, sobrannye i izdannye Arheograficeskoj komissiej*, vol. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 1865, no. 130, p. 148.

¹⁰ D. Bantyš-Kamenskij, *Istoriâ Maloj Rossii*, Moskva 1830, part 1, p. 127.

¹¹ M. Kostomarov, *Malorosijskij get’man Zinovij-Bogdan Hmel’nic’kij*, [in:] M. Kostomarov, *Galereâ portretiv: Biografični narisi*, Kiïv 1993, p. 125.

Volodymyr Antonovych, the founder of the „Kyiv school” of Ukrainian historians, hesitated to determine the place of construction of the fortress, which he called the beginning of Zaporizhzhia. He assumed that it could be one of the islands – Khortytsia or Tomakivka. It is known for certain that the fortress was built in the lower stretches of the Dnipro river¹². In another of his studies, the scholar emphasized the fact that Vyshnevetsky, as a starosta of Kaniv and Cherkasy, protected the „uhods” and wanted to ensure the length of the Cossack border in order to protect the lands where „uhodniks” went to trade („promysly”)¹³.

According to Dmytro Bahalii, a representative of Antonovych’s scientific academic, the prince built a stronghold („horod”) on Khortytsia, in the vicinity of the Crimean nomads. The historian considered it Khortytsia Sich and described the Tatar attacks on it¹⁴.

Dmytro Yavornytsky, an outstanding researcher of the Ukrainian Cossackdom noted that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky came up with an idea of protecting the Lithuanian borders by building a strong castle on the island and placing a strong garrison there after returning from the Ottoman Porte. However, the idea was not supported by the authorities of that time. Nevertheless, in 1556, the prince built an earthen „town” on Khortytsia, which Yavornytsky considered a prototype of the Zaporozhian Siches¹⁵.

In the late 19th and the early 20th century, the authors considered the construction of D. Vyshnevetsky’s fortress and the organization of the Cossack units as an activity of a subject of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Andrii Storozhenko, a historian and Slavic scholar followed the version according to which the prince built a defensive fortification on Khortytsia against Tatar raids on the king’s instruction. According to Storozhenko, the king approved the construction of the Khortytsia castle by the prince, but demanded that a stop was put to the attacks on Turkish possessions. The historian did not see a connection between the castle in Khortytsia and the Zaporozhian Sich¹⁶. Mykola Arkas, a Ukrainian historian, writer, cultural and educational activist claimed that after returning from Turkey in 1555 (where the prince stayed for two years), the Grand Duke assigned Dmytro „Baida” to defend Khortytsia island against the Tatars. According to the historian, Vyshnevetsky had

¹² V. Antonovič, *Prokozac’ki časi na Ukraïni*, Kïiv 1991, p. 52.

¹³ Idem, *Korotka istoriâ kozoččini*, Winnipeg–Dauphin 1971, p. 22.

¹⁴ D.I. Bagalej, *Očerki po istorii stepnoj okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva*, Moskva 1887, p. 147.

¹⁵ D. Âvornic’kij, *Îstoriâ zaporoz’kih kozakiv*, Kïiv 1990, vol. 2, pp. 18–19.

¹⁶ A. Storozhenko, *Knâz’ Dmitrij Ivanovič Višneveckij, po narodnomu prozvišu Bajda*, Kiev-skaja starina 16 (1897), kn. 3, p. 520.

a plan of restraining the Crimean Khanate, relying on the Polish-Lithuanian state and maintaining friendly relations with Turkey¹⁷.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky, an outstanding Ukrainian historian, and the author of the 10-volume „History of Ukraine-Rus” considered the early 1550s the time of building the fortress on Khortytsia. In his view, Dmytro „Baida” planned to make it a stronghold of the entire Cossack population and „a political force with which the neighboring states would reckon”¹⁸. According to Hrushevsky, the name of the prince and the tradition of the castle on Khortytsia are closely related to the founding of the Zaporozhian Sich. Vyshnevetsky became the historical patron of the Sich and the spiritual father of the Cossack republic¹⁹. Thus, we can conclude that Hrushevsky did not consider Khortytsia Castle to be the Sich, but saw it as the beginning of the development of the Cossacks.

Ahatanhel Krymsky, a Ukrainian historian-orientalist referred to Dmytro „Baida” as a great adventurer, emphasizing his overly impatient nature and violent temper. According to this historian, the prince built a fortress on Khortytsia in the early 1550s (not later than in 1553), thus uniting the Cossacks in their fight against Crimean Khanate. The historian considered this fact to be the origin of the Zaporozhian Sich²⁰. So, in the first quarter of the 20th c., most of the authors presented the Cossacks not just as a community centered in Kosh, but primarily as a state-forming force, a guardian of national interests.

The Ukrainian Galician researchers of the Interwar period did not ignore the issue of Khortytsia Castle. They did not share a point of view not only on the purpose of the fortress but also on the exact date of construction thereof. Omelian Terletsky, a publicist and a disciple of M. Hrushevsky, fully supported his teacher’s hypothesis that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky had built the fortress on Khortytsia in 1552²¹, while the authors of „The History of Ukraine” considered the end of 1550 to be the date of its foundation²². Ivan Krypiakievych, a researcher of the history of the Cossackdom from Lviv, pictured Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as an experienced military commander who understood that an organized army and a stronghold were necessary to defeat the Tatars. With this in mind, he gathered the bravest Cossacks and built a fortress

¹⁷ M. Arkas, *Īstorĭâ Ukraĭni-Rusi*, Krakiv 1912, p. 129.

