

## ARTICLES, STUDIES AND DISSERTATIONS

WŁADYLENA W. SOKYRSKA

(PAWEŁ TYCZYŃNA PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY IN UMAN)\*

TADEUSZ SROGOSZ

(JAN DŁUGOSZ UNIVERSITY IN CZĘSTOCHOWA)\*\*

### **The haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna in the Polish and Ukrainian historiography The Polish-Ukrainian duet**

---

**Summary.** In the article Polish and Ukrainian historians will analyze scientific achievements of researchers, who in the Polish and Ukrainian historiography occupy a prominent place as regards the haidamak movements and Koliyivshchyna, i.e. Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński, Władysław A. Serczyk, Petr Mirchuk, and Grigorij Hraban. Authors agree with the opinion that the historian does not judge, but tries to understand. The common Polish-Ukrainian research program on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna, thanks to which at least necessary queries and a discrepancy report will be developed, remains a main postulate. Only in that way the vivid use of history for current ideology and shaping of young generation will be minimized. Unfortunately, apart from substantive arguments, still there will remain other arguments of ideological or political context. The point is, however, that a discourse on Polish-Ukrainian relations in various epochs should be reduced to a normal scientific discussion that should take into account limitations resulting from cultural imputation only, the fact that has not been preserved on the part of both Ukrainian, and Polish side so far.

**Keywords:** haidamaks, Koliyivshchyna, Polish historiography, Ukrainian historiography.

---

\* The Faculty of History, The Department of General History and Methodology of Teaching / Wydział Historyczny, Katedra Historii Powszechnej i Metodyki Nauczania, e-mail: vlada.sokirskaya@ukr.net.

\*\* The Faculty of Philosophy and History, The Institute of History, The Department of Methodology of History and History of Historiography / Wydział Filologiczno-Historyczny, Instytut Historii, Zakład Metodologii Historii i Historii Historiografii, e-mail: tadeusz.srogosz@ajd.czyst.pl.

Currently, there are more and more bibliographic deficiencies resulting from rush, that is, the failure of researchers to meet the criterion of meticulousness. However, not only this factor deforms queries and narratives of scientists. The basic obstacle in the progress of scientific research, historical research included, is an ignorance of foreign literature. This usually leads to unilateral approaches, resulting from the ideological corset, cultural imputation, *etc.* In the current conditions of facilities in an intercultural communication, as well as rapprochements of civilizations, a barrier of ignorance of foreign scholars' achievements, in particular Ukrainian historians, should be minimized.

Kolijivshchyna became particularly well-established in the Ukrainian culture, mainly (but not only) thanks to works of Taras Shevchenko. Many Ukrainian historians wrote about Kolijivshchyna. Ukrainian and Russian historians, both in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, described events concerning haidamaks and Kolijivshchyna similarly<sup>1</sup>. As a rule, they rejected the thesis, that Russia provoked Kolijivshchyna, while pointing to its religious, ethnic and social background at the same time. It was supposed to be a rebellion of Orthodox peasants against the Catholic Polish nobility, an anti-feudal movement, favorable conditions of which (namely the

<sup>1</sup> A. Skałkovskij, *Najezdzy gajdamakov na Zapadnuju Ukrainy v XVIII stoletij, 1733–1768*, Odessa 1845; D. Mordovcev, *Gajdamaczina. Istoriczieskaja monografija*, Sankt Petersburg 1870; J. Szulgin, *Oczierki Koliszcziny po nieizdannym i izdannym dokumentam*, Kijev 1890; V. Antonowycz, *Umanskijsotnik Ivan Gonta*, "Kijevska Starina" 1882, vol. XI, pp. 250–276; M.V. Gorban, *Hajdamaczina*, Charkiv 1923; A. Dmitriev, *Koliszczina. Iz istorii klasovoj borby v Ukrainie vo vtoroj polovinie XVIII st.*, Moskva 1934; V.A. Gołobuckij, *Maksym Żeliezniak*, Moskva 1947; O.L. Lola, *Hajdamackij ruch na Ukraini 20–60 r. XVIII st.*, Kiiv 1965; G.J. Hraban, *Czi slid koristuvatisia terminom "Koliszczina"?*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1967, No. 8, pp. 154–158; F.P. Szevczenko, *Pro miżnarodni je znaczenja povstanja 1768 r. na Pravobieriežnij Ukraini*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1968, No. 9, pp. 11–15; S.J. Borovoj, *Do chronologii istorii gajdamacziny*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1968, No. 9, p. 117; I.O. Guržij, *Viznacznja podija v istorii ukrainskovo narodu: (do 200-lecia Koliszcziny)*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1968, No. 7, pp. 58–66; P. Mirchuk, *Koliszczina. Hajdamackie povstanja 1768 r.*, New York 1973; G.J. Hraban, *Spalach gnivu narodovo (Antifeudalne narodno-vizvolnje povstanja na Pravobieriežnij Ukraini u 1768–1769 r.)*, Kiiv 1989; D. Micyk, *Umań kozacka i hajdamacka*, Kiiv 2002. Works on the historiography of folk movements in the right-bank Ukraine in recent years do not take into account all literature. For example: V.J. Pavlenko, M.O. Batrakova, *Narodni ruchi na Pravobieriežni Ukraini u XVIII st.: istoriografija ta žeriela*, [www.irbis-nbuw.gov.ua](http://www.irbis-nbuw.gov.ua) (online: February 6, 2014).

Bar Confederation and the dissident case) were mentioned sometimes, as well. The haidamak tradition, which is a continuation of the Cossack one, was supposed to shape the Ukrainian people's awareness<sup>2</sup>.

Problems of the haidamak movements and Koliyivshchyna (interpreted by historians of Ukrainian national liberation movements) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century have not been fully examined, yet. What is more, there are discrepancies as to their course, chronology, *etc.*

In the article we will mainly focus on scientific achievements of researchers, who in the Polish and Ukrainian historiography occupy a prominent place as regards the haidamak movements and Koliyivshchyna, i.e. Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński, Władysław A. Serczyk, Petr Mirchuk, and Grigorij Hraban<sup>3</sup>. They lived under specific conditions, thus sometimes ideological assumptions were implemented in their works. Does it, however, relieve us of the obligation to know their vision of the history and, at least, the content of their works?

Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński was born on November 4, 1846, in Stepaszky on the Boh river, and died on April 16, 1930, in Józefów<sup>4</sup>. He came from a Polish noble family, started education in Winnica, and then learned in a middle school in Kiev. During the January uprising he was arrested and imprisoned in the Kiev citadel. He stayed in various prisons for several months. Until 1867, he worked at the property in Niesłuchów, where he enrolled at the School of Agriculture in Dubliany. He graduated in 1871. In the following years he was practicing agriculture, while working on agricultural issues and publishing in that field. Rawita-Gawroński traveled a lot around Europe, he knew many representatives of science, culture and politics. He lived in Lviv, Warsaw, Briukhovychi near Lviv, Przemyśl, Cracow, Zakopane and Wisła. He managed the purchased estates: Tarnawa near Dobromyl, Łozina near Lviv, and Józefów near Warsaw. In Tarnawa and Łozina he met with a hostile attitude of the Ukrainian population. He was the initiator

---

<sup>2</sup> V.A. Smolij, *Foirmuwanja socjalnoj svidomosti narodnych mas Ukraini b cho-di klasovoj borotby (druga połovina XVII-XVIII st.)*, Kiiiv 1985.

<sup>3</sup> Description of the entire Ukrainian historiography concerning the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna would significantly exceed the size of the article. It is rather an issue for a more comprehensive work.

<sup>4</sup> More information: E. Koko, *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości*, Gdańsk 2006.

and vice-president of the Scientific and Literary Association in Lviv, a co-organizer of the Ethnographical Society in Lviv, a corresponding member of the Society of the Polish Museum in Rapperswil, a vice-president of the Polish Journalists Association, a president of the Polish Union of Journalists, a member of the Society of Lovers of the History of Lviv, a publisher and an editor of the “Ruś” and “Litwa i Ruś”. He is an author of many novels, historical works, mainly on Borderlands, and numerous biographies.

Rawita-Gawroński underlined an inclination of the Orthodox Church’s representatives to fuel hatred for the Polish nobility and Jews. A prevailing religious fanaticism and bandit origins of the haidamaks, as well as bloodthirsty instincts of Ukrainian people, often appeared on pages of his book. He wrote, for example: “The only thought that animated those bloodthirsty crowds was either personal revenge, or a common desire to rob, or sometimes religious fanaticism of common people, who were savage by nature”<sup>5</sup>. It was supposed to be due to ethnic Turanian elements “in the blood of Ukrainian society of Rus”<sup>6</sup>. The author of those words, a graduate of the School of Agriculture, and an owner of a land estate in Volyn, assessed that a situation of borderland peasants was better than of those living in the Commonwealth’s western territories. He wrote: “Duties at that time were light, almost universally: almost no labor and tributes or fees (rents), not at all inconvenient”<sup>7</sup>. Thus, Rawita-Gawroński firmly rejected opinions, which suggested, that Ukrainian people were oppressed by the Polish nobility. Yet, while referring to a discussion on Russia’s impact on accidents in the right-bank Ukraine, he directly stated that Russia “having taken the left-bank Ukraine, never lost sight of the entire country, in other words, it also sought to seize the right-bank Ukraine”<sup>8</sup>. Rawita-Gawroński emphasized, that a commander of the Ukrainian and Podole parties, Józef Gabriel Stempkowski, was cruel towards rebellious peasants<sup>9</sup>.

