



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

The Image of Jews in Ukraine's Intellectual Tradition: The Role of "Istoriia Rusov"

Author(s): ZENON E. KOHUT

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 22, Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe (1998), pp. 343-358

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036746>

Accessed: 04/09/2014 21:09

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Image of Jews in Ukraine's Intellectual Tradition: The Role of *Istoriia Rusov*

ZENON E. KOHUT

In 1828, two members of the Starodub district court in Chernihiv province, Stepan Laikevych and Oleksander Hamaliia, while compiling an inventory of the estate of Princess Kleopatra Lobanova-Rostovskaia in the village of Hryniv, discovered a manuscript copy of *Istoriia Rusov* (History of the Rus' People) by Archbishop Heorhii Konys'kyi. Impressed by their find, the two lawyers showed the historical tract to Stepan Shyrai, the local marshal of the nobility and a known amateur collector of old documents. Shyrai made a copy for himself and returned the original to the library in the Hryniv estate—and this “original” manuscript has not been seen by anyone ever since. Yet Shyrai's “mastercopy” was copied many times and widely circulated among the Ukrainian nobility before Osyp Bodians'kyi first published the work in Moscow in 1846.¹ It has since been shown that the Hryniv find was not the “original” manuscript copy, for *Istoriia Rusov* was already known in 1825—and probably earlier. Nor was Archbishop Konys'kyi (1717–1795) its author, although there is as yet no agreement on the identity of the author or authors. Moreover, scholars still are debating whether *Istoriia Rusov* was written in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century, or after the Napoleonic wars.²

The origin of *Istoriia Rusov* thus remains one of the most challenging puzzles of Ukrainian intellectual history. There is little doubt, though, as to the work's important place in the national tradition of history writing. *Istoriia Rusov*'s underlying thesis was that Ukrainians have a natural, moral, and historical right to their own political development. Moreover, the Rus' (Ukrainian) nation has existed as a political entity since Kyivan times: “As is well known, once we were what the Muscovites are now: government, seniority, and the very name Rus' went over to them from us.”³ The Rus' people were independent under the rule of their princes until the Tatar threat drove them into contractual relations with Lithuania and Poland “as equal to equal, and free with free.”⁴ The same contract theory is applied to the Pereiaslav agreement of 1654 with the Russian tsar and the existence of an autonomous Little Russia within the Russian Empire.⁵ In this scheme, Ukraine was never conquered and entered into all the political unions in its history as a free and equal partner.

Istoriia Rusov had a profound impact on both the development of a Ukrainian national historiography and on Ukrainian nation building. In the face of the prevailing denial of a peculiarly Ukrainian historical experience, this

premodern historical work presented Ukraine as an actor in history, whether affiliated with Poland or Russia. It described Ukrainians as endowed with specific “rights and liberties.” In this, *Istoriia Rusov* expressed in concentrated form the ideas of previous generations, particularly the Cossack chronicles, but it also incorporated concepts of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It profoundly influenced the founders of the Ukrainian Romantic national awakening and was extremely popular not only within the Ukrainian gentry circles in which it originated, but also among the newly emerging Ukrainian intelligentsia. To the latter it supplied a view of Ukrainian national history and many images of Ukrainians and their neighbors.

The attitude of the author of *Istoriia Rusov* toward Poles, Tatars, and Russians has been covered in a number of studies.⁶ However, no study has been done on the image of Jews in the work.⁷ Yet, on closer examination, much of nineteenth-century Ukrainian anti-Jewish rhetoric can be traced to *Istoriia Rusov*. It established powerful Jewish stereotypes in Ukrainian historical thought and memory that proved difficult to modify. In this article I will trace how and why *Istoriia Rusov* adopted, developed, and reshaped previous interpretations of this question and passed them on to a subsequent literary tradition.⁸

I

As I have shown elsewhere, early modern Ukrainian historiography emerged in the Hetmanate—the territory that became a de facto independent Cossack state after the Khmel’nytskyi uprising and remained an autonomous part of the Russian Empire until the end of the eighteenth century. Initially it was developed in two distinct genres.⁹ The Orthodox clergy sought to enlist the protection of the Muscovite tsar by producing a historical scheme of dynastic, religious, and territorial continuity between Kyivan Rus’ and contemporary Muscovy. Within that scheme, they advanced the thesis that the Ukrainian lands were the rightful patrimony of the tsar. The *Sinopsis*, attributed to the archimandrite of the Kyivan Caves Monastery, Innokentii Gizeľ, was the foremost example of this historiographic tradition. The book, first published in Kyiv between 1670 and 1674, discussed Kyivan Rus’ and the dynastic history of the Rurikids in great detail, but completely ignored the Cossacks and the Khmel’nytskyi uprising. Although it was the work of a Ukrainian cleric, the *Sinopsis* came to be adopted as the first official textbook of Russian history, reprinted 30 times by 1836. Its historical scheme became a springboard for imperial Russian historiography.¹⁰

