

UDC 930(438):94(477)(092)“1648/179”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258984

**Yuriy STEPANCHUK**

*PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of History and Culture of Ukraine of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, 32 Kostiantyn Ostrozkyi' Street, Vinnytsia, Ukraine, postal code 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0001-6693-1463

**Serhii KORNOVENKO**

*PhD hab. (History), Professor of Head of the Department of Intellectual Property and Civil Law Disciplines, Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy, 81 T. Shevchenko Boulevard, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18031 (s-kornovenko@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-6268-2321

**ResearcherID:** U-4291-2018

**Юрiй СТЕПАНЧУК**

*доктор iсторичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри iсторiї та культури України Винницького державного педагогiчного унiверситету iменi Михайла Коцюбинського, м. Винниця, вул. Костянтина Острозького, 32, Україна, iндекс 21001 (iiepp@ukr.net)*

**Сергiй КОРНОВЕНКО**

*доктор iсторичних наук, професор кафедри iнтелектуальної власностi та цивiльно-правових дисциплiн Черкаського нацiонального унiверситету iменi Богдана Хмельницького, б-р Шевченка, 81, м. Черкаси, Україна, iндекс 18031 (s-kornovenko@ukr.net)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Stepanchuk, Yu. & Kornovenko, S. (2022). The Figure of Hetman Petro Sahaidachny in Understanding of Modern Polish Historiography. *Skhidnoieuropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 23, 204–213. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.23.258984

**THE FIGURE OF HETMAN PETRO SAHAIDACHNY  
IN UNDERSTANDING OF MODERN POLISH HISTORIOGRAPHY**

**Abstract.** *The purpose of the research* consists in clarifying the features of modern vision of strategies and a historical role of Hetman Petro Sahaidachny in the Polish historiography. **The methodology of the research** involves the use of symbiosis of comparative studies methods, contextual analysis, convergence from the abstract to the concrete and vice versa. **The scientific novelty** is determined by the fact that the approaches of modern Polish historians to conceptualization of Petro Sahaidachny's activity have been clarified; the intellectual bases of the formation of the field of interpretation have been determined; and the Polish discourse has been inscribed in the modern historiographical context; echoes with ideas developed in other historiographies have been observed. **The Conclusions.** Modern scientific understanding of P. Sahaidachny's activities and historical role by the Polish historians is strongly influenced by the penetration into the discourse of the issue, related to clarifying the identity of the rus'ka nobility, the Orthodox model of the "rus'ky people", the involvement of the Cossacks in the struggle for the protection of the Orthodox faith, "the rights and freedoms of the rus'ky people". These

issues led to enrichment of P. Sahaidachny's scientific image in the Polish historiography. The military component, which traditionally dominated and prevails nowadays, was balanced by factors arising from the evolution of the Cossack demands from purely caste to the idea of the Cossacks as a member of the "rus'ky people" and a defender of its interests within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. P. Sahaidachny's modern image includes his achievements as a commander and organizer of an extraordinary role of the Zaporozhian Army in the wars of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, as well as political concepts about the place and role of the Cossacks in the Ukrainian society. The majority of conceptual positions that are in a scientific circulation in the Polish historiography resonate with the visions of the Ukrainian historians regarding the interests of P. Sahaidachny within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