¹⁸ M. Gruševskij, *Īlŭstrovana ĭstorĭâ Ukraĭni*, Kiiv-Lviv 1913, pp. 179–180.

¹⁹ Idem, *Bajda-Višnevec’kij u poezĭi j ĭstorĭi*, [in:] V. Sergijčuk, *Dmitro Višnevec’kij*, Kiiv 2003, p. 189.

²⁰ A. Krims’kij, *Īstorĭâ Tureččini*, Kiiv-Lviv 1996, pp. 187–188.

²¹ O. Terlec’kij, *Īstorĭâ Ukraĭns’koĭ deržavi*, Lviv 1924, vol. 2, p. 12.

²² *Īstorĭâ Ukraĭni*, ed. by A. Pavlišin, Lviv 1991, p. 73.

on Khortytsia in 1550²³. According to him, the first fortifications created by the prince in Zaporizhzhia later became the center of the Cossackdom²⁴.

The Ukrainian researchers living abroad were engaged in studies of the Cossack past throughout the 20th c. In their writings, the Cossacks were given significance in the creation of the Ukrainian nation. Glorifying the Cossack past as one of the most outstanding chapters in Ukrainian history, the majority of the authors perceived Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as the organizer of the Cossack units. In particular, while in exile, in his fundamental research on the history of Ukraine Dmytro Doroshenko characterized the prince as an outstanding personality with a strong inclination for adventures. The historian thought that Dmytro „Baida” appeared among the Cossacks around 1540, and in 1552 built the fortification on Khortytsia²⁵.

Lubomyr Vynar was one of the brightest representatives of Ukrainian diasporian historiography who researched the life and activities of D. Vyshnevetsky. His work „Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky” is based on a wide range of source material – documents from the courts of European rulers, reports of European diplomats, chronicles, as well as examples of oral folk art about Baida. L. Vynar emphasized that the prince was the first to tie the Cossacks to a specific territory, but there are no facts confirmed by sources about the existence of a permanent Cossack center, and even more so of the Zaporozhian Sich²⁶. Nevertheless, the diaspora researcher named Vyshnevetsky the builder of the first Cossack fortress beyond the Dnipro rapids²⁷ and noted that Vyshnevetsky built the fortress on Khortytsia at his own expense, and also armed the Cossacks²⁸.

Nataliia Polonska-Vasylenko, one of the foremost Ukrainian émigré historians briefly considered this aspect of the prince’s activities in an article written for the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. She noted that in the 1540s, D. Vyshnevetsky united the scattered Cossack groups, thus starting the military organization of Cossackdom. Polonska-Vasylenko considered the fortress built on Khortytsia as a center of Cossackdom – the Zaporozhian Sich²⁹.

²³ Ї. Крип’якеви́ч, *Історія коза́ччини*, Lviv 1934, pp. 10, 129.

²⁴ Idem, *Історія Украї́ни*, Lviv 1990, p. 157.

²⁵ D. Dorošenko, *Історія Украї́ни з малю́нками ді́я шко́ли j родини*, New York 1957, p. 84.

²⁶ L. Vinar, *Knáz’ Dmítro Višnevec’kij*, München 1964, p. 22.

²⁷ Ibidem, p. 64.

²⁸ Ibidem, p. 67.

²⁹ N. Polons’ka-Vasilenko, *Украї́на за литовс’ко-пол’с’кої j пол’с’ко-козач’кої доби*, [in:] *Enciklopediá Ukraїnoznavstva, Zagal’na častina (EU-Ī)*, München–New York 1949, vol. 2, p. 439.

A literary historian in exile, George Yurii Shevelov, contrasted the Khortytsia fortress with the Zaporozhian Sich. He called the castle built by Vyshnevetsky the easternmost castle in Europe (castles were a typical European embodiment, unlike the Siches). The author considered the destruction of the castle on Khortytsia by the Tatars in 1557 a victory of the steppe way of life over the European tradition³⁰.

During the Soviet era, the emphasis in the study of the Cossacks shifted – the history of the Cossacks was presented from an anti-elitist position, and the Cossack uprisings were presented as peasant wars or demonstrations of marginal sections of the population. Ukrainian Soviet historians often tried to contrast the activities of the prince, a representative of the aristocratic family, with the activities of the Cossacks as representatives of the people. Volodymyr Holobutsky, the most famous Soviet researcher of the Cossackdom, analyzed the prince's activities in this vein. The author claimed that Vyshnevetsky had tried to hinder the activities of the Cossacks, and had built the fortress on the Khortytsia island not to attack the Tatar hordes, but to attack the Cossacks themselves. In addition, according to the historian, Vyshnevetsky's squads had consisted of servants of the prince or mercenaries, rather than genuine Cossacks³¹.

Mykola Kytsenko, another Soviet historian, one of the founders of the Museum of the History of the Zaporozhian Cossackdom on the island of Khortytsia, shared an opinion with Holobutsky regarding the relationship between Vyshnevetsky and the Cossacks. On the basis of historiographical analysis of the works of the 19th and 20th centuries, he came to the conclusion that the castle on Khortytsia had been built for the purpose of pacifying the Cossacks. The historian substantiated his conclusion by the fact that the prince had built a center on Khortytsia against the will of the grand duke, relying on the letters of Sigismund II Augustus to Devlet I Giray. In his letters, the Grand Duke reported that he knew nothing about the existence of a settlement on Khortytsia³².