The Ukrainian émigré historian and political scientist, Zenon E. Kohut, described the historiography of the haidamak rebellion

---

<sup>5</sup> F. Rawita-Gawroński, *Historja ruchów hajdamackich (w. XVIII)*, vol. I, Brody 1913, p. 200.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*, vol. I, p. VI.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, vol. I, p. 149.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, vol. I, p. 77.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, vol. II, p. 216, pp. 227–228.

and Koliyivshchyna as a formation of the myth<sup>10</sup>. First works dealing with Koliyivshchyna were diaries written by opponents of the uprising, who were depicting the insurgents as bandits, disobedient subjects, and Orthodox fanatics inspired by Russian agents<sup>11</sup>. Those memoirs, sharp in their tone, were of paramount importance when it came to a creation of the Polish myth about the haidamaks. That is why Kohut criticized the one-way explanation of Rawita-Gawroński, who presented the haidamak movement as a result of a degenerate character of the Ukrainian nation<sup>12</sup>. On the other hand, the Soviet historiography depicted the haidamak movements and Koliyivshchyna as a class struggle of poor peasants and Cossacks against a feudal order, a national liberation struggle aiming at a “meeting” with Russia<sup>13</sup>.

From the contemporary Polish historian’s point of view, Rawita-Gawroński’s position is unacceptable. Andrzej Stępnik stated, that his amateurism and clear conservatism turning into nationalism did not allow him to have an objective overview of the Ukrainian problem<sup>14</sup>. Undoubtedly, it was influenced by his contacts with the Ukrainian people, as well as ethnic theories of that time.

The interpretation of Rawita-Gawroński’s findings made by a contemporary Ukrainian historian is even more radical. Those arrangements, marked by hostility towards the Ukrainian people, are unauthorized generalizations.

Władysław A. Serczyk was born on July 23, 1935, in Cracow, in a family with traditions of Galician peasants and activists of the Polish People’s Party, and died on January 5, 2014, in Rzeszów<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Z.E. Kohut, *Myths old and new the Haidamak movement and the Koliyivshchyna 1768 in recent historiography*, “Harvard Ukrainian Institute” 1997, vol. I, No. 3, pp. 359–378.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 360.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 361–362.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 365–367.

<sup>14</sup> A. Stępnik, *Mit Kozaczyzny w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku*, [in:] *Mity i stereotypy w dziejach Polski i Ukrainy w XIX i XX wieku*, eds A. Czyżewski, R. Stobiecki, T. Toborek, L. Zaskilniak, Warszawa–Łódź 2012, p. 377.

<sup>15</sup> Biographic data: *Spętana Akademia. Polska Akademia Nauk w dokumentach władz PRL*, eds P. Pleskot, T.P. Rutkowski, vol. I, Warszawa 2009, p. 350; *Prof. Władysław Serczyk: Nieustannie się odnawiam*, [www.rzeszow.gazeta.pl](http://www.rzeszow.gazeta.pl) (online: February 5, 2014); *Nie żyje prof. Władysław Serczyk, pasjonat dziejów Rosji*, [www.wyborcza.pl](http://www.wyborcza.pl) (online: February 5, 2014); *Zmarł prof. dr hab. Władysław Serczyk*, [www.ur.edu.pl](http://www.ur.edu.pl) (online: January 19, 2014); *Zmarł prof. Władysław Serczyk*, [www.krakow.gosc.pl](http://www.krakow.gosc.pl) (online: January 19, 2014).

His father, Wojciech, a farmer and an engineer, participated in a defense of Lviv, he was a prisoner of German concentration camps; Serczyk's mother, Waleria, was a teacher. His brother, Jerzy Włodzimierz, also became a professor of history in Toruń. Serczyk studied history at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow and Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin. When he graduated in 1956, he worked at the Department of the History of the Nations of the USSR, which was then headed by Antoni Podraza. He became a Ph.D. in 1963 on the basis of a dissertation on a magnate farm in Podole in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and obtained habilitation qualifications in 1967. In 1971, he became the head of the Department of Eastern European History (Serczyk changed the name of the former Department of the History of the Nations of the USSR). In 1978, he became an associate professor, and in 1983, a full professor. In the years 1974–1978, he was a director of the Jagiellonian Library, and in the years 1979–1981, he was the vice-rector for science at the Jagiellonian University (he ceased to perform that function when he resigned from the membership in the Polish United Workers' Party). In the years 1986–1996, he was employed at the branch of the University of Warsaw in Białystok, where in 1993–1996 he was the vice-rector of the University of Warsaw for the Białystok branch. At that time a memorial book on the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth was published<sup>16</sup>. In 1997, he moved to Rzeszów, where he became a professor at the Higher Pedagogical School (from 2001 the University of Rzeszów) and a head of the Department of Eastern European History and Culture. Serczyk was awarded many times (e.g. in 2007 he received the prestigious "Przegląd Wschodni" award for his achievements in science), he belonged to many organizations. He was a chairman of the Polish-Ukrainian Commission on School Textbooks, twice a vice-president of the Main Board of the Polish Historical Society, a member of the Main Board of the Polish Literature Society, a member of the Presidium of the Historical Sciences Committee of the Polish Academy of Sciences, three times a member of the Central Commission for Scientific Degrees and Titles. He was a visiting professor at many universities in Ukraine, Russia, Germany, Austria and Canada. He also became the main historical consultant during the

---

<sup>16</sup> *Z dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana prof. dr. hab. Władysławowi Serczykowi w 60 rocznicę Jego urodzin*, Białystok 1995.

filming of Jerzy Hoffman's, his high school friend's, movie *Ogniem i mieczem*. In 2010, a commemorative book on the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Serczyk's birthday, and the 55<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his scientific work, was published<sup>17</sup>.

Serczyk's habilitation was devoted to Koliyivshchyna, namely the rise of the haidamaks and peasants in the years 1768–1771, which was published as a part of "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego" (Series: Prace Historyczne, issue No. 24)<sup>18</sup>. In first two chapters the researcher described the socio-economic, political and military situation, as well as moods on the eve of the uprising in "far-away Ukraine". Some of the information came from his previous work on the magnate farm. The following chapters were devoted to the analysis of the Koliyivshchyna's course: from a departure of Maksym Zalizniak's detachment from the Motroninsky Monastery, the march from Lisianka to Uman<sup>19</sup>, a retaliation of Polish authorities in cooperation with the Russian army, to the last acts of resistance of the haidamaks and peasants.

Serczyk wisely used archive materials from various centers in Ukraine and Poland, as well as memoirs, reports, letters, etc. It is necessary to emphasize his thorough knowledge of the historiography of Poland, Ukraine, Russia and the Soviet Union. The analysis of that historiography led him to exaggerated conclusions, consistent with the then methodological and ideological interpretation (albeit cautious): "It also seems, that in new circumstances Polish history has a duty, as well as much greater than ever possibility, to discuss an event that was permanently recorded in the history of Poland, Ukraine and Russia. The only book devoted to those issues is an obsolete and tendentious work by Rawita-Gawroński – it is the entire achievement of the Polish historiography in this respect. Time has come to free ourselves from a cyclical impact of the current moment, to finally *sine ira et studio* look at Koliyivshchyna from different perspectives of the contemporary society, assess how they were adopted by various social strata, that were

<sup>17</sup> *Między Odrą a Uralem. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Władysławowi Andrzejowi Serczykowi*, ed. W. Wierzbieniec, Rzeszów 2010.

<sup>18</sup> W.A. Serczyk, *Koliszczyzna*, Kraków 1968.

<sup>19</sup> According to Władysław A. Serczyk, it is impossible to determine the number of victims of the Uman massacre. Various figures give the number of 20–30 thousand people, of whom many died of cruel tortures. According to him, the most likely calculations are 12 thousand victims (*ibidem*, p. 99).

relevant to their current and future fate. In a word, Koliyivshchyna should be shown in its proper scale, not only on the broadest possible historical background, but also as an undivided part of it"<sup>20</sup>.

According to Serczyk, along with a basic conflict between the peasant and the feudal lord, there were also religious and national conflicts, which at the turn of 1767 and 1768 led to the emergence of a crisis, an increase in revolutionary moods<sup>21</sup>. The war with Bar confederates paralyzed a defensive capacity of the Commonwealth's feudal apparatus of power. Insurgents, in turn, counted on an armed Russian assistance, but they were hugely disappointed. When Russian rulers noticed that a social unrest might threaten order in the left-bank Ukraine, the tsarist army began to cooperate with the Ukrainian and Podole party led by Franciszek Ksawery Branicki, and later on by Józef Gabriel Stempkowski.

From the perspective of two hundred years after the uprising in Ukraine, Serczyk noticed values unnoticeable for the contemporaries. First of all, Koliyivshchyna was of a great importance for the awakening of the Ukrainian nation's ethnic unity, it became an important link in a process of forming a national tradition. According to Serczyk, one of the causative factors of the crisis of 1767–1768 was, arising from the class ground and inherent in the social consciousness of the Ukrainian peasantry, an aversion to the Polish element settled in the right-bank Ukraine. On the other hand, the Polish side, blinded by a desire to take revenge, did not draw necessary conclusions, and continued repressions and terror, even though it produced results contrary to the intended ones. Serczyk summed up that policy with those words: "Koliyivshchyna was a dangerous memento for the Polish reign in the eastern borderlands, that was proclaiming the impermanence and collapse of the entire social system at the time"<sup>22</sup>.

A book on the haidamaks, published twice by Literary Press in Cracow (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1972, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1978), was a significant extension of research on social unrest in Ukraine. Serczyk tried to reach the origins of the haidamaks phenomenon, while searching terms deriving from the Turkish language ("attack, plunder, rob")<sup>23</sup>. As a result of painstaking archive searches (municipal books), he remained

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 20.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 165–166.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 167.

<sup>23</sup> *Idem*, *Hajdamacy*, Kraków 1978, pp. 10–11.



with an original version, that the phenomenon began in the second decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (it was mentioned for the first time in a document of 1717). In the nineties of the 18<sup>th</sup> century last attacks on manors and taverns, followed by rapid escapes behind the border cordon, took place. In his book the author discussed the history of the haidamak movement from the very first references of it, largest rebellions, Koliyivshchyna among them, to the events taking place in the era of the Great Diet, when the fear of new Koliyivshchyna was growing.