**Key words:** Petro Sahaidachny, modern Polish historiography, concepts, scientific ideas, key trends.

## ПОСТАТЬ ГЕТЬМАНА ПЕТРА САГАЙДАЧНОГО В ОСМИСЛЕННІ СУЧАСНОЇ ПОЛЬСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ

**Анотація.** Мета дослідження полягає у з'ясуванні особливостей сучасного бачення в польській історіографії стратегій та історичної ролі гетьмана Петра Сагайдачного. **Методологія дослідження** передбачає використання симбіозу методів компаративістики, контекстуального аналізу, сходження від абстрактного до конкретного і навпаки. **Наукова новизна** визначається тим, що з'ясовано підходи сучасних польських істориків до концептуалізації діяльності Петра Сагайдачного, визначено інтелектуальні підстави формування інтерпретаційного поля, а польський дискурс уписано в сучасний історіографічний контекст, спостережено перегуки з ідеями, опрацьованими в інших історіографіях. **Висновки.** Сучасне наукове осмислення польськими істориками діяльності й історичної ролі П. Сагайдачного перебуває під потужним впливом проникнення в дискурс проблематики, пов'язаної зі з'ясуванням тотожності руської шляхти, православної моделі "народу руського", утягування козацтва в змагання за захист православної віри, "прав і свобод народу руського". Це привело до збагачення наукового образу П. Сагайдачного в польській історіографії. Військова складова, що традиційно домінувала й переважає нині, була врівноважена врахуванням чинників, які впливали з еволюції козацьких вимог від суто станових до ідеї козацтва як члена "народу руського" й оборонця його інтересів у рамках Речі Посполитої. Сучасний образ П. Сагайдачного охоплює його досягнення як полководця й організатора непересічної ролі Війська Запорозького у війнах Речі Посполитої, а також політичні концепції щодо місця й ролі козацтва в українському соціумі. Більшість концептуальних положень, які перебувають у науковому обігу в польській історіографії, перегукуються з візіями українських істориків щодо інтересів П. Сагайдачного в рамках Речі Посполитої.

**Ключові слова:** Петро Сагайдачний, сучасна польська історіографія, концепції, наукові уявлення, ключові тенденції.

**The Problem Statement.** The figure of Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny was always in the focus of the Polish historiography, which is quite natural, taking into consideration his famous military victories "for the glory of the King and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth", and because of the powerful ideological influence on the development of relations between the Cossacks and the nobility and Warsaw. Among the Cossack hetmans P. Sahaidachny belongs to a small cohort of those who "reserved" a permanent place in the Polish conceptual visions of the history of the Cossacks, Ukraine and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In modern Polish historiography of the early modern period, the development of which is marked by a clear departure from the previously dominant concepts of "a home war" and "a sword and plow" (Maslak, 2014, p. 47), scientific interest in the historical role of P. Sahaidachny increased due to a significant transformation of approaches to assessing the genesis of the era of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and transformation of the Cossacks into the heart of a new Ukrainian elite. Interpretation of the view on the relations between the Cossacks and the nobility, represented

by P. Sahaidachny, and the model of B. Khmelnytsky, which ultimately determined the future fate of both Ukraine and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, again came to the fore as a significant factor in new (or modified) readings of early modern Ukrainian history and the Ukrainian-Polish relations. There were also discussions about this issue, reinforced by the growing interaction between the Ukrainian and Polish historiographies. Thus, in modern Polish historiography a detailed elucidation of the conceptualization peculiarities of two alternatives that originated from the Ukrainian Cossacks, is important to create an adequate idea of the latest interpretive trends in the field of early modern Ukrainian history in general.

**The Analysis of Resent Researches.** Despite obvious significance of the issue, it has not been the subject of a special study yet. Increased scientific interest in the achievements of modern Polish historiography against the background of early modern history of Ukraine and the Ukrainian-Polish relations of that time, which has been observed recently, including modern processes in it (Isaienko, 2020; Maslak, 2014, Stepanchuk, 2018; Nagielski, 2010; Bobiatynskyy, 2008; Petkevych, 2007), focused immediately on the milestones in the history of the Ukrainian-Polish relations (the middle – the second half of the XVIIth century). Currently we have a number of valuable observations which are important intellectual inspirers. In particular, the conclusions of T. Khynchevska-Hennel and N. Yakovenko about the “conceptual revolution” in the Polish historiography of 1960 – 1970 as a starting point for the latest research approaches serve as a significant impetus (Chynczewska-Hennel, 1985, pp. 285–291; Yakovenko, 2010, pp. 83–88). Within the framework of a comparative study of the interpretation specifics of the concepts of B. Khmelnytsky and P. Sahaidachny by modern Polish historians, thorough studies and conclusions of V. Maslak become important on the latest trends in the interpretation of the nature and typology of the Ukrainian National Liberation War in the Polish historiography, as well as the evolution of B. Khmelnytsky’s political programme (Maslak, 2014, pp. 55–59; pp. 70–101). Finally, D. Kolodzeychuk’s review of one of M. Franz’s monographs, in which an attempt was made to compare the ideas of P. Sahaidachny and B. Khmelnytsky, contains important observations (Kołodziejczyk, 2007, pp. 575–586).

**The purpose of the research** is to study in detail the current discourse in the Polish historiography concerning the role of P. Sahaidachny in the history of early modern Ukraine and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, to trace the interactions of the Ukrainian and Polish historiography in this segment. The concept of “modern Polish historiography” covers the period that began after the significant events in Poland and throughout Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s.