Clearly, Ukrainian Soviet historians origin often presented Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as an antagonist of the Cossacks rather than their patron. They substantiated their point of view by the fact that the prince's goal as a representative of the grand ducal administration was primarily to control the Cossack attacks on Crimea and other Turkish possessions, and not to defend the border against the Tatars. This point of

³⁰ Ū. Ševel'ov, *Vasil' Mova i Kuliševa škola v ukraïns'ki j publicistici j poezii*, [in:] V. Mova (Limans'kij), *Kuliš, Bajda i kozaki*, New York 1995, p. 59.

³¹ V.A. Golobuckij, *Zaporožskoe kazačestvo*, Kiev 1957, pp. 74–78.

³² M. Kicenko, *Horticâ v geroïci i legendah*, Dnìpropetrovsk 1972, pp. 41–43.

view was repeatedly criticized by Ukrainian researchers, as it was not confirmed by sources but was ideologically biased.

In modern Ukrainian historiography, there is no unanimous assessment of the historical significance of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's Khortytsia castle. A number of historians deny the identification of the fortress with the first Zaporozhian Sich, and some historians still attribute the first Zaporozhian Sich to Vyshnevetsky's castle on Khortytsia.

Olena Apanovych, a researcher of the Zaporozhian Siches, did not consider Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's castle on Mala Khortytsia to be the Zaporozhian Sich, even though it was built using the fortification experience of the Cossacks³³. In her work „Stories about the Zaporozhian Cossacks” she presented another vision of the events: „It was considered that at first it [the Zaporozhian Sich – S.Z.] was located on the island of Khortytsia. There, in the middle of the 16th century, prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky built a fortified castle. Its collateral consisted of the Cossacks who, probably while building earthen fortifications, used a system of abatises”³⁴. Nevertheless, O. Apanovych emphasized the huge historical role played by the Khortytsia fortress during its short period of existence. According to the researcher, Dmytro Vyshnevetsky gave the Cossacks an impetus to realize their strength, which contributed to the fact that the Cossack army was built up³⁵.

In 1994, the second Ukrainian-language edition of V. Holobutsky's work, dedicated to the Zaporozhian Cossackdom, was published. The author explained that this was facilitated by the newly-enjoyed freedom of speech and access to new source material. Holobutsky claimed that his view of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's character had changed and his role in guarding the Ukrainian borders had been downplayed. However, the author changed his opinion only partially. While he did not deny that the prince relied on the Cossacks in the campaigns against the Tatars and Turks, he asked if these Cossacks were from Zaporozhzhia? Holobutsky insisted that the grand duke tasked Vyshnevetsky primarily with restraining the Zaporozhians from independent campaigns in Crimea and Turkey. The prince handled the task well, having built a castle on the island of Mala Khortytsia in the fall of 1556³⁶.

Natalya Yakovenko, an outstanding Ukrainian historian holds a different opinion about Khortytsia castle. She considers the fortress built by the prince to be the first

³³ O. Apanovič, *Rozpovidi pro zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, Kiiiv 1991, p. 298.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 9.

³⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 300.

³⁶ V. Golobuc'kij, *Zaporoz'ke kozactvo*, Kiiiv 1994, pp. 130–131.

Zaporozhian Sich, where he united scattered groups unity to form a Cossack community³⁷.

V. Serhiychuk is quite critical of the assessment of the prince's activities in the context of domestic and foreign political factors. Valuable in the researcher's work are the appendices: the published sources on the basis of which it is possible to analyze the prince's deeds in the international arena and perception thereof by the ruling milieus in Poland, Turkey, and the Crimean Khanate. V. Serhiychuk criticizes the Soviet historiography for an attempt to refute the fact of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's participation in the founding of the first Zaporozhian Sich on Khortytsia, describing the merits of the prince in the creation of this first Cossack organization. However, the historian emphasizes the fact that initially, Vyshnevetsky acted by order of the Grand Duke to guard the steppe border lands together with Bernhard von Prittwitz³⁸ with whom he went on expeditions until 1552³⁹. Later, while serving as the starosta of Kaniv and Cherkasy, Vyshnevetsky was tasked by the Grand Duke with „being a guard („stražnik”) on Khortytsia”⁴⁰. With the defense of the southern borders of his starost areas, Vyshnevetsky actively attracted both the agricultural population and the „uhodniks” to the Dnipro islands⁴¹. V. Serhiychuk also notes that Vyshnevetsky chose the island of Mala Khortytsia for the construction of the fortress by chance, since this largest island beyond the Dnipro rapids was of strategic importance for controlling Tatar raids⁴².

Andrii Hurbyk and Vitalii Shcherbak, researchers into the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks, deny the identification of Vyshnevetsky's castle with the first Sich. The authors refer to sources that recorded in Khortytsia in the mid-1550s not a „sich” but a „stronghold” („horodok”) or a „castle”. Referring to the thorough work of the French researcher Chantal Lemercier-Quelquejay, the authors claim that the „Cossacks” were hardly mentioned in Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's army, and even more so „Sichovyks”. The researchers note that neither of the known sources from the mid-1650s directly mentions the „Sich”. What is more, they do not name either Kish otamans or their elections. Instead, the documents describe Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as a sole ruler, not an elected military leader. The authors also insist on the anti-

³⁷ N. Âkovenko, *Naris istorii Ukraïni z najdavniših časiv d okincâ XVIII stolittâ*, Kiïv 1997, pp. 125–126.

³⁸ V. Sergijčuk, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, p. 30.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 46.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 81.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 54.

⁴² *Ibidem*, pp. 66–67.