The haidamak movement did not last long, but in the minds of Ukrainians and Poles it left long-lasting traces. Serczyk emphasized, that the haidamak movement became a permanent part of the national consciousness of Ukrainians. Thus, one should not be surprised “because the phenomenon, despite an existence of social movements of similar character in other areas, was after all specific to Ukraine, and inseparable from the past of the Ukrainian nation”<sup>24</sup>. After the liquidation of the Cossacks in its classical, autonomous form at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, and after the abolition of a Sich in 1709, the entire tradition of the social movement was taken over by the haidamaks. The rebirth of a Sich in 1734 in the left-bank Ukraine did not change the situation, because the Cossacks did not return to their former glory, ceasing almost completely to play the role of an independent political factor.

The author did not intend to write a story about the haidamaks only, a popular science work, but above all to show that movement on the complicated background of the 18<sup>th</sup>-century borderland reality. He argued that: “When discussing this issue, it is important not only to understand the socio-economic background that determines the course of this long-term plebeian rebellion, but also to pay attention to phenomena belonging to another sphere, the one that was called the superstructure – and, thus, the sphere of political, religious and national relations”<sup>25</sup>. Serczyk tried to display the haidamak movement as one, but not the only, phenomenon of Ukrainian lands’ reality in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

Currently, due to the dictates of publishing imposed by the so-called parameterization of science, the phenomenon that years ago Andrzej Feliks Grabski described as a de-professionalization of the Polish historiography, intensifies. It may be compared to

<sup>24</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 6.

the law of the market on crowding out good money by the bad<sup>26</sup>. That is why more and more often, apart from other shortcomings, there are bibliographical deficiencies resulting mainly from rush. Some contemporary authors want to synthesize their findings and interpretations too soon, thus constructing syntheses, or popular science works. They do not understand, that the popular science narrative is difficult, and it easily falls into a trap of simplifications, banal sentences, that are unanchored in a socio-cultural context. Such a narrative requires erudition, which is achieved after tedious analytical research. Serczyk wrote his book on the haidamaks after thorough source research based on solid non-source knowledge. Some insufficiencies may only arise from minor bibliographical deficiencies (e.g. ignorance of works, that appeared after the release of *Koliszczyzna*, namely those of Grigorij J. Hraban and Petro Mirchuk), or substantive flaws (including the dating of the activities of commissions of order as early as February 1789)<sup>27</sup>.

When writing a book on haidamaks, Serczyk was well aware of the difficulties that were piling up during the queries, especially a construction of the narrative: "Taking up this topic today, a historian faces a very difficult and thankless task. On the already existing formal artistic visions and traditional monographic studies, in which there were presented views of either the borderline nobleman outraged by the haidamaks' severity, or the nationalist, who turns his eyes at the cruelty and tries to justify absolutely all actions of the haidamaks, one must impose a new vision. It must meet a number of important conditions: be based on a new class interpretation of the phenomenon; be a scientific study, not a literary fiction, and at the same time reach as wide a circle of readers as possible. If any of these assumptions are to be omitted, a desirability of undertaking such a task is questioned"<sup>28</sup>. It was, therefore, clear for Serczyk, that the historian's task is not to judge, but to embed the heroes of his narrative (in this case the haidamaks) in the socio-cultural context, as well as not to succumb to emotions, e.g. nationalistic ones.

In 1979, the first edition of a textbook on the Ukrainian history was published. Chronologically it covered the state history from

---

<sup>26</sup> A.F. Grabski, *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej*, Poznań 2000, p. 246.

<sup>27</sup> Probably Serczyk confused civilian-military commissions of order with commissions of good order.

<sup>28</sup> W.A. Serczyk, *Hajdamacy...*, p. 8.

the Stone Age to modern times. The second edition (ed. 1990) was already uncensored, while in the third one (ed. 2001) Serczyk added materials that covered also first years of the Ukrainian independence in the nineties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century<sup>29</sup>. The author tried to show the multidimensionality and colorfulness of history, linking the history of Ukraine with our history, and with the history of Russia, as well. He moderately wrote, that in the nineties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century “social consciousness of the Polish and Ukrainian nations began to change. That change has a truly revolutionary character. Place of a traditional perception of the neighbor as, on the one hand, «the murderer» bathed in the blood of an innocent, and on the other, the oppressor, as well as the polonizer, is now occupied by the images of the nation perseveringly fighting for its right to live in its own country, and another, wrongly treated and neglected in the past, potential ally, which can provide reliable support in this fight. It is true, that emotions still play an important role not only in mutual relations, but also in an approach to a common, often dramatic, even tragic, past; yet, a laborious work of historians allows to eliminate the stereotypical treatment of history”<sup>30</sup>.

Serczyk was engaged in the popularization of history. In 2000, he published a popular science work, richly illustrated, devoted to the events of the late sixties and seventies of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as part of the series “The history of the nation and the Polish state”<sup>31</sup>. The author, undoubtedly literary talented, synthesized issues of the dissident affair, the Bar Confederation, Koliyivshchyna, the Russo-Turkish war, the first partition, and the Partition Diet. In fact, all those issues concerned directly, or indirectly Ukraine, where great problems of international and domestic politics, social, religious and national conflicts, as well as human interests and passions, were concentrated. Serczyk was the most appropriate author to popularize that part of history, because of his erudition and solid own research.

From the point of view of the contemporary Polish historian, Serczyk’s opinion regarding the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna is acceptable. It is a multi-factorial interpretation of the conflict in the right-bank Ukraine that covers social, religious, national, and international problems. At the same time, Serczyk did not avoid difficult

<sup>29</sup> *Ide m*, *Historia Ukrainy*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 2001.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 5–6.

<sup>31</sup> *Ide m*, *Początek końca. Konfederacja barska i I rozbiór Polski*, Warszawa 2000.

matters affecting Polish-Ukrainian relations. He set the postulate of a laborious work of historians to eliminate elements of emotions and ideology.

Views of the Ukrainian historian are similar, although the number of victims in a humane slaughter that was quoted in Serczyk's recent publications are exaggerated.

Petro Mirchuk was born on June 26, 1913, in Dobrowlany near Stryj (those lands belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire at that time), he died on May 16, 1999, in Philadelphia<sup>32</sup>. In the thirties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century he studied law at the University of Lviv. He was a member of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) since its creation in 1929, and later a reporter of the National Executive of the OUN; he participated in the publishing of the "Bulletin of the National Executive of OUN in the West Ukrainian Territories", and other Ukrainian magazines. In the years 1933–1939, because of the above-mentioned activity in the Ukrainian nationalist movement, he was being repeatedly arrested by the Polish police. In 1939, that is after an aggression of the Third Reich and the Soviet Union on Poland, he left for Prague, where until 1941 he continued his studies at the Ukrainian Free University. In that year he was arrested by the Gestapo and imprisoned in the German concentration camp in Auschwitz. During an evacuation of prisoners on January 25, 1945, Mirchuk was sent to the camp at Mauthausen, where he was liberated on May 6, 1945.

After his liberation, Mirchuk stayed in Western Europe, while his family, that remained in the Soviet Union, was repressed. His parents died during mass deportations of Ukrainians to Siberia, one of his sisters was tortured by the Soviet security service, the other two barely survived the Gehenna and slave labor in the working camps. It was not until 1991, that Mirchuk had the opportunity to meet the surviving members of his family.

Mirchuk was still active in the Ukrainian nationalist movement. In the years 1945–1946, he was the chairman of the émigré Central Union of Ukrainian Students, and in the years 1948–1952, a member of the Board of Foreign Branches of the OUN. At that time he worked in editorial offices of Ukrainian and German magazines. In 1952, he emigrated to the United States, where in 1957, he obtained an American citizenship. Initially, he worked in the indus-

---

<sup>32</sup> Biographical data: *Mirczuk Petro*, [in:] *Encyklopedia istorii Ukrainy*, vol. VI, Kiiiv 2009, p. 790; [www.ukrweekly.com](http://www.ukrweekly.com) (online: January 23, 2014).

try. In 1959, he got a master's degree in librarianship at Drexel University in Philadelphia, then he worked as a librarian in several colleges and universities, and finally he became a lecturer. In 1969, he became a Ph.D. in history at the Free Ukrainian University in Munich.

Mirchuk wrote over 20 books on the history of Ukraine. Almost all were devoted to the history of Ukraine in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. His historical work (studies and source materials) concentrates mainly on the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the Ukrainian nationalist movement and its leaders (e.g. Stepan Bandera, Yevhen Konovalets, Roman Shukhevych), as well as the Ukrainian statehood in 1917–1920. Mirchuk was also writing for journals in which, for example, he denied the existence of a traditional Ukrainian nationalism.

In the United States Mirchuk was a member of many scientific and social societies, as well as an activist of youth organizations. He was a head of the League of Ukrainian Political Prisoners in America, he was also granted a prestigious membership in the American Chapel of Four Chaplains Foundation.

Taking into account the very article, the most important Mirchuk's work is a book on Koliyivshchyna published in 1973 in the United States by the Shevchenko Scientific Society<sup>33</sup>. The book consists of a foreword by Matvei Stachiw, a historiographic introduction, ten chapters, a list of sources, as well as bibliography, and index of persons.

The foreword was written by Matvei Stachiw (1895–1978), an Ukrainian lawyer, historian and political activist<sup>34</sup>. In the interwar period he became an active member of the Ukrainian nationalist movement. In 1939, he emigrated to Germany, and in 1949, to the United States. He was a professor of law and administration at the Ukrainian Free University of Munich, an active member of the World Congress of Free Ukrainians, and in the years 1969–1974, the president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society.