**The Results of the Research.** Four interrelated factors, including Hetman’s victorious raid on Moscow in 1618, his extraordinary role in the Khotyn War of 1621, and his decisive contribution to the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy in Ukraine, elaboration of the strategy for the Zaporozhian Army within the framework of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, traditionally glorified in the eyes of the Polish historians the figure of P. Sahaidachny, elevated him above the general Cossack officers of the first half of the 17th century, among whom there were many famous and colourful figures. All of them are at the center of modern Polish discourse, stimulating the introduction of P. Sahaidachny to the circle of people worthy of a special place in the Ukrainian and Polish history of early modern times. But its main difference from previous analogues is that at the same time the issue was presented earlier only superficially and without a clear trace in broader contexts: Petro Sahaidachny and identity formation among the Zaporozhian Army and involvement of the Cossacks in the

defense of “the rights and freedoms of the rus’ky people”. It can be even said that this aspect came to the fore over time to conceptualize the historical role of the figure of P. Sahaidachny.

On the one hand, a powerful stimulus for this was the appearance of a pioneering study by Teresa Khynchevska-Gennel in the Polish historiography in 1985 “National Consciousness of the Ukrainian Nobility and the Cossacks from the End of the XVIth to the Middle of the XVIIth Century”, which provoked a mixed reaction among the Polish intellectuals (Gawlas, Grala, 1986). However, later it inspired the growth of scientific interest in this segment of the history of the Ukrainian nobility and the Cossacks. At the same time, the Polish historians had to respond to an active discourse on early modern elites and the Cossacks, which has been going on in the Ukrainian historiography for more than two decades (Brekhunenko, 2014; Sas, 2010; Shcherbak, 2000; Yakovenko, 2008; Plokyh, 2001). At the intersection of both factors, in modern Polish historiography, the image of Hetman was enriched by further development and interpretation of the problem of including the Cossacks of the era of moral leadership P. Sahaidachny in the Zaporozhian Army in the development of the Orthodox model of rus’ka identity.

The largest conceptualization of this problem belongs to the pen of Mariusz Drozdowski – a student of T. Khynchevska-Gennel, made, quite naturally, within the study of the religiosity of the Ukrainian Cossacks. Based on the tradition the most clearly represented in the Ukrainian historiography, the researcher associates the whole period in the history of the Zaporozhian Army with the name of P. Sahaidachny: “The beginning of this new period in the contacts of the Cossacks with the Orthodox Church determines, as we should judge, certainly the fact that Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny took over power over the Cossack society” (Drozdowski, 2008, p. 780). At the same time, the researcher modifies the dominant view (also available in the Polish historiography, starting with V. Tomkiewicz (Drozdowski, 2008, p. 36) as to the fact that the important year in the involvement of the Cossacks in religious affairs became the year of 1620 allegedly (Drozdowski, 2008, pp. 78–92). Absorbing the works of S. Oparina, Y. Mytsyk, S. Plokyh, which can be seen even from the correspondent citations, M. Drozdowski writes about the crucial for the Orthodox cause participation of the Cossacks led by P. Sahaidachny in “Theophanes’ ordination” as a kind of result of previous practices protection of the Orthodox faith (Drozdowski, 2008, pp. 94–95, 236).

Another significant feature of M. Drozdowski’s approach, which clearly distinguishes him from the Polish historians, is that he does not limit the horizons of the Cossacks only to a religious confrontation between the Orthodox, on the one hand, and the Catholics and the Uniates, on the other hand. The researcher closely connects the Cossacks’ interference in religious relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with the emergence of the concept of Cossack membership in the “rus’ky people” with all the consequences for the social role of the Zaporozhian Army. The researcher clearly focuses on the theses of T. Khynchevska-Gennel (Drozdowski, 2008, pp. 88–93), as well as the results of recent research by S. Plokyh (Plokyh, 2001, pp. 145–175), insisting that “the involvement of the Cossacks in the defence of the rights of the Orthodox Church was one of the reasons for the formation of their class consciousness, as well as, primarily, national consciousness” (Drozdowski, 2008, p. 237). However, M. Drozdowski did not bring his position to the level demonstrated by the St. Petersburg researcher T. Tairova-Yakovleva with her direct identification of the involvement of the Cossacks in religious affairs with the emergence of the state idea in their environment (“under those conditions, the struggle for the Orthodoxy was a political struggle for the national self-consciousness, and the state idea”) (Yakovleva, 1997, pp. 51–59). It is worth noting that the

intellectual idea of T. Tairova-Yakovleva was not properly discussed even in the Ukrainian historiography, where the ideological imperatives of the Cossack officers of the end of the XVIth – the first half of the XVIIth century are actively studied nowadays.