Cossack orientation of Vyshnevetsky castle, which, in their opinion, had a dual purpose: establishing an outpost of the struggle against the Tatar aggression and control over the actions of the Cossacks. The garrison of Khortytsia castle included not only the Cossacks but also other representatives of the military population. While the inhabitants of the fortress were heterogenous, according to the researchers, their cohabitation in the specific conditions on the frontier contributed to the emergence of a peculiar military-political organization. Thus, the authors came to a conclusion that the Khortytsia fortress had a significant impact on the evolution of the Ukrainian Cossackdom and the increase of its ranks⁴³.

Viacheslav Kovbasa, a researcher of the historiography of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, does not consider the fortress built by the prince on Khortytsia to be the Zaporozhian Sich. In one of his articles, he investigates the history of the siege of Khortytsia by the Tatars, and offers a new perspective on the reasons for the prince's abandonment of the fortress⁴⁴. In another article, the author examines the structure of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's military formations. He also denies the statement that there were no or almost no Cossacks in the prince's military units⁴⁵. V. Kovbasa notes the great role of the prince in organizing the Cossack community and insists that there is a lot of evidence about the prince's connections with the Cossacks, but it is fragmentary and not always direct⁴⁶. The historian insists that the Cossacks formed the basis of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's military units. In support of his conclusions, he refers to two letters of the royal secretary Stanisław Bojanowski where the prince's connections with the Cossacks are mentioned⁴⁷.

Philosopher and publicist Petro Kraliuk tries to dispel the myths surrounding the prince. The author does not identify the castle on Khortytsia with the „typical” Zaporozhian Sich, since it was commissioned by the Polish-Lithuanian authorities, following the example of other border castles. However, the Cossacks who built the castle and stayed in it could have adopted the model of construction and organization in order to create the „real” Sich in the future⁴⁸.

Thus, most researchers are inclined to consider the early 1550s as the fortress' completion as protection against raids by the Crimean Tatars. There was an evolu-

⁴³ A.O. Gurbik, V.O. Šerbak, *Geneza ta šlâhi rozvitku zaporoz'kogo kozactwa*, [in:] *Īstoriâ ukraïns'kogo kozactva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kïiv 2006, vol. 1, pp. 534–536.

⁴⁴ V. Kovbasa, *Novi dani do istorii Hortic'kogo zamku D. Višnevec'kogo*, pp. 55–62.

⁴⁵ Idem, *Knâz' DMITRO Višnevec'kij i kozactvo*, p. 3.

⁴⁶ Ibidem, p. 5.

⁴⁷ Ibidem, p. 7.

⁴⁸ P. Kralûk, *Kozac'ka mîfologiâ Ukraïni: tvorci ta epigoni*, Harkiv 2016, p. 21.

tion of views on the purpose of Khortytsia castle. According to some Ukrainian historians, the initiative should be attributed to the Lithuanian Grand Duke, and Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, as his subject, followed suit. The most likely version seems to be the construction of the castle by the prince as a subject of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to protect the state borders from attacks by the Crimean Khanate. As for the identification of the fortress with the first Zaporozhian Sich, currently in Ukrainian historiography the dominant view is that the castle was not the Sich but could have served as a prototype for the Cossack siches.

3. Participation in the struggle for the Moldavian throne

For historians, the most significant has been the final period of Dmytro „Baida’s” life, namely his Moldavian campaign and execution in Istanbul. The Moldavian aspect of his military and political activity has occupied an important place in the history of the Cossacks in the second half of the 16th c. The Cossack leaders were tempted by an opportunity to occupy the prince’s throne in the course of frequent civil strife in Moldavia. Due to the vassal dependence on Turkey, the power in the principality was very weak, which gave the Cossacks an opportunity to put „their own man” on the throne. There is also a view that the Moldavian princes, not enjoying an equal status with the rulers of other states, were more willing to recognize the Cossacks as an independent political force in the international arena. It was prince Dmytro Vyshnevetsky who initiated Moldavian politics. Researchers often called the prince’s Moldavian campaign an adventure that a person with a colourful character could embark on. The role of Vyshnevetsky in the Moldavian events of 1563, the circumstances of his campaign, have not been fully clarified and the interpretation varies from one historian to another.

According to D. Bantysh-Kamensky, the struggle for the Moldavian throne was motivated by Vyshnevetsky’s ambition and desire for glory, in which he became a „victim of deception”⁴⁹.

M. Hrushevsky described Dmytro Vyshnevetsky’s Moldavian campaign in sufficient detail, insisting that the „adventurer” Olbracht Łaski persuaded him to take this step. For the scholar, the connection between the prince’s „Vlach adventure” and his anti-Tatar plans was unclear. The historian briefly described the infighting that was going on at that time in the principality of Moldavia, and also noted that shortly

⁴⁹ D. Bantyš-Kamenskij, *Istoriâ Maloj Rossii*, p. 130.

before the campaign, Vyshnevetsky was poisoned and did not fully recover, which played against him during the campaign. According to Hrushevsky, even despite his unsuccessful attempt to seize the Moldavian throne, the prince became an example for subsequent Cossack leaders up to Tymish Khmelnytsky⁵⁰.

D. Yavornytsky⁵¹ and A. Storozhenko⁵² briefly touched on Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's Moldavian campaign. Yavornytsky explained this step by the spirit of heroism that was characteristic of the prince. The historian noted that the intention of Olbracht Łaski, who persuaded the prince to leave for the Moldavian lands, was to join them to Poland, but the prince went further and decided to become a Moldavian hospodar⁵³. The amateur historian from Katerynoslav, Adrian Kashchenko, did not agree with this statement because he thought that only the fight against the Turks and Tatars was of importance for the prince⁵⁴.