The ruling elite of the Hetmanate, the Cossack officer class, was interested in a different kind of history. A general scheme of East European history, the mighty medieval Kyivan state, and the relationship between the Muscovite tsars and the grand princes of old Rus’ all did not appeal to them. The Cossack elite produced a new genre of historical writing—the so-called Cossack

chronicles—that emphasized Cossack rights and liberties under both Polish kings and Russian tsars. The chronicles concentrated on what was then relatively recent history: the Polish violations of Cossack rights that justified the uprising, the great liberator Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, and the presumably contractual nature of Ukraine's union with both Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy. This obsession with the recent past led the Cossack chroniclers to deemphasize the “historical” affinity with Russia. The authors insisted on Ukraine's distinctiveness in the political and social order as well as on its autonomous historical development.¹¹ *Istoriia Rusov* was, in many ways, the culmination of this literary tradition.

Unlike the clerical writings, the Cossack chronicles focused primarily on the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising—its causes, course, and consequences. Yet Jews and the description of anti-Jewish violence do not figure prominently in the narratives of the Cossack chroniclers. References to them are few, especially as compared to the attention paid to the Tatars, or to tracing Cossack rights under different monarchs, or to the smallest detail of every military engagement with the Poles. Moreover, the discussion of the Jews, their economic role in Ukraine, and their slaughter by the rebels does not constitute a separate subject (narrative line), but is always inserted into the list of Polish misdeeds or the story of revenge against the Polish lords. The treatment of Jews in the Cossack chronicles is structurally subordinated to the Polish problem.

The chronicle authors did, however, pay much more attention to Jews than the clerics had. Not only did they record the slaughter of Jews along with Poles during the uprising, but they also attempted to show that the Jews, again together with the Poles, were guilty of oppressing the Ukrainians. This is already evident in the first example of the genre, the *Eyewitness Chronicle*, which most likely was written by Roman Rakushka-Romanov'skyi between 1672 and 1702. The author begins his account of the war with a list of the Polish misdeeds and oppression that caused the Cossack rebellion—a compilation opening with a characteristic statement that “the origin and cause of the Khmel'nyts'kyi War is solely the Polish persecution of the Orthodox and oppression of the Cossacks.” Only after dwelling on the Polish misdeeds for some time does the author turn to the Jews, beginning with the observation that the town Jews had control over the liquor monopoly, which prevented the Cossacks from keeping any spirits at home. Then the author turns to the oppression of the peasants, blaming it mainly on the local castle chiefs and vicegerents (*starosty* and *namisnyky*), as well as on Jewish leaseholders:

That was what befell the Cossacks. It did not apply to the peasants, for they were well off with their fields, cattle and apiaries, but new practices, not customary in Ukraine, were devised by the castle chiefs, vicegerents, and Jews. For the lords themselves did not reside in Ukraine, but merely held offices and therefore knew little of the oppression of the peasants, or even if they knew, they were so blinded by gifts from the castle chiefs and the Jewish leaseholders that they could not recognize that their own property was being

used to bribe them; that they were being given what had been taken from their subjects, of which the subjects would not have complained so bitterly if the lord himself had taken it freely. Meanwhile the lazy scoundrel, the lazy Jew grew richer, riding a carriage drawn by several pairs of horses and thinking up new taxes: the ox tax, the handmill tax, the measuring tax, the marriage tax and others, seizing [debtors'] estates—until [the Poles] encountered one man whose apiary they seized, and that apiary was the source of trouble for all of Poland . . .¹²

In describing the course of the war, the author notes that the rebels “killed the noblemen, castle servants, Jews, and town officials wherever they found them, without sparing even their wives and children.” All the property of the victims, including specifically mentioned “Jewish estates,” was confiscated. Finally, “no Jews remained in Ukraine,” while “the greatest number of Jews perished in Nemyriv and Tulchyn—a countless number.”¹³