However, it should be recognized that the generalizations of T. Khynchevska-Gennel and M. Drozdowski did not become mainstream in Poland for the conceptualization of the place and role of P. Sahaidachny. Probably, this fact can be explained by the general restrained attitude to the problem of the nobility identity, not to mention the worldviews of the Cossacks, deprived of elitism reflection. It is not paid much attention, and it is also not openly questioned (as it was in the 1980s, after the publication of the above-mentioned monograph by T. Khynchevska-Gennel), trying to emphasize the sense of belonging of the *rus'ka* elite to the noble people of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, integration successes of the ideology of sarmatism, etc. Here is how, for example, the figure of P. Sahaidachny is presented in the publication “Poland. Essay on History”, translated into Ukrainian for the Ukrainian reader: “Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny (1570 – 1622) was one of the most prominent leaders of the Cossack units during the period before the uprising outbreak of 1648, honored in the wars of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with Muscovy and Turkey... He led many Cossack campaigns to the Turkish possessions along the Black Sea coast. He made friends with the royal family. He remained loyal to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, leading the troops in the wars with Muscovy and Turkey. Owing to the participation of the Cossack troops led by him in the battle of Khotyn in 1621, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth troops managed to stop the offensive of the Turkish army” (Mendzhetskyi & Bratsyevych, 2015, p. 123).

This position distinguishes modern Polish approaches from the dominant ideas of the Ukrainian historiography, which emphasizes the problem of involving the Ukrainian Cossacks into the process of forming a set of ideas in line with the “*rus'ky* people” (Brekhunenko, 2011, pp. 276–293; Sas, 2010, pp. 323–340; Ploky, 2001, pp. 145–175). Against this background, the appearance of archeographic research is noticeable, in which a number of Cossack documents were published, prepared by the joint efforts of the Ukrainian and Polish historians. In the research the preface deals with the Cossacks’ idea of their place in the “*rus'ky* people” (Brekhunenko & Nahelskyi, 2004, pp. 435–437).

Instead, the main direction of P. Sahaidachny’s presentation is the modern interpretation of the traditional concept, according to which Hetman’s views on the relations of the Cossacks with the nobility and Warsaw embodied the discourse of the moderate part of the Cossacks, willing to compromise. At the same time, during the time of P. Sahaidachny, everything was brought to the level of the elaborated strategy of fighting for concessions from Warsaw in favour of the Zaporozhian Army. After all, it is under this accent that Hetman’s activity is interpreted both in scientific papers and in popular texts. An intellectual consensus was also reached with the Ukrainian historiography, in which there is no alternative to such interpretation approach of P. Sahaidachny’s cornerstone idea. The differences between the constructs of the Polish historians begin at the level of finding out the depth of the compromise, which P. Sahaidachny was ready to reach in relations with Warsaw.

There are two typical approaches. The first one consists in declaring only a general conceptual thesis about P. Sahaidachny’s confession of the idea of understanding with Warsaw, prevention of an armed conflict and military cooperation in the interests of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Finding out the deep essence of P. Sahaidachny’s idea, especially its possible evolution, was secondary, which made the structure fragile, giving the impression of uncrystallization and chaos of Hetman’s plans and lowering the threshold of

understanding of intentions by him and his supporters. A clear evidence of this approach is, at least, the above-cited thesis from the book “Poland. Essay on History”.