Among Ukrainian authors, including those living abroad, Lubomyr Vynar paid most attention to the Moldavian campaign. He called Vyshnevetsky the „father” of Moldavian politics. According to the researcher, the prince wanted to establish an independent Moldavian principality and move the centre of the Cossack organization there. In this way, it was possible to protect the Ukrainian lands from Tatar raids, but this, as Vynar claimed, was prevented by the treacherous policy of the Moldavian boyars⁵⁵. The historian emphasized the close cultural, religious, political, and economic ties between the Ukrainian and Moldavian lands, as well as the fact that the family ties of the Vyshnevetskies with the Albanian, Serbian, and Moldavian families played a major role in shaping the anti-Muslim views, and later the prince's political concepts⁵⁶. In his opinion, Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's ascending the Moldavian throne opened up an opportunity for an anti-Turkish and anti-Tatar force in Eastern Europe. Vynar saw the importance of the Moldavian campaign for the Ukrainian lands and for the Cossacks as follows: 1) a possibility of controlling the steppe and protecting Podilia from Tatar raids; 2) for the first time, a Ukrainian prince was to occupy the hospodar throne in Moldavia; 3) the Cossacks made a name for themselves in international politics⁵⁷.

⁵⁰ M. Gruševskij, *Bajda-Višnevec'kij u poezii j istorii*, p. 186.

⁵¹ D. Âvornic'kij, *Îstoriâ zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, pp. 24–25.

⁵² A. Storozhenko, *Knâz' Dmitrij Ivanovič Višneveckij*, p. 523.

⁵³ D. Âvornic'kij, *Îstoriâ zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, p. 24.

⁵⁴ A. Kašenko, *Zrujnovane gnizdo. Îstorični povisti taopovidannâ*, Kiiiv 1991, p. 546.

⁵⁵ L. Vinar, *Knâz' Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, p. 66.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 13.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 38–39.

In his work, L. Vynar cites several versions of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's capture, but all of them boil down to the fact that the prince was betrayed by a local peasant or priest and handed over to Ștefan Tomșa⁵⁸. When describing the capture, stay in Constantinople and the execution of the prince, the scholar refers to chroniclers as well as the reports of Roman (papal) and French diplomats. L. Vynar notes that the prince, related to the Moldavian hospodars and recalling the cooperation of the Moldavians with the Cossacks in the late 15th and the early 16th centuries, could not have assumed treason⁵⁹. The historian came to a conclusion that the tragic death of Vyshnevetsky had a great impact on the Cossack campaigns in Moldavian territories.

N. Polonska-Vasylenko, in turn, claimed that D. Vyshnevetsky took part in the Moldavian campaign because he aimed to liberate Ukraine, Moldavia and Wallachia from the Polish and Turkish reign⁶⁰. The opinion of N. Polonska-Vasylenko was also shared by O. Apanovych who also saw the prince's Moldavian campaign as the goal of freeing the principality from the Ottoman vassal dependence. That is why, in her opinion, Dmytro Vyshnevetsky decided to assume the Moldavian throne⁶¹.

V. Serhiychuk cites the desire to put an end to the Ottoman rule in the Northern Black Sea region as the main reason behind Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's participation in the Moldavian campaign which necessitated united efforts of the Cossacks and the population of Moldavia. In addition, the author emphasizes that the prince had a formal right to claim the Moldavian throne, as he had family ties with the former Moldavian rulers – the House of Mușat⁶².

P. Kraliuk describes in detail the prince's Moldavian campaign, seeing it as adventurous actions. The author has doubts about the reality of all the details of the prince's death in Constantinople, described by the European diplomats of the time. He admits that the diplomats were interested in presenting the prince's martyrdom as an „optimistic tragedy” – the victory of the Christian spirit over Islam⁶³.

Thus, in Ukrainian historiography, there is no agreed view on the motives of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's participation in the Moldavian strife. In the writings of historians, several versions prevail: the blood relationship of the House of Vyshnevetsky with the Moldavian hospodars; the invitation of the Moldavian boyars to embrace

⁵⁸ Ibidem, p. 44.

⁵⁹ Ibidem, p. 46.

⁶⁰ N. Polonska-Vasilenko, *İstoriâ Ukraïni*, Kiiiv 1992, vol. 1, p. 452.

⁶¹ O. Apanovič, *Rozpovîdi pro zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, Kiiiv 1991, p. 301.

⁶² V. Sergijčuk, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, p. 119.

⁶³ P. Kraliuk, *Kozac'kamifologiâ Ukraïni*, pp. 24–25.

the hospodar throne; the transformation of the principality of Moldavia into a buffer zone or a bridgehead for the fight against Ottoman Empire; ambitious plans to create his own state by uniting with eastern and southern Ukrainian lands. In my opinion, a more likely motive for Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's Moldavian campaign is a combination of the prince's ambitious nature with pragmatic plans to transform the principality of Moldavia into one of the outposts of the struggle against Turkish Empire.

4. The significance of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in history

Many researchers have assessed the historical significance of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's activities. M. Hrushevsky depicted Vyshnevetsky as a magnate lord, inheritor of the Old Rus' traditions of the princely-militia unit system. The scholar considered the prince's pursuit of glory and adventure to be a manifestation of a knight's worldview, highlighting first of all his struggle against the Tatars, and referred to Vyshnevetsky as a „steppe adventurer”. M. Hrushevsky made a connection of the prince's penchant for adventurism and the specific life on the Ukrainian border⁶⁴.