The next Cossack chronicle, Hryhorii Hrabianka's *The Events of the Most Bitter and Most Bloody War since the Origin of the Poles Between Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, the Zaporozhian Hetman, and the Poles . . .* (1710), also began with a long list of Polish misdeeds in Ukraine. Hrabianka probably used the Eyewitness's lengthy enumeration of complaints, but also, as Mykhailo Hrushevskyi has shown, relied heavily on the list of wrongdoings in Ukraine compiled by the Polish author Wespazjan Kochowski.¹⁴ One sentence from this five-page list of Polish misdeeds merits special attention, since it marks the first appearance in Ukrainian history writing of Jews as the leaseholders of Orthodox churches: “Also [the Poles] sold the Lord's churches to the Jews, and infants were baptized with the Jews' permission, and various religious customs of the pious [Christians] were at the mercy of Jewish leaseholders.”¹⁵

Parts of Samiilo Velychko's monumental, if too often fictional, *Chronicle* (1720s) have been lost. It cannot, therefore, be ascertained whether Velychko discussed Jewish oppression of Ukrainians in greater detail. The only relevant surviving mention of Jews in such a context comes from an apocryphal speech by Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi to the Ukrainian people dated 28 May 1648: “We shall not describe here comprehensively all the insults, oppression, and devastation inflicted upon us Little Russians by the Poles and their leaseholders and beloved factors, the Jews . . .”¹⁶

As for Hrabianka, in the subsequent narrative he mentions the Jewish invention of new tributes and the appropriation of debtors' estates, as well as the great landowners' “inflicting upon us” the Jewish tribe (in the text of the letter supposedly sent by Khmel'nyts'kyi to Warsaw). He tells the story of the Polish *szlachta* surrendering Jews to the Ukrainian Cossack colonel, Ivan Hanzha, at Nestervar (Tulchyn), and writes that the Jews defended themselves for three days. When Colonel Maksym Kryvonis took Bar, all the Poles there were slaughtered, as were the Jews, “of whom alone more than fifteen thousand were killed in Bar.”¹⁷ Velychko describes the massacre of Nestervar (Tulchyn) in terms almost identical to those of Hrabianka (instead of “defended themselves

for three days," he writes that the Jews "defended themselves relentlessly"). Velychko does not mention the killing of the Jews of Bar at all; rather, he says that "fourteen thousand German settlers, nobles who sought refuge there with their treasures, their servants, and others" perished.¹⁸ It is quite remarkable that the Ukrainian chroniclers' accounts of the anti-Jewish violence are so similar. As Velychko's translator, Valerii Shevchuk, has shown, their version of events was based on the widely read Polish historical poem *Wojna domowa* by Samuel Twardowski, published in 1681.¹⁹

Generally, the anti-Jewish pathos of the Cossack chroniclers can be traced to Polish sources. The most sensational story of "the keys to the church" surfaced suspiciously late in the Ukrainian written tradition, but was first cited in Polish literature as early as 1649. In the latter instance, it was employed as an illustration of Polish tolerance of Jewish exploitation, one of the misdeeds that gave rise to the Cossack rebellion.²⁰ As Polish historians began looking for the causes of the great uprising, which had precipitated a whole series of tragedies for Poland, they first focused on the magnates and particularly on their stewards, the Jews. In a sense this was an attempt, conscious or subconscious, to admit some responsibility for the uprising, while simultaneously minimizing the blame by identifying Jewish profiteering as the primary cause. In Polish writings, the prewar exploitation of Cossacks and peasants by Jews is described in the most strident terms. Among contemporary Polish authors, Samuel Grondski (Grądzki) in his *Historia belli Cosacco-Polonici* (early 1670s) and Wespazjan Kochowski, who wrote in the 1680s, developed the topic of Jewish exploitation of Ukrainians most prominently.²¹ Grondski, for instance, lists 17 causes of the uprising, with Jewish leaseholding, judicial powers, and control of Orthodox religious ceremonies (including payments demanded for the baptismal ceremony) prominent among them.²² Kochowski provides a similar enumeration of wrongdoings, especially by Jews, and his list, as noted earlier, was appropriated by the Ukrainian chronicler Hrabianka.

All these Polish influences notwithstanding, the Jewish motif in the Cossack chronicles was ultimately subordinated to the anti-Polish theme. In discussing the three fundamental grievances against the Poles—violation of the rights and liberties of the Cossack estate, violation of the rights of the Orthodox Church, and general social oppression—the chroniclers considered Jews to have acted as agents of the Polish lords, not as independent exploiters.