Stachiw referred to a concept of the Ukrainian history developed by Mykhailo Hrushevsky, who could not have realized it due to the introduction of Moscow-Soviet power. Among other things he had not finished his work on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna. Ukrainian historians after Hrushevsky omitted the state factor, they portrayed Koliyivshchyna as a non-programmatic movement. How-

<sup>33</sup> P. Mirchuk, *Koliszczina. Hajdamackie povstanja 1768 r.*, New York 1973.

<sup>34</sup> *Stachiv Matviej. Biografia*, [www.ukrcenter.com](http://www.ukrcenter.com) (online: February 10, 2014).

ever, Mirchuk's work was a continuation of Hrushevsky's thought. Koliyivshchyna was an uprising that had a national program. It assumed the reconstruction of the Ukrainian Hetman-Cossack state, following an example of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Insurgents were fighting against Polish occupation authorities, noble and colonial relations, in the name of the defense of the Orthodox Church. Currently, Stachiw continued, not only intellectuals are appalled by the fact that insurgents, while fighting against occupation authorities, massacred Polish nobility and other supporters of Polish power in the right-bank Ukraine. However, massacres mentioned in Polish government sources and memoirs must be considered in a historical context, that is one should take into account that the Hague Convention had not existed at that time. To justify the haidamaks and peasants, Matvei Stachiw gave examples of the Thirty Years' War slaughters of Jews, as well as the murdering of the nobility and Jews during Khmelnytsky's uprising on the one hand, and Jeremi Wiśniowiecki's and Stefan Czarniecki's pacification actions, on the other. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century we also have examples of genocide: German anti-Semitism during World War II, atomic bombs dropped on civilians in Japan<sup>35</sup>.

Mirchuk began his historiographical introduction with a remark, that none of the pages of the history of Ukraine suffered such a "humiliation and defamation" on the part of enemies, namely Poles and Muscovites, as Koliyivshchyna, the uprising of the haidamaks and the Ukrainian people<sup>36</sup>. Unfortunately, they received the support of some Ukrainian historians. Further on, the author discussed source materials, consisting mainly of dairies reporting, according to him, events in Uman not from the position of an eyewitness: Paweł Mładanowicz, Weronika Krebsowa, and Jan Lippoman. It must be said, that Mirchuk was well informed as regards Polish historiography regarding the haidamak movement, including the then new publication, Władysław A. Serczyk's monograph on Koliyivshchyna. Initially, he praised the Polish historian for his objectivity unpolluted by chauvinistic views. Then, however, he stated, that Serczyk trusted memoirs too much, which was a shortcoming of the narrative of all Polish historians without exception. Russian historians, in turn, represented the Moscow point of view that was in accordance with Empress Catherine II's "Black Hramota".

---

<sup>35</sup> P. Mirchuk, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

Mirchuk less emotionally approached the Ukrainian historiography, especially that of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (e.g. works of Volodymyr Antonovych). At the end he added, that the book on Koliyivshchyna was edited on the occasion of the 200<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the uprising. He wrote: "It is high time, that the most probable and the best, objective description of events in the right-bank Ukraine in 1768–1769 should be presented on the base of what has been published on the Koliyivshchyna so far"<sup>37</sup>.

The first chapter of the book on Koliyivshchyna by Mirchuk is devoted to the characteristics of the right-bank Ukraine in the haidamaks' period, the population structure in the area, political relations and Poland's socio-political system (such name was used by the author) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, a culture and morality of the Polish nobility and Polish armed forces. The so-called haidamak movement, existing, according to Mirchuk, in 1702–1775 only in the right-bank Ukraine, was directed against "Polish invaders", who oppressed the Ukrainian people<sup>38</sup>.

In the second chapter there is a description of the haidamaks until 1768, their beginnings at the turn of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, and their first movements, as well as further actions. Ukraine's location between Poland, Russia and Turkey, Hetman Ivan Mazepa's maneuvers between those countries, and finally an agreement without taking into account Ukrainians' interests, gave the possibility to further "Polish occupation". The activity of Semen Paliy and the uprising of 1702 were considered by Mirchuk as a kind of bridge between the Cossacks and the haidamaks. Mirchuk stated, that the Turkish term the "haidamak" means nothing less than a "rebel", or an "insurgent"<sup>39</sup>.

In the third chapter Mirchuk discussed the course of Koliyivshchyna. When the uprising broke out, Maksym Zalizniak moved to Uman, a fortified seat of the Potocki family. Thanks to Ivan Gonta's help he won the city. Mirchuk criticized the term "humane slaughter", that was used in Polish diary literature, as well as the number of 5–18 thousand victims of Polish nobility and Jews<sup>40</sup>. He wanted to balance that data with Ivan Gonta's attitude, who apparently saved many Polish women and children, by sheltering them in the

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 29.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 31.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 52.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 82.

Orthodox Church. In Uman Maksym Zalizniak became a hetman, Ivan Gonta a colonel of Uman; other leaders received prominent positions, too. From July 1768 to May 1769, insurgents began armed operations against “Polish occupiers” and “Russian advocates”<sup>41</sup>. As a result, the Kiev and Bratslav provinces were cleansed of Poles. However, there was a bloody Polish-Muscovite carnage of the Ukrainian population. For example, in Lisianka about 300 Ukrainians died, while in 1769 and in the following years the “bloody orgies of Polish **legislation**” lasted there [bold print – P. Mirchuk]<sup>42</sup>.

The next three chapters are devoted to relations between Koliyivshchyna and the Zaporozhian Sich, a situation in the left-bank Ukraine, and Moscow’s policy towards Koliyivshchyna. Mirchuk wrote about Peter I’s reign, when the first liquidation of a Sich occurred, which after some time was rebuilt, though. After initial waiting, Russian authorities issued a strict ban on any assistance for insurgents. The Cossack poverty did not want to follow the ban, which, in turn, gave an excuse for a second liquidation of a Sich. Mirchuk summed up that part of his book with the remark, that two Russian tyrants destroyed a Sich<sup>43</sup>.

With a support of the Zaporozhian Cossacks Koliyivshchyna was directed mainly against Poland with a goal to liberate the right-bank Ukraine from the Polish rule. Although battles lasted in the right bank, Mirchuk became interested in a situation of the left-bank Ukraine, too. Therefore, he discussed such issues as the population of the area (called by the tsarist authorities Little Russia), as well as its political history from Peter I. Because of the Russian military power, there was no possibility of extending the uprising to the left side of the Dnieper. The author added, that the concept of the “Iron Curtain” is not an idea of communist Moscow, as it was effectively used in tsarist Russia<sup>44</sup>.

Mirchuk assumed, that the role of the Muscovites in the ruthless, bloody suppression of Koliyivshchyna through an armed intervention and assistance to noble Poland is well-known and sufficiently documented. The author did not intend to settle the authorship of the “Golden Hramota”, a fictional Catherine II’s decree, in which she was to order the expulsion of the Polish nobility, Jews and

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 89.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 98.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 118.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 129.



clerics of the Uniate from the right-bank Ukraine. He pointed out, however, that the Ukrainian people always showed favor to the Russians, brothers in the Orthodox faith. Mirchuk emphasized Moscow's primal hostility to the Ukrainian liberation struggle, which was clearly expressed in the "Black Hramota", Catherine II's decree of July 9 (20), 1768<sup>45</sup>. Actions of the tsarist army against the insurgents resulted from those real intentions of Russian authorities.

At the beginning of the seventh chapter Mirchuk asked the question about a true nature of Koliyivshchyna. Was it: "a blind rebellion of unruly peasantry against its masters, the prowling of robbery groups plundering other people's goods, the class struggle of the exploited proletariat against noblemen exploiters, the fight to defend Orthodoxy against the Catholic religion, the Ukrainian national uprising against Polish invaders, or something else?"<sup>46</sup>. Former Polish and Russian historians assured that insurgents had no political goals, and could not have had them. However, Mirchuk stated that Koliyivshchyna had a clear character of the national liberation struggle, so it was the uprising of Ukrainian nation directed against the Polish and Russian occupiers<sup>47</sup>.

In the eighth chapter Mirchuk extensively described participants of Koliyivshchyna, volunteers joining ranks of insurgents by conviction, wanting to fight Polish reign and Russian intervention. Nineteen Zaporozhians, headed by Zalizniak, started the rebellion, to which Ukrainian peasants and townsmen joined spontaneously. Then, he described figures of the leader-heroes: hetman Zalizniak and colonels: Ivan Gonta, Semen Nieżywy, Mykyta Szwaczko<sup>48</sup>, Andrei Żurba, Stankiewich (formerly a captain of the Russian army), Ivan Bondarenko. The diarists, followed by Polish and some Ukrainian historians (including Grigorij J. Hraban), argued, that archimandrite Melchizedek Znaczko-Jaworski, an active defender of the Orthodox Church in the right-bank Ukraine, caused an outbreak of the rebellion. Mirchuk, on the other hand, stated, that no fact indicated that he was an organizer, or an initiator of the uprising<sup>49</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 137–143.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 146.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 178.

<sup>48</sup> Mirchuk did not give the name.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 257–264.

In the ninth chapter Mirchuk returned to basic problems of Koliyivshchyna, thus summing up and concluding all his arguments. In the face of discrepancies in dating, the author stated, that the beginning of the uprising took place at the turn of April and May 1768, and the conquer of Uman should be dated on June 21. Maksym Zalizniak was an organizer and a leader of the Ukrainian nation's uprising. After the Cossak Council's meeting on June 22, 1768 in Uman, where the renewal of the hetman title was announced, he was nominated a Hetman of Ukraine<sup>50</sup>. Mirchuk assigned part of the "Golden Hramota" to Melchizedek Znaczk-Jaworski. Although the Ukrainian historian gave various hypotheses regarding the origin of the name "Koliyivshchyna", he considered them irrelevant. When analyzing the "Kodnia Book", Mirchuk stated, that from mid-1768 to mid-1770, the Polish "legislation" passed 300 death sentences by beheading, hammering, or tearing by horses. He added: "And Kodnia, although the bloodiest, was just one of numerous places in the right-bank Ukraine, where noble-Polish «torch of culture», Catholics, exercised such judgments and executions over Ukrainian victims"<sup>51</sup>. The uprising of the Ukrainian nation of 1768–1769 can be compared to other great liberation uprisings of the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century: the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and the Kościuszko Uprising.