M. Hrushevsky saw an idea behind the transition of the prince's service for different states, a plan to defend Ukraine from Tatar raids by uniting the efforts of the neighbouring states to oppose the Crimean Khanate and ensure the Ottoman Empire's neutrality. However, according to the researcher, the idea of Dmytro „Baida” regarding the unification of the Cossacks and the creation of an outpost to repel Tatar attacks was premature, since the Cossack forces were not yet significant enough. The very fact that the magnate became the head of the Ukrainian Cossacks was seen by M. Hrushevsky as a guarantee of raising the prestige of steppe chivalry in the country and beyond. The historian saw the merit of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in the establishment of a Cossack base beyond the Dnipro rapids, from where he launched preemptive strikes, thereby contributing to a decrease in the number of Tatar raids on Ukrainian lands⁶⁵.

Mykola Vasylenko, a Ukrainian scholar and a public and political figure believed that the meaning of the name „Baida” did not quite coincide with the real character of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky. In his opinion, in the fight against the Tatars, like other aristocrats, the prince was inspired primarily by his selfish motives, far from any po-

⁶⁴ M. Gruševskij, *İstoriâ Ukraïni-Rusi*, Kiïv 1995, vol. 7, pp. 114–115.

⁶⁵ Idem, *Bajda-Višnevec'kij u poezii j istorii*, pp. 187–188.

litical goals. He believed that adventurers like Dmytro „Baida” had no homeland, no native people, no state interests, so they easily moved from one state to another, regardless of their relations⁶⁶. The researcher did not see any political ideas or specific plans to fight the Tatars in the transitions of Dmytro „Baida” from the Great Duchy of Lithuania to the Ottoman Empire and the Tsardom of Muscovy⁶⁷. Thus, the author argued primarily with M. Hrushevsky. In my opinion, M. Vasylenko’s assessments, although based on rich source material, are somewhat biased and downplay the role of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in the history of the Cossacks.

In 1918, Hryhorii Kovalenko-Kolomatsky – a Ukrainian writer, journalist and public figure described the prince as one of the main leaders of the national idea, a real warrior, defender of the Ukrainian people. He presented the idea under the pseudonym „H. Hetmanets” in a brief, popular investigation on Dmytro Vyshnevetsky⁶⁸. O. Terletsy saw the reason for Dmytro Vyshnevetsky’s „Cossacking” in his belief that he would play an important role in the region. According to the historian, the education of the prince led to his broad political outlook, which Vyshnevetsky impressed upon the Cossack masses⁶⁹. Following M. Hrushevsky, O. Terletsy claimed that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky had a plan to destroy the Crimean Khanate in alliance with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or Muscovy.

L. Vynar emphasized the fact that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky not only contributed to the development of the Cossackdom but also directly participated in its development. According to the historian, the Ukrainian Cossacks could not have become a strong organization in such a short period of time without the direct participation of Ukrainian aristocratic families⁷⁰. The prince’s participation in the Cossack movement introduced a knightly element into the early Cossack ideology⁷¹. Thus, the historian emphasized the chivalrous outlook of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, who, unlike most representatives of his class, was guided by a desire for heroic acts rather than accumulating wealth. When assessing the significance of the prince’s activities in Ukrainian history, the diaspora researcher argued with M. Hrushevsky. The latter considered the main reason for Vyshnevetsky’s failures to have been the untimeliness of his activities – the Cossacks had not yet reached a level of development

⁶⁶ N. Vasilenko, *Očerki po istorii Zapadnoj Rusi i Ukrainy*, Kiev 1916, p. 154–155.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 163–164.

⁶⁸ G. Kovalenko-Kolomac’kij (G. Get’manec’), *Slavnijlicar’: Kozak-knâz’ Dmitro Višnevec’kij (Bajda)*, Kiiiv 1918, 32 p.

⁶⁹ O. Terlec’kij, *Īstorîâ ukraïns’koï deržavi*, Lviv 1924, vol. 2, p. 15.

⁷⁰ L. Vinar, *Knâz’ Dmitro Višnevec’kij*, p. 14.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, p. 16.

that would have made the prince's plans successful. However, L. Vynar insisted that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky appeared on the historical stage just in time when Ukrainian lands needed protection from Tatar raids. Nevertheless, he had to act in difficult geopolitical conditions⁷².

O. Apanovych characterized Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as a talented military leader, an exceptionally courageous person with unbridled energy, who devoted his life to the struggle against the Turkish Empire and the Crimean Khanate. Dmytro Vyshnevetsky had a clear goal and used the Cossacks to achieve it. According to O. Apanovych, the goal was to liberate the southern steppes from the Khanate hordes and destroy the Turkish fortresses on the Dnipro Niza, and later to conquer the Black Sea coast. The researcher saw the prince's merit in the fact that the Cossacks entered the international arena for the first time. The researcher did not condemn the changes in the prince's subjects of interest; on the contrary, she justified them and explained as steps typical of the feudal customs of the Middle Ages. According to O. Apanovych, the prince's merit included a strategy of offensive defense against the Turks and Tatars, transferring the warfare to the enemy's territory with the help of Cossack raids deep into the Tatar settlements⁷³. The researcher joined M. Hrushevsky in considering the prince's ambitious plans ahead of their time, since there were no suitable international conditions for the implementation of his military and political program to liberate the lands in the South and the Black Sea⁷⁴.