Another approach involved concretizing the real intentions of Hetman against the background of the development peculiarities of the Cossacks. M. Nagielsky, the author of the only complete essay on modern Polish historiography about P. Sahaidachny presented a view, which systematically absorbed the experience of the basic requirements to an officer, testifying to its entry into new horizons of understanding the role of the Cossacks in Ukraine and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in general: “There is no doubt that he belonged (P. Sahaidachny. – *The authors*) to that group of the Cossack officers, who saw opportunities for cooperation with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, of course, on condition of concessions by the Polish authorities regarding the Cossacks, both under the auspices of the approval of the Orthodox hierarchy and the increase in the register of the Zaporozhian Army” (Nagielski, 2003, p. 149). The researcher also believed that the role of non-church leaders, including P. Sahaidachny and the Cossacks, was crucial for the restoration of the Orthodox hierarchy in Ukraine (Nagielski, 2003, p. 140). However, the researcher avoided talking about the attitude of P. Sahaidachny and his supporters to the inclusion of the Cossacks into the Orthodox model of the “rus’ky people”, leaving out of his conceptualization the works of T. Khynchevska-Gennel and M. Drozdovsky. The results of the implementation of P. Sahaidachny’s idea into life are also presented without emphasis. It seems that M. Nagielsky did not want to write about the collapse of politics, which became so clear after Khotyn of 1621 and paved the way for the future Cossack uprisings. The researcher limited himself to a milder phrase that “the authorities of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth did not draw any conclusions from the rapid growth of the Cossacks, limiting the registered army to a number that the Cossacks could not admit”; “Unfortunately, Sahaidachny failed at achieving anything for the Zaporozhian Army” (Nagielski, 2003, pp. 147–148).

On the basis of the emphasis on the moderate line represented by P. Sahaidachny in Polish historiography, a contrasting comparison of the political concepts of P. Sahaidachny and B. Khmelnytsky appeared. This intention, no doubt, contains a rational grain, but its embodiment by Maciej Franz in the study of the history of the Cossack state was unsuccessful and was criticized in a review by Dariusz Kołodziejczyk, as, after all, the whole monograph. The reviewer accused the author of the research apparatus weakness, poor knowledge of the historiographical situation and the lack of a representative source base, which led to the proclamation of unsubstantiated theses that can only surprise (Kołodziejczyk, 2007, pp. 580–583). Among other things, D. Kołodziejczyk focused on a rude and straightforward “opposition of the “good hetman” from Khotyn to the “evil hetman” Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who dared to rebel against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth” (Kołodziejczyk, 2007, p. 583).

The essence of the problem for M. Franz was that B. Khmelnytsky’s political conceptions at a certain stage resulted in the idea of breaking with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, while P. Sahaidachny did not consider such scenario at all. Thus, the first one deserves ostracism on the part of the Polish historians, because, as V. Maslak observed, M. Franz is a supporter of cultivating a specific “point of view of the Polish historiography”, which, in fact, activates the ideological factor in scientific approaches (Maslak, 2014, p. 58). The credo of the researcher concerning the assessment of P. Sahaidachny objectively reflects the following thesis: “Konashevych, well-prepared and educated, saw the great Cossacks on the side of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but as an important and self-governing military and political factor on which Poland could base its actions on these lands” (Franz, 2005, p. 391).

And further – Hetman “never considered the possibility of development of this society in disputes with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and considered the greatest threat – the Russian power, which was dormant at that time. If we compare this with the fatal politics and the same skill of political assessment of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the assessment of the figure of the most prominent Cossack Hetman of the first half of the XVIIth century will look even more interesting” (Franz, 2005, p. 391).

Within the framework of his own interpretive model, the researcher is looking for any opportunity to glorify P. Sahaidachny at the expense of B. Khmelnytsky, as a result of which the former is attributed intellectual achievements, which currently cannot be found in a source basis. Thus, P. Sahaidachny appears as a generator of the idea of the “Cossack state” in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (exclusively so): “During the first half of the XVIIth century the idea of the Cossack statehood appeared among the elites of the Cossack society in the Ukrainian lands, and Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny should be recognized as its creator”. M. Franz sees the reasons for such a radical conclusion in the military activity of Hetman, as well as in “the attitude to the church, the creation of the foundations of unity with the Ukrainian people, the development of social ties” (Franz, 2005, p. 392).

Obviously, this was not without the influence of T. Tairova-Yakovleva’s idea, although the book by M. Franz does not contain the relevant work of St. Petersburg researcher in the bibliography. However, T. Tairova-Yakovleva did not write about the officer’s direct awareness of the fact that his actions are connected with the “state idea”, but only about the possibility of today’s interpretation of support for the Orthodoxy as an action aimed at generating the “state idea” in society. Instead, M. Franz believes that this idea was developed earlier, and B. Khmelnytsky took it ready, and therefore is “only the executor of certain ideas that were created during the days of P. Sahaidachny, later developed by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla” (Franz, 2005, p. 390).