In the end Mirchuk stated, that "Koliyivshchyna, as a historical fact, as well as a harbinger of Ukrainian national tradition, is an important jewel of the state tradition, which combines an idea of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people from era of Cossacks with the dawn of the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation, of which the prophet was Taras Shevchenko, «a born grandson of one of the haidamaks»"<sup>52</sup>.

The assessment of Mirchuk's interpretation of the haidamak movement and Koliyivshchyna must be ambiguous. On the one hand, his work is extensive, based on numerous sources and writing materials, it was written efficiently, with knowledge of the historical workshop. On the other hand, for the Polish historian Mirchuk's book on Koliyivshchyna is unacceptable due to the selective choice

---

<sup>50</sup> There is a conviction in the Ukrainian émigré historiography, that Russia appropriated the idea of the Hetmanate. See Z.E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1988.

<sup>51</sup> P. Mirchuk, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 306.

of facts (e.g. almost complete omission of actions of the haidamaks' repressor, commander Józef Gabriel Stempkowski), biased theses, use of specific conceptual apparatus ("Polish occupation" included).

From the Polish point of view, the search for a national program, or state thought, in Koliyivshchyna is too far-reaching. I understand that Ukrainian historians, while searching the national identity, are trying to equate it with the Cossack Hetmanate, that had been functioning since Bohdan Khmelnytsky's uprising to 1764, and the final liquidation of Zaporozhian Cossacks in the seventies of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (during Koliyivshchyna, in 1768 in Uman, an attempt was made to renew the Hetmanate). However, it was a form of an autonomy of the Zaporozhian army, so in that case it is difficult to write about any statehood.

Mirchuk's point of view was shared by some other historians of the Ukrainian emigration. However, there were other opinions, too. For example, a historian of Ukrainian socio-political thought and publicist, Ivan Łysiak-Rudnycki, when describing the Polish-Ukrainian relations as the "burden of history", wrote in a balanced way: "The right-bank Ukraine, restored at such a huge cost, still remained a source of weakness of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the last decades of its existence. During the 18<sup>th</sup> century people's riots touched the right-bank. The Ukrainian peasants, although deprived of the Cossack organization, did not agree with the serfdom, and still hated the Polish nobility. Numerous people's uprisings, the so-called haidamak rebellions, ended with a huge peasant uprising in 1768, called Koliyivshchyna. Tragic events of 1768 left a deep mark in the consciousness of both societies, and were a source of inspiration for Polish and Ukrainian writers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Continuous anxiety on the Polish part of Ukraine gave Russia the possibility of meddling in the affairs of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On the one hand, Russia assumed the role of a defender of the Orthodox Church so persecuted under the Polish rule, on the other hand, it provided military support against insurgents. Koliyivshchyna was suppressed by the Russian army"<sup>53</sup>.

Among Ukrainian historians there are different judgements of such a radical position. For example, Taras Czuchlib was deliberating about such concepts as: the Uman slaughter, the Uman

---

<sup>53</sup> I. Łysiak-Rudnycki, *Między historią a polityką*, tr. M. Buchalik, Wrocław 2012, p. 178.

tragedy, or the Uman victory? He criticized views of Yakovenko and Leonid Zaszkilniak, wrongly suggesting that they underlined only one side of the haidamak movements, during which the slaughter of innocent Polish people continued<sup>54</sup>. Unfortunately, he stated, their findings are present in textbooks. Czuchlib also discussed contrary views of Panteleimon Kulish and Volodymyr Antonovych. In conclusion he wrote: “The Uman victory of the peasantry commanded by Cossacks (both of the right-bank, and the Zaporozhians) in 1768 has definitely confirmed the long-standing existence of an idea of the Ukrainian nation’s aspiration since the revolution led by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky”<sup>55</sup>. In response to that point, an article was published in the historical Ukrainian magazine<sup>56</sup>.

Grigorij J. Hraban was born on May 9, 1902, in the village of Wielki Mołodków in the Novgorod-Volyn district, in a large peasant family, he died on January 30, 1990, in Uman<sup>57</sup>. A researcher, who studied his life and works, Władylena W. Sokyrka, separated the following stages in his life journey: Novgorod-Volyn (1902–1934), the first stage in Uman (1934–1938), Perm (1938–1946), the second stage in Uman (1946–1950), Krasnoyarsk (1950–1956), and the third stage in Uman (1956–1990)<sup>58</sup>.

Hraban received a thorough secondary education. When he graduated from the middle school, he spoke several languages: Latin, German, French and Polish. When in a middle school, he was involved in the activities of various organizations and circles of interests. A medical commission did not qualify him for military service, because he was diagnosed with tuberculosis.

When he graduated from the middle school, Hraban took up a job as a German language teacher in the Volyn district. At that time he married Maria, a teacher, with whom he had two sons. In 1924, he was transferred to the Korosten district, where he

<sup>54</sup> T. Czuchlib, “Umanska riznja”, “Umanska tragedia” czy “Umanska pieriemoha”, [www.getmanat.org](http://www.getmanat.org) (online: May 2, 2016).

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>56</sup> T. Srogosz, *Umanska rzeź, Umanska tragedia, czy Umanske zwycięstwo?*, “Istoricznij Archiv. Naukovi Studij” [Mikołajiv] 2017, issue 14, pp. 134–139.

<sup>57</sup> Biographical data: V.V. Sokyrka, *Istoria Grigorij Juchimowicz Hraban: žitevij szlach ta naukova spadszczina (1902–1990 r.)*, Uman 2009; [www.arheolog-ck.ru](http://www.arheolog-ck.ru) (online: January 17, 2014); [www.kraeznavstvo.at.ua](http://www.kraeznavstvo.at.ua) (online: January 17, 2014). Władylena W. Sokyrka has also published some articles on Hraban’s activities, but we can assume, that a monography is the most complete version of the results of her research.

<sup>58</sup> V.V. Sokyrka, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

worked as an inspector of the Department of Education, and later, a headmaster of the school. In 1925, he joined the Communist Party (b) of Ukraine. In 1931, he graduated from the Kyiv Institute of Social Education (currently the Kyiv National Pedagogical University). Hraban was promoted in the structures of the Communist Party. The party authorities of the Korosten district directed him at that time to teach political economy, in 1932, he was accepted as an absentee aspirant at the Institute of Red Professors, he also became a member of the party's regional authorities. In 1933, however, Hraban was expelled from the party. The reason was said to be his "kulak" origin.

In 1934, Hraban's life changed once again. His membership in the party was restored, and he was sent as a director to the Pedagogical Technical School in Uman. In 1938, he raised his qualifications, as he graduated from the Historical Department of the Kiev Pedagogical Institute. In 1938, when he became a deputy director of the Pedagogical Institute in Uman, he was arrested and sent to Usollazy in today's Perm district.

In 1946, Hraban was released and returned from his exile to Uman. Here he learned, that one of his sons died on the front, and other stayed in a military hospital. Initially, he did not have a job, later he was employed in an industrial plant as an accountant. In 1950, he was arrested again and sent to the Krasnoyarsk district, where he worked as a senior accountant.

In 1956, Hraban returned to Uman, where he became a director of the Museum of Sightseeing. He held that position for many years, and at the same time he was taking part in excavations in the Cherkasy and Poltava regions, later also in the area of Uman. At that time he became involved in the sightseeing and archaeological activities, cooperating, inter alia, with the Institute of Archeology of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In the years 1963–1966, he lectured basics of archeology at the Pedagogical Institute in Uman.

During the third Uman stage, both when working in various institutions in Uman, and on the retirement, he became fully involved in the scientific activity: scientific conferences, translations from French and Polish into Ukrainian, publications in the field of archeology, the history of Koliyivshchyna in the right-bank Ukraine in the years 1768–1769, the history of Uman, in particular the history of the "Sofiyivsky Park", and the liberation of that city from German occupation. Hraban was also involved in a pop-

ularization of knowledge. He created the Regional Department for the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture, gave lectures, constantly cooperated with local and national magazines (also illustrated dailies).

Hraban had been examining the haidamak movement in the right-bank Ukraine for several decades. He conducted archival searches in Kiev, Lviv, Moscow and Leningrad (now St. Petersburg), gave speeches at scientific conferences, and published scientific articles on the subject<sup>59</sup>. Hraban's scientific activity, namely speeches at conferences and publication of his articles on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna, fell, without exception, in the second half of the sixties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He probably stopped that activity, because of the criticism of other national and émigré historians (e.g. Petro Mirchuk), as well as polemics in magazines<sup>60</sup>.

It was not until before his death in 1989, when Hraban published a monograph on Koliyivshchyna in the right-bank Ukraine in the university's publishing house in Kiev<sup>61</sup>. The title of that work was in line with the Ukrainian historiographical paradigm, prevailing until the eighties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Koliyivshchyna was supposed to be "an explosion of national/folk anger", an "anti-feudal, national-liberation uprising".

In addition to the aforementioned archival sources, in his research Hraban used source publications, including the *Kodnia Book of Legal Affairs* edited in Ukraine in 1931. When taking into account Polish authors, he polemicized with the theses of Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński, only mentioned the book of Władysław A. Serczyk on Koliyivshchyna, but he did not know that author's book on the haidamaks. He also omitted works of other Polish historians, e.g. Władysław Konopczyński.