II

By the late eighteenth century, the Jewish factor came to occupy a more prominent place in narratives of the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising (with particular reference to its causes). Significantly, though, anti-Jewish rhetoric developed together with heightened anti-Polish and anti-Uniate fervor. The compilative *Historical Collection* (1770) by Stefan Lukoms'kyi ends its story in the late sixteenth century, long before the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising, but the author in-

cludes a diatribe against Uniates, Poles, and Jews as a postscript. Again, Jewish wrongdoings are placed at the end of the list:

Here this Historical Collection ends. What follows is [a description of] various developments in Russia, Ukraine, Poland, and Lithuania from 1606 to 1648, of the wars among different peoples, of how the damnable Union with Rome commenced in all the lands held by Poland and in Lithuania (this has already been discussed above), who was responsible for it, and how it was strengthened, of the persecutions experienced by the faithful Ruthenians and Cossacks who did not accept the Union, how the blameless exarch of the patriarch of Constantinople was exiled by the Uniates to Malbork and died there, and how the Orthodox would yet suffer because of the Union. Also, how the Poles included in the Cossack register only 6,000 of the 50,000 Cossacks who fought against the Turks under Hetman Sahaidachnyi, how [the Poles] abolished the hetman's office and cruelly executed many hetmans, and enserfed the remaining 44,000 Cossacks either by force or by deceit, and imposed the heaviest taxes on the Ukrainian peasants. Finally, [the Poles] leased divine churches to the Jews, to the great grief of the Orthodox, so that the Jews kept the keys to the churches, and should there be a need to celebrate a Christian rite, baptism, wedding, or anything else, [the Jews] charged the Orthodox a special tax, and would also curse, insult and beat the priests, tearing out their hair and beards. In other words, the Poles treated the Ruthenians just as they pleased with no fear of God or Judgment Day, and the following stories will expose their crimes in detail.²³

The triune nature of the “enemy” in this fragment—Uniates, Poles, and Jews—seems to provide a clue to the sources of Lukom'skyi's historical imagination. (The Cossack chroniclers were not especially concerned with the Uniate question, for example.) While Lukom'skyi was writing in the autonomous Hetmanate (under Russian authority) on the Left Bank of the Dnipro, another part of his fatherland, Right-Bank Ukraine, remained under Polish control. Through renewed colonization beginning approximately in the 1710s, the Poles had reestablished the institution of large estates owned by Polish magnates, worked by Ukrainian peasants, and run by stewards. The latter were now not necessarily Jewish; many were recruited from the minor Polish nobility instead. Yet Jews returned this time as well in the capacity of tax-farmers and tavern-keepers.²⁴ At the same time, the Orthodox Church was being liquidated, and most Ukrainians were at least nominally Uniate. While no Uniates were to be found in the Hetmanate and the Jewish presence there was insignificant, the same issues that sparked the Khmel'nytskyi uprising simmered again in eighteenth-century Right-Bank Ukraine. Unlike Hrabianka and Velychko, who wrote in the first two decades of the century, Lukom'skyi witnessed a series of virtually continuous uprisings west of the Dnipro in 1734 and 1750, and most notably in 1768, when Uniate clergymen, Polish nobles, and Jews were slaughtered in Uman. It was likely under the impression of the 1768

haidamaka uprising that Lukomskyi wrote his diatribe against Uniates, Poles, and Jews.

Istoriia Rusov is colored by the same heightened sense of Orthodoxy and Ukraine under siege, with even more emphasis on the evil Jews (and Uniates). The work was almost certainly written after the second partition of Poland (1793), when the Right Bank became part of the Russian Empire and brought home the Uniate, Polish, and Jewish questions.²⁵ Initially, the imperial authorities accepted the existing situation on the Right Bank, including the Polish magnate estates, the Jewish leaseholds, and even the hated Uniate Church. Although the forced conversion of the Uniates began in the 1790s, the Church itself continued to exist until 1839. There was an influx of Polish nobles into Kyiv, and Polish culture predominated there well into the nineteenth century.²⁶ Thus, for the author of *Istoriia Rusov*, even though Poland had been vanquished, the Polish issue remained very much alive within the borders of the Russian Empire. Inexorably linked to the Polish issue was the role of the Jews. Moreover, there was a massive influx of Jews into Left-Bank Ukraine, where previously there had been no significant Jewish presence. The Hetmanate, where *Istoriia Rusov* was written, found itself included in the emerging Pale of Settlement. Active and visible Jewish involvement in commerce and crafts, as well as their leaseholding practices in the Pale of Settlement (which included almost all of Ukraine, i.e., eight out of nine ethnic Ukrainian provinces), quickly triggered the “discovery” of the Jewish question in the Russian Empire. This discovery came complete with economic anxieties and, subsequently, religious animosity.²⁷