G.Y. Shevelov considered the activities of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky in a much broader context. He saw the main goal of the prince in undermining the arbitrariness of the Crimean Khanate in the Ukrainian steppes and equated this matter with the Europeanization of Cossack Ukraine, and even more broadly, the whole of South-Eastern Europe. To achieve his goal, Vyshnevetsky had to control the steppe, building castles in the process. The establishment of the fortress on Khortytsia was the first step in the implementation of this grandiose program. G.Y. Shevelov compared the prince's activities to the journey of Christopher Columbus, who, with the support of the Spanish rulers, moved the borders of Europe across the Atlantic Ocean. Like Columbus, Vyshnevetsky moved civilization to the East, but did not find support for his actions either from the Polish king, the Muscovite tsar, or the claimants to the Moldavian throne⁷⁵.

⁷² Ibidem, pp. 65–67.

⁷³ O. Apanovič, *Rozpovidi pro zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, pp. 296–298.

⁷⁴ Ibidem, p. 301.

⁷⁵ Ū. Ševel'ov, *Vasil' Mova i Kuliševa škola v ukraïns'kij publicistici j poezii*, p. 59.

Clarifying the significance of the prince's personality in Ukrainian history, N. Yakovenko turns to the genealogy of the Vyshnevetsky family, specifically to its princely branch. The researcher emphasizes that the family, considered the descendants of the Gediminids, was not as wealthy as other princely families. Therefore, the representatives of the family were often in the military service of the Grand Duke. She notes that the cult of personal prowess prevailed among the Vyshnevetskies, and covering yourself with military glory was of the utmost importance. Thus, the researcher did not question the reasons behind Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's leaving behind his possessions at a young age and pursuing knightly glory. N. Yakovenko sees the phenomenon of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky not in his ability to come to an understanding with the Cossacks, but in the fact that for the first time he managed to lead the Cossacks from the inside⁷⁶.

V. Serhiychuk emphasizes the state-building mission of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky, since the prince adopted measures aimed at securing the freedoms of the Zaporozhian Army in the East and South⁷⁷. According to the historian, the prince began to create a caste of knights from scattered looting groups that could faithfully serve the Ukrainian peoples⁷⁸.

Serhii Lepiavko, a researcher into the history of the Ukrainian Cossackdom and military history in general, calls Dmytro Vyshnevetsky the creator of the independent Cossack policy. He was the first to realize the strategic importance of the activities of the Cossacks and the Zaporozhian region against the Tatars. According to the author, the prince's minor border service turned into the fact that he built a castle on Khortytsia at his own risk with the help of the Cossacks, making it the prototype of the Sich. The importance of Vyshnevetsky for the history of the Cossacks lies in his marking the future directions of the development of the Cossacks' activities, in particular, in the international arena⁷⁹.

P. Kraliuk cannot be convinced by the assertions of historians that Dmytro Vyshnevetsky organized a military service in Khortytsia to repel Tatar aggression. In his opinion, the prince created his own army in order to later join the service of some generous patron. The historian believes that there is no reason to portray

⁷⁶ N. Âkovenko, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, [in:] *Īstoriâ Ukraïni v osobah: Litovs'ko-pol'ska doba*, Kïiv 1997, pp. 77–80.

⁷⁷ V. Sergijčuk, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, p. 129.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 134.

⁷⁹ S.A. Lep'âvko, *Ukraïns'ke kozactwo umižnarodnich vidnosinach XVI–seredini XVII st.*, [in:] *Īstoriâ ukraïns'ko gokozačtva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kïiv 2006, vol. 1, p. 329.

Dmytro Vyshnevetsky as an ideological fighter against the Tatars. Rather, he was a hero of the frontier who served various rulers in their military affairs. As proof of his statement, the author refers to Dmytro Vyshnevetsky's trip to Turkey in 1553. This act on the part of the prince does not connect with his chivalrous image of a fighter against the Tatars and Turks. Therefore, according to the author, it has not been deeply analyzed in Ukrainian historiography⁸⁰.

Thus, between the 19th and the 21st centuries, the views of historians on the motives and significance of Dmytro Vyshnevetsky have been changing. However, in Ukrainian historiography, no one denies the merit of the prince in organizing the Cossack community and bringing it to the international arena.

Bibliography

Printed Sources

Akty, odnosâšiesâ kistorii Ūžnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii, sobrannye i izdannye Arheografičeskoj komisij, vol. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 1865, pp. [6], 15, 288

Literature

Antonovič V., *Korotka istoriâ kozaččini*, Winnipeg–Dauphin 1971

Antonovič V., *Pro kozac'ki časi na Ukraïni*, Kïiv 1991

Apanovič O., *Rozpovidî pro zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, Kïiv 1991

Arkas M., *Îstoriâ Ukraïni-Rusi*, Krakiv 1912

Âkovenko A., *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, [in:] *Îstoriâ Ukraïni v osobah: Litovs'ko-pol'ska doba*, Kïiv 1997

Âkovenko A., *Naris istorii Ukraïni z najdavniših časiv do kincâ XVIII stolittâ*, Kïiv 1997

Âremčuk V., *Ukraïns'ka istoriografiâ: suspil'no-politična istoriâ: posibnik*, Ostrog 2017

Âvornic'kij D., *Îstoriâ zaporoz'kih kozakiv*, Kïiv 1990, vol. 2

Bagalej D.I., *Očerki po istorii stepnoj okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva*, Moskva 1887

Bantyš-Kamenskij D., *Istoriâ Maloj Rossii*, Moskva 1830, part 1

Dorošenko D., *Îstoriâ Ukraïni z malûnkami dlâ školi j rodini*, New York 1957

Golobuckij V.A., *Zaporožskoe kazačestvo*, Kiev 1957

Golobuc'kij V., *Zaporoz'ke kozactvo*, Kïiv 1994

Gruševskij M., *Bajda-Višnevec'kijupoezii j istorii*, [in:] V. Sergijčuk, *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, Kïiv 2003

Gruševskij M., *Îlûstrovana istoriâ Ukraïni*, Kïiv–Lviv 1913

Gruševskij M., *Îstoriâ Ukraïni-Rusi*, Kïiv 1995, vol. 7

⁸⁰ P. Kralûk, *Kozac'ka mîfologiâ Ukraïni*, p. 20.