<sup>59</sup> G.J. Hraban, *Dwa dokumenta pro Koliwzczynu*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1966, No. 2, pp. 11–113; idem, *Z istorii hajdamaczczyny*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1968, No. 6, pp. 96–106; idem, *Memuary jak istoriograficzne źeriele vivczienja narodno-vizvolnovo povstanja 1768 r.*, [in:] *Koliwzczyna: Materialy jubilejnoj naukovej sesji, prisviaszczenoj 200-riczjupovstanja*, Kiiv 1970, pp. 134–146; idem, *Pro spogadi Pavla Mładanowicza*, "Naukova Dumka" 1969, No. 4, pp. 47–65; idem, V.S. Kryszovskij, *Recenzja na knigu O.P. Lola "Hajdamackij ruch na Ukraini 20–60-ch rr. XVIII st."*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnal" 1966, No. 5, pp. 147–149.

<sup>60</sup> More information: V.V. Sokyrska, *op. cit.*, pp. 94–95, 101–102.

<sup>61</sup> G.J. Hraban, *Spatach...*

In the first chapter Hraban outlined the situation of the right-bank Ukraine on the eve of the uprising, where a class conflict between the Polish nobility and the Ukrainian Orthodox people was noticed. According to him, the Ukrainian people suffered under the Polish-noble oppression. The political situation in noble Poland was complicated due to the outbreak of the Bar Confederation.

The second chapter described the first stage of Koliyivshchyna under the leadership of Maksym Zalizniak (the second half of May – the first half of July, 1768). Hraban mentioned the beginning of the uprising, and then the “liberation” of Uman. Despite two thousand killed in the city, as Zalizniak quoted, the author of the monograph suggested, that the real number of victims was lower<sup>62</sup>. After Uman other cities were “liberated”, as the uprising spread throughout the entire Dnieper Ukraine, Polesie, and the Bratslav region. Soon, however, Russian generals began to cooperate with commander Franciszek Ksawery Branicki. Yet, when they saw the awkwardness of that Pole, tsarist generals began to suppress the uprising on their own. As a result, several hundred insurgents, including leaders of Koliyivshchyna, were captured. General Mikhail Nikitycz Kreczelnikov ordered, that captured Zaporozhians and peasants should be sent to Kiev and Branicki, respectively.

In the third chapter Hraban described the second stage of the uprising (July – December, 1768), when the empress was trying to suppress the insurgent movement, and trials of the Polish administration and nobility over insurgents were taking place. On the night of July 8, 1768, to Serby, where commander Branicki had his headquarters, arrived a convoy leading 680 shackled insurgents, among whom was also Ivan Gonta. Branicki appointed a court-martial, that punished the haidamaks, but it was his successor, Józef Stempkowski, who finished the work. Hraban thoroughly described Ivan Gonta’s execution, which took place on July 14, 1768. He also wrote about 700 people’s hanging in various cities and villages, and an exile for works to Kamianets-Podilskyi, Lviv and Warsaw of those, who showed remorse<sup>63</sup>. In a letter to the king, and a proclamation to the nobility, Branicki had already announced the end of the fights, but the people’s movement continued and it was even spreading to Lithuania.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 68. Polish historians give much higher numbers, see footnote 19.

<sup>63</sup> G.J. Hraban, *Spalach...*, pp. 110–111.

The fourth chapter was devoted to the end of the uprising, which, according to Hraban, took place in January–April 1769. The author believes, that the beginning of that period coincided with Stempkowski taking command of Ukrainian and Podole subdivisions on January 23, 1769<sup>64</sup>. Dating of that fact is one of a few new scientific findings in Hraban's book. The reconstruction of military activities of the newly nominated commander was based on earlier findings of other historians (Kalnińoty, Lisianka). Hraban concentrated on the analysis of the *Kodnia Book*, in which there were notes from February 24, 1769, to September 28, 1773<sup>65</sup>. He noticed, that in Kodnia a collective responsibility was applied, people were killed for members of their families. Stempkowski directed some of the convicts to work in his estates. Hraban thoroughly discussed individual investigations, during which tortures were applied. However, terror did not break the spirit of the nation. The haidamaks were active in the following years, but the author did not devote much attention to that fact.

Conclusions regarding events of 1768–1769 drawn by Hraban, who quoted classics of Marxism-Leninism, communards, “the foundation of the Great October”<sup>66</sup>, are ridiculous not only from the point of view of today's historians, but also of those of the second half of the eighties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. According to him, Koliyivshchyna was the largest uprising in Ukraine, in which participated Ukrainian, Moldovan and Polish peasants, Ukrainian townsmen, tsar soldiers, impoverished Ukrainian noblemen, representatives of the Orthodox clergy, and even converted Jews. Thus, the Zaporozhian army had an international composition, which resulted in a community of interests of working people of different nationalities. Koliyivshchyna was a kind of a class struggle, in which the haidamak movement played an organizing role. Insurgents wanted to incorporate the right-bank Ukraine to Russia, but Catherine II had other plans for the Commonwealth, which were unknown to the leaders of Koliyivshchyna. Hraban saw signs of peasant movements not only in Lithuania, but also in Mazovia, Lesser Poland, and even in the Sieradz voivodship<sup>67</sup>.

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 133.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 136.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 141–146.

<sup>67</sup> It should be noted, though, that he referred to the Polish history handbook, which was published in the Stalinist period. See *Historia Polski*, vol. II, part 1 (1764–1795), eds S. Kieniewicz, W. Kula, Warszawa 1958, p. 66.



Tadeusz Srogosz in a book on the history of the south-eastern borderlands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries, due to the coincidence in time and long-term publishing process, failed to discuss Hraban's work published by the Uman scientific community. Thus, he assessed Hraban's research on Koliyivshchyna as follows: "Perhaps in Ukrainian scientific circles (especially in Uman) a diverse organizational activity and scientific research of Hraban, as well as his truly renaissance interests are appreciated. Still, I am not convinced by his findings on the haidamak movement and Koliyivshchyna. One may ask the question: did the scholar make new factual findings, if he failed to take into account a significant part of the Polish literature, and he did not make use of Polish manuscripts from libraries and archives? The factual construction is based on earlier findings of Polish (mainly, despite an almost complete lack of references, Władysław A. Serczyk), as well as Ukrainian and Russian historians. One can point to a few detailed factual supplements, for example the dating of Stempkowski's taking command of the Ukrainian and Podole parties. At the interpretation level, though, in 1989 Hraban did not rise above the Soviet paradigm of the Ukrainian history constructed in 1936–1954, and ideological assumptions forced in the previous era"<sup>68</sup>. The researcher, being a guest at the National Pedagogical University in Uman on May 16–20, 2017, heard an explanation that in 1989 Hraban could not have published all the results of his research on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna for political reasons.

Over 20 years after the death of Hraban, the Uman scientific environment published the entire legacy of its polyhistor as regards the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna<sup>69</sup>. The book consists of two parts: the first is devoted to the haidamak movement until 1768, and the second, to Koliyivshchyna. Thus, it is time to maintain, or modify my stance on Hraban's findings.

Firstly, publishers thanked various institutions for help given during the publication of the book. Then, they familiarized readers with Hraban's life and achievements. The title of the work is explained thanks to quotations from works of Vladimir I. Lenin,

---

<sup>68</sup> T. Srogosz, *Między wojną a modernizacją. Studia z dziejów kresów południowo-wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej w XVII–XVIII wieku*, Częstochowa 2016, pp. 44–45.

<sup>69</sup> G.J. Hraban, *Sielianska vijna na Ukraini v 1768–1769 rokach*, part 1–2, Uman 2012.

Wilhelm Zimmermann work of 1937 on the peasant war in Germany, and a fragment of the poem *The Haidamaks* by Taras Shevchenko.

The main part of the monograph is opened by an *Introduction* written on May 1, 1975. The author discussed the state of research and criticized the “landowner-bourgeois” historiography. The peasant war in Ukraine in the years 1768–1769 required further research, especially in the field of socio-economic relations, as well as people’s exploitation by the nobility in the “Polish” part, which led to the dissatisfaction of the masses. Finally, Hraban wrote: “It will not be a mistake to say, that only in this way one may show true and real history of the class struggle of peasant masses in «Polish» Ukraine, the haidamak movement included, as it should be considered as a kind of peasant resistance. Then, the peasants’ movement in Ukraine will also get the right dimension, the Polish-noble and landowner-bourgeois historiography will be ultimately overcome”<sup>70</sup>.

In the first chapter of the first part Hraban described a class struggle in the right-bank Ukraine and Galicia until 1768. Galicia was taken into account, because of the activity of thugs, who were using there similar methods of conduct as the haidamaks. Being dependent on the noble Commonwealth, peasants suffered oppression and deprivation, because feudal obligations ruined rural households. Referring to the words of Lenin, the author of the book stated, that the peasant population had no rights in the noble Commonwealth, including the right-bank Ukraine<sup>71</sup>. In the right-bank Ukraine there could be also noticed the use of a national-religious peasants’ oppression, as well as the inn’s rent.

In the second chapter Hraban analyzes an intensification of the anti-feudal struggle of peasants in the sixties of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. According to the author, peasants of “Polish” Ukraine used various forms of struggle against feudal exploitation. The haidamaks and thugs were not insurgents, although they were also fighting against feudal oppressors. At the same time, after the election of King Stanisław August Poniatowski, there was a religious-national terror of the Uniate-nobility that represented Polish interests. That terror resulted in many victims and the commander of the Ukrainian party, Paweł Woronicz, played, according to Hraban, “Nero’s role”<sup>72</sup>.

---

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, part 1, p. 57.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibidem*, part 1, p. 124.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibidem*, part 1, p. 225.