Another conceptual statement, which has no basis, is the thesis that P. Sahaidachny allegedly clairvoyantly saw in Moscow the greatest threat to the Cossacks (Franz, 2005, pp. 390–392). If, attributing the development of the “state idea” to Hetman, M. Franz still tried to argue his point, in this case he avoided argumentation, mentioning only that the free Cossacks were not beneficial to the Moscow autocracy. It seems that the researcher became a hostage of his own strategy to oppose P. Sahaidachny and B. Khmelnytsky. Moreover, according to M. Franz, until 1653 the Cossacks, in relations with Moscow, followed the path paved by P. Sahaidachny, whose policy towards Moscow was “always hostile” (Franz, 2005, p. 392). Finally, as noted by D. Kołodziejczyk (2007, p. 582), the author’s thesis that the goal of the Cossack naval campaigns was to weaken Turkey and prevent the Black Sea trade is surprising.

At the same time, despite the above mentioned, M. Franz has several inspiring observations. The researcher persistently expresses the right opinion about the continuity between the set of ideas of the Cossack officers of the first half of the XVIIth century and B. Khmelnytsky’s political conceptions, which became a “fresh word” in modern Polish historiography and resonates with the approaches of the Ukrainian historians. It is important to think that even during the time of P. Sahaidachny the Cossacks saw a direct threat to their existence in the magnate’s colonization, so it seems fruitful to compare the Turkish-Tatar option of P. Sahaidachny with the concepts of Jan Zamoysky (Franz, 2005, pp. 390–392).

Traditionally the military component of P. Sahaidachny’s activity enjoyed the greatest attention in the Polish historiography. There was a consensus on the recognition of a significant role of Hetman in the military campaigns led by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, in particular, in the expedition of King Vladyslav to Moscow in 1617 – 1618 and the Khotyn

War in 1621 (Borek, 2001, pp. 258–311; Drozdowski, 2008, pp. 108–114; Majewski, 2006, pp. 147–149; Nagielski, 2010, pp. 144–150; Serczyk, 2008, pp. 235–239). Researchers emphasize the fascinating responses among the Polish-Lithuanian nobility after the victory near Khotyn, citing abundantly Ukrainian (K. Sakovych. Ya. Yerlych), and Polish (Sh. Starovolsky, V. Potocki, J. Sobieski) contemporaries, who colorfully described the military skills, virtues of P. Sahaidachny and his contribution to the overall victory over the Ottoman army (Nagielski, 2010, pp. 149–150). M. Drozdovsky and M. Nagielski emphasized an important point: under the influence of the Cossack military services of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the period of P. Sahaidachny, an attempt was made among the Polish intellectuals to inscribe the Cossacks in the Sarmatian myth, (which gave additional impetus to the competition of the Cossacks for a place in a closed club of social elites. Hetman Sh. Starovolsky was included in the group of 130 most famous Sarmatian commanders) (Drozdowski, 2008, p. 114; Nagielski, 2010, p. 150). In this fact, the position of both researchers echoes the observations of S. Ploky (Ploky, 2001, pp. 19–175).

M. Nagielski, however, penetratingly observed a notable feature of reception of P. Sahaidachny, which had not been considered before – the heterogeneity of Hetman's opinion in his eyes. Along with respect, there were critical assessments, in particular, from the Lithuanian Hetman Lev Sapiga. The latter accused P. Sahaidachny of ambiguity regarding the problem of defence against Muslim neighbours, which consisted in contacts with the Tatars by refusing to help the quartz army in repelling the Tatar attack of 1615 (Nagielski, 2010, p. 132).

It should be noted that modern Polish historians joined the process of archeographic publication of documents, which dealt with the activity of P. Sahaidachny. At first, in his monograph M. Drozdowski re-published (after Yu. Mytsyk) a letter from Hetman to the Polish Lithuanian Hetman K. Radziwill dated January 13, 1622, and later in Ukraine, Krakow researcher A. Bedrzhyska published a set of documents of the Cossack commission from January 1622 on the basis of one of the copies (Drozdowski, 2008, pp. 267–268; Bedrzhyska, 2006, pp. 523–532).