In *Istoriia Rusov*, the theme of leasing Orthodox churches to Jews precedes any discussion of economic exploitation. It is developed vividly and in great detail, with the Jews characterized as “irreconcilable enemies of Christianity” who are enjoying this opportunity to trample upon the Christian faith.²⁸ The theme of economic oppression is generally subordinated in *Istoriia Rusov* to the religious motive: the Jews curse the Orthodox faith in their synagogues, which pleases the Poles, who afford the Jews even more economic opportunities to oppress the Ukrainians.²⁹ The list of complaints goes on to incorporate the “keys to the church” argument:

The churches of those parishioners who did not accept the Union [with Rome] were leased to the Jews, and for each service a fee of one to five talers was set, and for christenings and funerals a fee of one to four *zlotys*. The Jews, relentless enemies of Christianity, universal wanderers and outcasts, eagerly took to this vile source of gain and immediately removed the church keys and bell ropes to their taverns. For every Christian need, the cantor was obliged to go to the Jew, haggle with him, and, depending on the importance of the service, pay for it and beg for the keys. And the Jew, meanwhile, having laughed to his heart's content at the Christian service, and having reviled all that Christians hold dear, calling it pagan, or, in their language, goyish, would order the cantor to return the keys with an oath that no services that were not paid for had been celebrated.³⁰

Given its strong presence in *Istoriia Rusov*, and Polish literature in general, as well as the subsequent increasing preoccupation of Ukrainian writers with this topic, one should at least briefly address the factual basis (if any) of the “keys to the church” theme. Mykhailo Hrushevskyi considered the question of Jewish church leaseholding in volume 8 of his monumental *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, concluding that no documentary evidence of such a practice had been discovered, and that the accusation itself had appeared rather late in the Ukrainian written tradition.³¹ The Russian Jewish historian Il'ia Galant similarly argued that, although the motif of Jewish leaseholding of churches was present in Polish and Ukrainian historical works and in Ukrainian folk tradition, there was no documentary proof of such a practice.³² Most recently, Judith Kalik of Hebrew University has indicated that although it was a rare phenomenon, there is clear documentary evidence of the leasing of both Catholic and Orthodox churches to Jewish leaseholders.³³ It is not my aim, of course, to resolve the question of whether Jews actually leased Orthodox churches in Ukraine. What interests me here is the dynamic of the Jewish question's appearance in Ukrainian historical tradition.

Istoriia Rusov includes many more references to Jews—mostly negative—that go far beyond the “keys to the church” theme. Jews are described as “Polish advisors and spies who, with their Talmud . . . also were not forgotten [by the Cossacks during the rebellion of 1630–1631] and were fully requited for their collection of taxes”; Jews were killed mercilessly by the thousands.³⁴ When the Khmel'nytskyi uprising broke out, the hetman “drove the Jews out of the part of Little Russia up to Kyiv and Kaniv.” Some “good” Jews, however, were able to purchase their survival and escape to Poland: “The Jews recognized by the people as behaving well and being useful rather than harmful to the community bought their freedom with silver and valuables that the army needed, and were allowed to go abroad without hostility.”³⁵

In the subsequent detailed narration of Khmel'nytskyi's war with the Poles, the author occasionally reminds us that one of the aims of the Cossack units was to clear Ukraine of Poles and Jews wherever they were to be found, although no concrete examples are provided.³⁶ The author of *Istoriia Rusov* reproduces the text of Khmel'nytskyi's fictional manifesto from Velychko (the one that mentions oppression at the hands of “the Poles and their leaseholders and beloved factors, the Jews”).³⁷ The story of the Bar massacre is given in much more detail than in the previous chronicles, although most of the new details concern particulars of the siege and military tactics. The author repeats the story of the 15,000 Jews killed in Bar.³⁸ He also makes a point of stressing rather minor reports of military action that have some remote connection with Jews; in some cases, he appears to rely on contemporary documents or diaries of Cossack staff officers: “On June 13, Khmel'nytskyi received a report from the quartermaster-general, Rodak, from the Siversk land, [informing the hetman] that he had cleared Chernihiv and the vicinity, as well as the Starodub region, including the town of Starodub, of Poles and Jews, and that his corps

was advancing rapidly to Novhorod-Siverskyi.”³⁹ According to *Istoriia Rusov*, Khmel'nytskyi continued to drive Poles and Jews out of the territories that he was taking, although “useful” Poles and Jews “who did not lord it over the Ruthenian people” were supposedly allowed to stay, paying a contribution in kind. This allegedly took place in Brody and Zamość in particular.⁴⁰