The next, third chapter, is a continuation of the previous one. It discussed events and processes that took place in the right-bank Ukraine on the eve of Koliyivshchyna (the “peasant war”). At that time, the Uniate-noble terror was arising, which was reflected in the arrest of Melchizedek Znaczkowski. Then, Hraban described a course of the Bar Confederation and a final defeat of confederates, who were beaten in Ukraine by the Russian and Royal armies, and expelled from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, the Bar Confederation, through its socio-economic and religious oppression, led to the outbreak of the peasant war. Thanks to those events the resistance of the Ukrainian people against feudal exploitation intensified. A group of Zaporozhians, using an execution of Danylo and the “Golden Hramota” as some kind of the propaganda, organized an insurgent camp in Chłodny Jar. In the fourth chapter of the second part Hraban discussed the first stage of the uprising under the leadership of Maksym Zalizniak from May 16 to July 15, 1768. After last preparations, Zalizniak moved from Chłodny Jar to Czerkasy, Smila, Boryslav, Lisianka, and Uman. Hraban quoted Polish, Russian and Ukrainian data regarding the number of victims, Poles and Jews, of the Uman slaughter, that was ranging from twenty thousand to less than two thousand. He was, of course, a supporter of the latter option. He wrote: “The issue is to determine the number of victims according to the objective truth. We are looking for all possible arguments for it, because the noblemen demonized the number of dead. It was done first of all for Potocki’s interests, as well as international interests of the Bar Confederation, that is the Polish reactionary feudal oligarchy”<sup>73</sup>. Then, Hraban quoted examples of the slaughter of the peasant war in Germany in 1525, and the Galicia revolt of 1846.

In that chapter Hraban described an expansion of the peasant war (the “liberating movement”): the uprising in Tetiiv, raids of Ataman Paweł Taran, Ataman Semen Nieżywy’s march and a conquest of Kaniv, actions of atamans Andrei Żurba and Mykyta Szwaczko along the Dnieper and in the region of Bila Tserkva and Fastiv, as well as Ataman Ivan Bondarenko-Czałyj in Polesie. Insurgents liquidated Polish authorities and the Uniate church. Zalizniak declared himself a hetman and Gonta, a colonel, as well as a knez of Uman.

In chapter five Hraban analyzed the second stage of the uprising from July to December 1768, when main insurgent forces were

<sup>73</sup> *Ibidem*, part 2, pp. 82–83.

defeated, but the peasants still resisted. At that time the “noblemen executioner’s activity”<sup>74</sup> was taking place. Zalizniak and Gonta were caught, the latter suffered a martyr’s death. Catherine II acted against insurgents, as she dealt with those Zaporozhians, who participated in the uprising.

Final stages of the uprising in January–June 1769, were presented in the short sixth chapter. At that time the Crimean horde attacked, and confederates raised their heads again. Insurgents were fighting with combined Russian, Crown and private forces. At the end of the eighties of the 18<sup>th</sup> century a fear of a “rebellion” was once again widespread, but there was no evidence of a revolutionary movement among the Ukrainian people; there were rather fantasies of the noblemen. After their incorporation into Russia, “Ukrainian and Belarusian territories integrated with Russia, the historical harm caused to the Ukrainian and Belarusian nations by a predatory and oppressive policy of the noble Poland was repaired”<sup>75</sup>.

In *Conclusions* Hraban included his reflections on the historical significance of Koliyivshchyna. He began with the words of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who stated that all great insurrections of the Middle Ages were born in the countryside. Hraban opposed the Polish assessment of the events of 1768–1769, using the words “wild explosion of the Uman slaughter”, “bloody riots”, “banditry”, “bloodshed”. He wrote: “Such terminology and evaluation of the uprising flourished on the pages of Polish-noble-bourgeois literature, historiography, as well as encyclopedic dictionaries in various languages of the world”<sup>76</sup>. Hraban once again compared Koliyivshchyna to the peasant war in Germany in 1525, and mentioned uprisings of Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev in Russia. Due to the similarity of those events, one may call the uprising in the “Polish” Ukraine in the years 1768–1769 a “peasant war”.

Hraban discussed historiography on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna, and he opposed mainly to Rawita-Gawroński’s views on the plundering nature of the Ukrainian people. At the end he wrote: “Paraphrasing wise words of a great leader of the proletarian revolution, V.I. Lenin, it may be stated, that during the peasant war in 1768–1769, Ukrainian peasants fought for a just cause, as they

---

<sup>74</sup> *Ibidem*, part 2, p. 205.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, part 2, p. 311.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibidem*, part 2, p. 314.

could and were able to, and after their defeat, the noblemen flooded entire «Polish Ukraine» with peasant blood. A happy communist builders, the Ukrainian Soviet people, will always remember and honor martyrs, fighters for freedom and happiness of working people”<sup>77</sup>.

Describing Hraban’s publication of 2012, that had been finished in 1975, one of the authors of this article, Tadeusz Srogosz, must verify his assessments of its factography. Undoubtedly, it is a book based on literature and source materials. Lack of references to the book *Hajdamacy* by Władysław A. Serczyk (1<sup>st</sup> ed., 1972, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1978) can be explained by a brief nature of the publication of 1989. At the time a book on a peasant war was being written, namely in the first half of the seventies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Hraban did not have to know the then Polish publishing novelties. However, one can disagree with the dating of the end of Koliyivshchyna. It was ended in the spring of 1771, when the haidamak movement, weakened by previous repressions and plague, no longer posed a greater threat.

Yet, from the Polish point of view, as well as from the perspective of 2017, it is necessary to partially maintain the assessment of an interpretation of the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna. It is a too far-reaching conclusion to call Koliyivshchyna a “peasant war”. Besides, Hraban quoted the classics of Marxism-Leninism quite often, he tried to adapt his vision of the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna to the requirements of a historical materialism. An ideological corset, that was imposed on scientists in the Soviet Union and satellite countries, is well seen here. Should we, thus, reject scientific achievements of the age of totalitarianism, regardless of the substantive and personal value of, often confusing, fate of researchers?

Is it true, that after an incorporation to Russia, Ukrainian and Belarusian territories integrated with Russia, while historical harm caused to the Ukrainian and Belarusian nations by a predatory and oppressive policy of noble Poland was repaired? After all, the socio-economic situation of people in the right-bank Ukraine did not improve. More stringent Russian legislation was introduced there. Landowners kept their estates and made Ukrainian peasants their subjects. New property owners, that is Russian aristocrats and colonels, turned out to be no better, too.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibidem*, part 2, p. 330.

Despite the Soviet system, the change in a cultural content did not mean a total rejection of “bourgeois” paradigms, it rather meant a partial adaptation of their selected elements. That is why some historical figures still functioned as worthy of being created and forced into a social consciousness. Ideologues of that new reality sometimes directly referred to the haidamak heroes. In 1929, while criticizing Les Kurbas’, the most outstanding theater director of the ukrainization period, work, Mykola Skrypnyk wrote: “We will not renounce this old one, this is our past. Zaluzniak and Gonta, they are our heroes, they are our predecessors. We want to take everything, but take it as proletarians. We do not want to assimilate old, historical, ideological traditions, we want to take the past, an old culture, and fertilize it with our proletarian relations, a new content, take it as a tool for our creative proletarian activity; not tie the proletariat with old ideological traditions”. In Skrypnyk’s case there could be noticed an influence of the family tradition, according to which in 1768 the Polish nobleman ordered to impale his ancestor<sup>78</sup>. In Hraban’s narrative such behavior is very visible. It justifies a specific conceptual apparatus: “Polish-noble historiography”, “Unite-noble terror”, “noble Poland”, “«Polish» Ukraine”, “liberating movement”, *etc.*

The point of view of Ukrainian historians as regards Hraban’s research on Koliyivshchyna is slightly different, especially among historians of Uman, represented by a co-author of the article. Hraban was, after all, an extraordinary figure not only in Uman, but also in the entire Ukraine. At the time he was writing his books and articles, there were no other possibilities of interpretation.

An opinion on the historiography of the haidamak movements presented by a prominent researcher of modern Ukrainian history, Natalia Yakovenko, gives a hope, that a common position would be reached: “Like the thug movement, the haidamak rebellions have always been a subject of disputes between Polish and Jewish historians on the one hand, and Russian and Ukrainian historians, on the other. On assessments of the former, with all possible differences, there weighted heavily a squeamishness to «outrageous instincts of the half-wild society» (as expressed in 1901 by Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński), on assessments of the latter, a desire to omit cruel

---

<sup>78</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 345.

events by raising the haidamak movement to the rank of a «national-liberation movement against noble Poland», caused by a «serfdom» and a «religious oppression». The author of that book, who is not a specialist in the field of the haidamak movement, does not consider it as ethical to propose a ready-made prescription for an agreement. However, a solution may be found in a banal postulate: the historian **does not judge** [bold text – N. Yakovenko], but **tries to understand** [bold text – N. Yakovenko] his heroes, while listening to, both the killer and his victim without prejudice, because both are equal subjects of the past. From this point of view, unfortunately, the haidamak movement has not been examined, yet<sup>79</sup>.

The Polish-Ukrainian relations have been developing over the centuries in complex circumstances. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century those relations were also influenced by social, national, religious and international factors. Historians wrote about them, but they represented Polish or Ukrainian views. From the 18<sup>th</sup> century the scale of the conflict changed, as it oscillated between sporadic cooperation and genocide, which undoubtedly influenced historical creativity. Nevertheless, one should strive for reconciliation between fraternal nations, which does not mean neglecting difficult and painful issues. The common Polish-Ukrainian research program on the haidamaks and Koliyivshchyna, thanks to which at least necessary queries and a discrepancy report will be developed, remains a main postulate. Only in that way the vivid use of history for current ideology and shaping of young generation will be minimized. Unfortunately, apart from substantive arguments, still there will remain other arguments of ideological or political context. The point is, however, that a discourse on Polish-Ukrainian relations in various epochs should be reduced to a normal scientific discussion, that should take into account limitations resulting from cultural imputation only, the fact that has not been preserved on the part of both Ukrainian, and Polish side so far.