**The Conclusions.** Among the Polish historians modern scientific understanding of the activities and historical role of Petro Sahaidachny reflects the essential convergence of approaches and interpretations with the Ukrainian historiography. It seems that there has been a final departure from the narrow interpretation of the figure of Hetman through the prism of an exclusively military component. Rooting in modern Polish historiography of the discourse on the identity of the nobility, national and religious competitions of the “rus’ky people”, the involvement of the Cossacks in these competitions resulted in the enrichment of the scientific image of P. Sahaidachny by taking into account the factors, which followed from the evolution of the Cossack demands from a purely caste to the idea of the Cossacks as a member of the “rus’ky people” and a defender of its interests within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It is noteworthy that the majority of the conceptual provisions that are in scientific circulation in Poland resonate with the visions of the Ukrainian historians. This creates a good basis for further synergy of research, in particular, on the basis of the anniversary of the Khotyn War of 1621.

**Acknowledgements.** We express our sincere gratitude to the editors for the opportunity to publish the article.

**Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Bedrzhyska, A.** (2006). Zvit pro robotu kozatskoi komisii u Kyievi u sichni 1622 r. [Report on the work of the Cossack commission in Kyiv in January of 1622]. *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Shevchenka*, 522–535. [in Ukrainian]

**Bobiatynskyi, K.** (2008). Hadiatska uniiia v polskii istoriohrafii [The Hadiach Union in Polish Historiography]. *Hadiatska uniiia 1658 roku*. (pp. 306–349). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

**Borek, P.** (2001). Ukraina w staropolskich diariuszach i pamiętnikach [Ukraine in old Polish diaries]. *Bohaterowie fortece, tradycji*. Kraków, 426 p. [in Polish]

**Brekhunenko, V. & Nahelskyi, M.** (2004). Dvanadtsiat lystiv hetmaniv Viiska Zaporozkoho XVI – pershoi polovyny XVII z polskykh rukopysnykh zibran [The hetmans' twelve letters of the Zaporozhian Army the XVIth – the first half of the XVIIth from the Polish manuscript collections]. *Ukrainskyi arkeohrafichnyi shchorichnyk*, 425–452. [in Ukrainian]

**Brekhunenko, V.** (2011). *Kozaky na Stepovomu Kordoni Yevropy. Typolohiia kozatskykh spilnot XVI – seredyiny XVII st.* [The Cossacks on the steppe border of Europe. Typology of the Cossack communities of the XVIth – middle of the XVIIth century]. Kyiv, 504 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Brekhunenko, V.** (2014). *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozatska Ukraina seredyiny XVII – XVIII st.* [The Eastern Gate of Europe. Cossack Ukraine in the Middle of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries]. Kyiv, 504 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Chynczewska-Hennel, T.** (1985). *Świadomość narodowa szlachty ukraińskiej i kozaczyzny od schyłku XVI do połowy XVII w.* [National awareness of the Ukrainian nobility and Cossacks from the end of the 16th to the mid-17th century]. Warszawa, 188 p. [in Polish]

**Drozdowski, M.** (2008). *Religia i Kozaczyzna zaporoska w Rzeczypospolitej w pierwszej połowie XVII wieku* [Zaporozhian religion and Cossacks in the Commonwealth in the first half of the XVIIth century]. Warszawa, 278 p. [in Polish]

**Franz, M.** (2005). *Idea państwa kozackiego na ziemiach ukraińskich w XVI – XVII wieku* [The idea of the Cossack state in the Ukrainian lands in the XVIth – XVIIth centuries]. Toruń, 421 p. [in Polish]

**Gawlas, S. & Grala, H.** (1986). Nie masz Rusi w Rusi. W sprawie ukraińskiej świadomości narodowej [You don't have Rus' in Rus'. On the topic of Ukrainian national consciousness]. *Pregląd historyczny, Toruń, (2)*, 31–351. [in Polish]

**Isaienko, O.** (2020). Polska istoriohrafia postati hetmana Petra Konashevycha Sahaidachnoho kintsia XX – XXI st. [The Polish Historiography of the Figure of Hetman Petro Konashevych Sahaidachny of the end of the XXth – XXIst centuries]. *Norwegian Journal of development of the International Science, 45(II)*, 22–27. [in English]

**Kołodziejczyk, D.** (2007). Jak Kozacy państwo budowali, a lachy historię im pisali [How the Cossacks built the state and wrote them history]. *Pregląd historyczny, Toruń, (4)*, 575–586. [in Polish]