- Gurbik A.O., Šerbak V.O., *Geneza ta šláhi rozvitku zaporoz'kogo kozactwa*, [in:] *Īstoriá ukráins'kogo kozactva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kíiv 2006, vol. 1
- Īstoriá Ukraíni*, ed. by A. Pavlišin, Lvív 1991
- Īstoriá ukráins'kogo kozactva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kíiv 2006, vol. 1, 2
- Kašenko A., *Zrujnovane gnizdo: Īstorični povisti ta opovidanná*, Kíiv 1991
- Kicenko M., *Horticá v geroici i legendah*, Dnipropropetrovsk 1972
- Kostomarov M., *Malorosijiskij get'man Zinovij-Bogdan Hmel'nic'kij*, [in:] M. Kostomarov, *Galereá portretiv: Biografični narisi*, Kíiv 1993
- Kovalenko-Kolomac'kij G. (G. Get'manec'), *Slavnij licar': Kozak-knáz' Dmitro Višnevec'kij (Bajda)*, Kíiv 1918
- Kovbasa V., *Knáz' Dmitro Višnevec'kij i kozactvo, Siveráns'kij litopis 3–4* (2012)
- Kovbasa V., *Novi daní do istorií Hortic'kogo zamku D. Višnevec'kogo*, *Novi doslidženná pam'átok kozac'koí dobi v Ukraíni* 21 (2012), part 2
- Kralúk P., *Kozac'ka mifologíá Ukraíni: tvorci ta epigoni*, Harkív 2016
- Kravčenko V., *Narisi z ukráins'koí istoriografii epohi nacional'nogo Vidrodženná (druga polovina XVIII – seredína XIX st.)*, Harkív 1996
- Krims'kij A., *Īstoriá Tureččini*, Kíiv–Lvív 1996
- Krip'ákevič Ī., *Īstoriá kozaččini*, Lvív 1934
- Krip'ákevič Ī., *Īstoriá Ukraíni*, Lvív 1990
- Lep'ávko S.A., *Ukráins'ke kozactwo u mižnarodnich vidnosinach XVI–seredini XVII st.*, [in:] *Īstoriá ukráins'kogo kozactva: Narisi: U 2 t.*, ed. by V.A. Smolij, Kíiv 2006, vol. 1
- Ogoblin O., *Ukráins'ka istoriografía. 1917–1956*, Kíiv 2003, p. 251. English version: Olexander Ohloblyn, *Ukrainian Historiography. 1917–1956*, [in:] *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, New York 1957
- Polons'ka-Vasilenko N., *Īstoriá Ukraíni*, Kíiv 1992, vol. 1
- Polons'ka-Vasilenko N., *Ukraína za litovs'ko-pol's'koí j pol's'ko-kozac'koí dobi*, [in:] *Enciklopediá ukraínoznavstva, Zagal'na častina (EU-Ī)*, München–NewYork 1949, vol. 2
- Romancova N., *Knáz' D. Višnevec'kij u kozac'ko-tatars'komu protistoánni seredini XVI st.: istoriografičnij aspect problemi*, *Īstorični i politologični doslidženná: naukovij žurnal. Vidanná Donec'kogo nacional'nogo universitetu, istoričnij fakul'tet 3/4* (2011), pp. 28–33
- Romancova N., *Knáz' D. Višnevec'kij u sučasnij ukráins'kij istoriografii*, *Visnik Mariupol's'kogo deržavnogo universitetu. Seriá: Īstoriá, politologiá* 1 (2011), pp. 67–72
- Romancova N., *Postat' knázá Dmitra Višnevec'kogo u visvitlenni istorikiv ukráins'koí dlaspori*, *Shid* 7 (2010), pp. 119–122
- Sergijčuk V., *Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, Kíiv 2003
- Sergijčuk V., *Mihajlo Gruševs'kij pro Bajdu-Višnevec'kogo i sučasna istoriografía*, *Ukrans'kij istorik* 110–115 (1991–1992), vol. 28–29
- Storoženko A., *Knáz' Dmitrij Ivanovič Višneveckij, po narodnomu prozvišu Bajda*, *Kievskaja starina* 16 (1897), kn. 3, pp. 519–524

- Ševel'ov Ū., *Vasil' Mova i Kuliševa školavukraïns'kijpublicistici jpoezii*, [in:] V. Mova (Limans'kij), *Kuliš, Bajda i kozaki*, NewYork 1995
- Terlec'kij O., *İstoriâ ukraïns'koï deržavi*, Lviv 1924, vol. 2
- Vasilenko N., *Očerki po istorii Zapadnoj Rusi i Ukrainy*, Kiev 1916
- Vinar L., *Knâz' Dmitro Višnevec'kij*, München 1964