---

<sup>79</sup> N. Jakowenko, *Historia Ukrainy od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, tr. O. Hnatiuk, K. Kotyńska, Lublin 2000, p. 327.

## Bibliography

### STUDIES

- Antonowycz V., *Umanskij sotnik Ivan Gonta*, "Kijevska Starina" 1882, vol. XI, pp. 250–276.
- Borovoj S.J., *Do chronologii istorii gajdamaczyny*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1968, No. 9, pp. 115–121.
- Dmitriev A., *Koliszczina. Iz istorii klasovoj borby v Ukrainie vo vtoroj polovinie XVIII st.*, Moskva 1934.
- Gołobuckij V.A., *Maksym Żeliezniak*, Moskva 1947.
- Gorban M.V., *Hajdamaczina*, Charkiv 1923.
- Grabski A.F., *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej*, Poznań 2000.
- Gurżij I.O., *Viznacznaja podija v istorii ukrainskovo narodu: (do 200-lecia Koliszcziny)*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1968, No. 7, pp. 58–66.
- Historia Polski*, vol. II, part 1 (1764–1795), eds S. Kieniewicz, W. Kula, Warszawa 1958.
- Hraban G.J., *Czi slid koristuvatisia terminom "Koliszczina"?*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1967, No. 8, pp. 154–158.
- Hraban G.J., *Dva dokumenta pro Kolivszczynu*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1966, No. 2, pp. 11–113.
- Hraban G.J., *Memuary jak istoriograficzne žerielo vivczienja narodno-vizvolnovo povstanja 1768 r.*, [in:] *Kolivszczina: Materialy jubilejnoj naukovej sesji, prisiviaszczenoj 200-riczjupovstanja*, Kiiv 1970, pp. 134–146.
- Hraban G.J., *Pro spogadi Pavla Mladanowicza*, "Naukova Dumka" 1969, No. 4, pp. 47–65.
- Hraban G.J., *Sielianska vijnja na Ukraini v 1768–1769 rokach*, part 1–2, Umań 2012.
- Hraban G.J., *Spalach gnivu narodnovo (Antifeudalne narodno-vizvolnje povstanja na Pravobieriežnij Ukraini u 1768–1769 r.)*, Kiiv 1989.
- Hraban G.J., *Z istorii hajdamaczyny*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1968, No. 6, pp. 96–106.
- Hraban G.J., Kryszyovskij V.S., *Recenzja na knigu O.P. Lola "Hajdamackij ruch na Ukraini 20–60-ch rr. XVIII st."*, "Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał" 1966, No. 5, pp. 147–149.
- Jakowenko N., *Historia Ukrainy od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, tr. O. Hnatiuk, K. Kotyńska, Lublin 2000.
- Kohut Z.E., *Myts old and new the Haidamak movement and the Kolivschyna 1768 in recent historiography*, "Harvard Ukrainian Institute" 1997, vol. I, No. 3, pp. 359–378.
- Kohut Z.E., *Russian Centralizm adn Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s.*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1988.
- Koko E., *Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński (1846–1930) wobec Ukrainy i jej przeszłości*, Gdańsk 2006.



- Lola O.L., *Hajdamackij ruch na Ukraini 20–60 r. XVIII st.*, Kiiv 1965.
- Łysiak-Rudnycki I., *Między historią a polityką*, tr. M. Buchalik, Wrocław 2012.
- Micyk D., *Umań kozacka i hajdamacka*, Kiiv 2002.
- Między Odrą a Uralem. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Władysławowi Andrzejowi Serczykowi*, ed. W. Wierzbieniec, Rzeszów 2010.
- Mirczuk P., *Koliszczyzna. Hajdamackie powstania 1768 r.*, New York 1973.
- Mordovcev D., *Gajdamaczina. Istoriczieskaja monografija*, Sankt Petersburg 1870.
- Rawita-Gawroński F., *Historja ruchów hajdamackich (w. XVIII)*, vol. I–II, Brody 1913.
- Serczyk W.A., *Hajdamacy*, Kraków 1978.
- Serczyk W.A., *Historia Ukrainy*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 2001.
- Serczyk W.A., *Koliszczyzna*, Kraków 1968.
- Serczyk W.A., *Początek końca. Konfederacja barska i I rozbiór Polski*, Warszawa 2000.
- Skałkovskij A., *Najezdy gajdamakov na Zapadnuju Ukrainy v XVIII stoletij, 1733–1768*, Odessa 1845.
- Smolij V.A., *Foirmuvanja socjalnoj svidomosti narodnych mas Ukraini b chodi kłasovoj borotby (druga połovina XVII–XVIII st.)*, Kiiv 1985.
- Sokyrskaja V.V., *Istorič Grigorij Juchimowicz Hraban: žitevij szlach ta nauková spadščyzina (1902–1990 r.)*, Umań 2009.
- Spętana Akademia. Polska Akademia Nauk w dokumentach władz PRL*, eds P. Pleśkot, T.P. Rutkowski, vol. I, Warszawa 2009.
- Srogosz T., *Humańska rzeź, humańska tragedia, czy humańskie zwycięstwo?*, “Istoricznij Archiv. Naukovi Studij” [Mikołajiv] 2017, issue 14, pp. 134–139.
- Srogosz T., *Między wojną a modernizacją. Studia z dziejów kresów południowo-wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej w XVII–XVIII wieku*, Częstochowa 2016.
- Stępnik A., *Mit Kozaczyzny w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku*, [in:] *Mity i stereotypy w dziejach Polski i Ukrainy w XIX i XX wieku*, eds A. Czyżewski, R. Stobiecki, T. Toborek, L. Zaskilniak, Warszawa–Łódź 2012, pp. 365–383.
- Stryjek T., *Ukraińska idea narodowa okresu międzywojennego*, Toruń 2013.
- Szevczenko F.P., *Pro miżnarodnije znaczenija povstanja 1768 r. na Pravobierieźnij Ukraini*, “Ukrainskij Istoricznij Žurnał” 1968, No. 9, pp. 11–15.
- Szulgin J., *Ocierki Koliszczyzny po niezdannym i izdannym dokumentam*, Kiiv 1890.
- Z dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana prof. dr hab. Władysławowi Serczykowi w 60 rocznicę Jego urodzin*, Białystok 1995.

#### INTERNET SOURCES

- Czuchlib T., “Umanska riznja”, “Umanska tragedia” czy “Umanska pieremoha”, [www.getmanat.org](http://www.getmanat.org) (online: May 2, 2016).
- Mirczuk Petro, [in:] *Encyklopedia istorii Ukrainy*, vol. VI, Kiiv 2009, pp. 790, [www.ukrweekly.com](http://www.ukrweekly.com) (online: January 23, 2014).

*Nie żyje prof. Władysław Serczyk, pasjonat dziejów Rosji*, [www.wyborcza.pl](http://www.wyborcza.pl) (online: February 5, 2014).

Pavlenko V.J., Batrakova M.O., *Narodni ruchi na Pravobierieźni Ukraini u XVIII st.: istoriografja ta źeriela*, [www.irbis-nbuw.gov.ua](http://www.irbis-nbuw.gov.ua) (online: February 6, 2014).

*Prof. Władysław Serczyk: Nieustannie się odnawiam*, [www.rzeszow.gazeta.pl](http://www.rzeszow.gazeta.pl) (online: February 5, 2014).

*Stachiw Matwiej. Biografia*, [www.ukrcenter.com](http://www.ukrcenter.com) (online: February 10, 2014).

*Zmarł prof. dr hab. Władysław Serczyk*, [www.ur.edu.pl](http://www.ur.edu.pl) (online: January 19, 2014).

*Zmarł prof. Władysław Serczyk*, [www.krakow.gosc.pl](http://www.krakow.gosc.pl) (online: January 19, 2014).

[www.arheolog-ck.ru](http://www.arheolog-ck.ru) (online: January 17, 2014).

[www.kraeznavstvo.at.ua](http://www.kraeznavstvo.at.ua) (online: January 17, 2014).

WŁADYLENA W. SOKYRSKA, TADEUSZ SROGOSZ

### **Hajdamacy i koliszczyzna w historiografii polskiej i ukraińskiej. Polsko-ukraiński dwugłos**

W pracy analizowany jest z punktu widzenia historyków ukraińskiego i polskiego pochodzenia dorobek naukowy badaczy, którzy w historiografii polskiej i ukraińskiej zajęli poczesne miejsce w zakresie badania ruchów hajdamackich i koliszczyzny, czyli twórczość Franciszka Rawity-Gawrońskiego, Władysława A. Serczyka, Petra Mirczuka i Grigorija J. Hrabana. Autorzy zgadzają się z opinią, że historyk nie sądzi, ale stara się zrozumieć. W dalszym ciągu w sferze postulatów pozostaje wspólny polsko-ukraiński program badawczy dotyczący hajdamaków i koliszczyzny, który przynajmniej pozwoli na wykonanie niezbędnych kwerend i wypracuje protokół rozbieżności. Tylko na tej drodze można będzie zminimalizować jaskrawe wykorzystywanie interpretacji dziejów do bieżącej ideologii i kształtowania młodego pokolenia. Niewątpliwie oprócz argumentów merytorycznych wciąż niestety funkcjonować będą inne, związane z kontekstem ideologicznym, politycznym etc. Chodzi jednak o to, aby dyskurs na temat stosunków polsko-ukraińskich w różnych epokach sprowadzić do naukowej dyskusji zbliżonej do normalności, która miałaby na uwadze jedynie ograniczenia wynikające z imputacji kulturowej, co nie było dotychczas zachowane zarówno ze strony ukraińskiej, jak i polskiej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** hajdamacy, koliszczyzna, historiografia polska, historiografia ukraińska.