**Majtowski, A.** (2006). *Moskwa 1617 – 1618* [Moscow 1617 – 1618]. Warszawa, 224 p. [in Polish]

**Maslak, V.** (2014). *Rannomoderna ukraińska derzhavnist ochyma suchasnykh polskykh ta rosiiskykh istorykiv* [Early Modern Ukrainian Statehood through the Eyes of Modern Polish and Russian historians]. Kamianets-Podilsiyi, 356 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Mendzhetskyi, V. & Bratsysevych, Ye.** (2015). *Polshcha. Narys istorii* [Poland. Essay on history]. Varshava, 38 p. [in Polish]

**Nagielski, M.** (2010). Piotr Konaszewicz-Sahajdaczny hetnam wojska zaporoskiego [Piotr Konaszewicz-Sahajdaczny, hetnam of the Zaporozhian army]. *Hetmani zaporoscy w służbie króla i Rzeczypospolitej*. (pp. 222–253). Zabrze. [in Polish]

**Nahelskyi, M.** (2003). Pereiaslavska uhoda 1654 roku u polskii istoriohrafii [Pereyaslav Treaty of 1654 in the Polish historiography]. *Pereiaslavska rada 1654 roku (istoriohrafia ta doslidzhennia) [Pereyaslav Council of 1654 (historiography and research)]*. (pp. 653–679). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian]

**Petkevych, K.** (2007). Pereiaslavskaia rada 1654 goda v noveishei polskoi istoriohrafii i publitsistike [Pereyaslav Rada of 1654 in the latest Polish historiography and journalism]. *Istoriia i sovremennost, 2*, 184–213. [in Russian]

**Plokhy, S.** (2001). *Kozatstvo ta relihiia v suchasni Ukraini* [The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine]. Kyiv, 402 p. [in English]

**Sas, P.** (2010). *Vytoky ukrainskoho natsiotvorennia* [The Origins of the Ukrainian Nation-building].

Kyiv, 702 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sas, P.** (2012). *Chesnyi rytsar Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachnyi* [The Honest Knight Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachny]. Kyiv, 350 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Sas, P.** (2012). *Khotynska viina 1621 roku* [Khotyn War of 1621]. Bila Tserkva, 526 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Serczyk, W.** (2008). *Na dalekiej Ukrainie. Dzieje Kozaczyzny do 1648 roku* [In distant Ukraine. The history of Cossacks until 1648]. Kraków, 362 p. [in Polish]

**Shcherbak, V.** (2000). *Ukrainske kozatstvo: formuvannia sotsialnoho stanu. Druha polovyna XV – XVII st.* [The Ukrainian Cossacks: the formation of social status. The second half of the XVth – XVIIth centuries] Kyiv, 300 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Stepanchuk, Yu.** (2018). *Obraz Bohdana Khmelnytskoho v novitii ukrainskii ta zarubizhnii istoriografii* [The Image of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in the Modern Ukrainian and Foreign Historiography]. Vinnytsia, 572 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Yakovenko, N.** (2008). *Ukrainska shliakhta z kintsia XIV do seredyiny XVII stolittia. Volyn i Tsentralna Ukraina* [The Ukrainian Nobility from the End of the XIVth to the Middle of the XVIIth century. Volyn and Central Ukraine.]. Kyiv, 472 p. [in Ukrainian]

**Yakovenko, N.** (2010). “Pro Ukrainu mozhna bez kraiu...”: zminy u spryiniatti polskymy istorykamy mynuloho davnoi Ukrainy (1960-ti – 2000–ni roky) [“You Can Talk about Ukraine without Borders...”: Changes in the Reception of the Polish Historians of the Past of Ancient Ukraine (the 1960s – 2000s)]. *Ukrainskyi humanitarnyi ohliad*, 15, 79–103. [in Ukrainian]

**Yakovleva, T.** (1997). Henezis hosudarstvennoi idei v Ukraine na primere dohovorov s Polshei i Rossiei [Genesis of state ideas in Ukraine on the example of agreements with Poland and Russia]. *Rossiiia – Ukraina: istoryia vzaimootnoshenyi*. (pp. 51–59). Moskva. [in Russian]

*The article was received August 30, 2021.*

*Article recommended for publishing 25/05/2022.*