The author goes so far as to claim that the absence of Jewish leaseholding in the Ottoman Empire was a factor to be considered in concluding a treaty with that empire rather than with Muscovy in 1654. He claims, moreover, that some “young officials and Cossacks” brought this consideration to the attention of the council at Pereiaslav.⁴¹ The final mention of the Jews in *Istoriia Rusov* is a telling one: certain “anti-patriots” of Polish and Jewish background are supposedly concealing the original texts of the Cossack treaties with Muscovy that provided for a free and equal union between the Hetmanate and the Russian Empire.⁴² Thus, not only have Poles and Jews oppressed Ukrainians in the past, but they are also suppressing the truth about that past.

Istoriia Rusov was written at a great watershed in Ukrainian history. The author observed the ultimate defeat of two of the Hetmanate's greatest enemies, Poland and the Crimean Khanate, but he also witnessed the abolition of the autonomy of his beloved Cossack state, which was reduced to a mere three provinces of the Russian Empire. Moreover, on the Right Bank the Polish magnates still ruled, the Jews held a monopoly on taverns and tax collection, and the Uniate Church continued to exist. To complete the humiliation, his Left-Bank homeland was now included in the Pale of Settlement. It was this constellation of developments that likely gave rise to the author's virulently anti-Polish, anti-Uniate, and anti-Jewish views and his almost fanatical devotion to Orthodoxy. At the same time, the author of *Istoriia Rusov* is a child of the Enlightenment and distinguishes between “good” and “bad” Jews, Poles, and even Tatars. Thus, neither all Poles nor all Jews—nor all Tatars, either—are considered perpetual enemies of Ukraine, and there is hope of achieving harmony with the “good” elements of those nations. (The author does not extend similar consideration to Ukrainian Uniates.)

III

A high point of the Cossack tradition of historical and political thought, *Istoriia Rusov* also became a springboard for the Ukrainian national revival of the nineteenth century and held considerable sway over the next generation of Ukrainian historians and writers. Mykola Markevych's five-volume *Istoriia Malorossii* (History of Little Russia, 1842–1843), a patriotic history written under the influence of Romanticism, was particularly known for literally recasting *Istoriia Rusov*.⁴³ As far as the image of Jews is concerned, Markevych reproduces the stories concerning the Jewish right to levy duties on blessed bread at Easter, the Cossacks mocking their Jewish victims' curses upon the Christians, the “good Jews” being allowed to leave after paying ransom, the

capture of Bar, etc.⁴⁴ Markevych's book was very popular in its own right; its importance was magnified, moreover, owing to its use by Ukrainian Romantic writers, most notably Taras Shevchenko. Generally, *Istoriia Rusov* influenced the Romantic literary imagination considerably, both directly and through its "scholarly" adaptation in Markevych's *History*. The negative stereotype of the Jew as leaseholder, Polish agent, or simply go-between found its way into Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, Ievhen Hrebinka's novel *Chaikovs'kyi*, Kulish's poetry, Kostomarov's dramas, and Shevchenko's poem *Haidamaky*. Ukrainian literature would only overcome this stereotype in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.⁴⁵

The leading Ukrainian historian of the mid-nineteenth century, Mykola Kostomarov, paid considerable attention to Jewish exploitation of the Ukrainian people in his folkloristic, historical, and journalistic works. In a study of Ukrainian folk songs, Kostomarov emphasized their reflection of the historical "tyranny of the arrogant Jews."⁴⁶ This condemnation of the social role of the Jews of Ukraine is also prominent in his publicistic writings of the early 1860s:

When the Judeans settled in Poland and Little Russia, they occupied the place of the middle class, becoming willing servants and agents of the mighty nobility; they clung to the stronger side, and they fared well until the people, rising against the lords, brought under their judgment the helpers of the latter. The Judeans, caring only about their own comfort and that of their tribe, began to extract [advantages] from the relationship that then existed between the nobles and the serfs. In this way, the Judeans became the factotums of the lords; the lords entrusted to them their income, their taverns, their mills, their industry, their property, and their serfs, and sometimes even the faith of the latter.⁴⁷

Kostomarov's widely read book *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (1857), written in semi-scholarly style, was marked by the strong influence of Velychko and *Istoriia Rusov*. Nevertheless, Kostomarov dropped *Istoriia Rusov* as a source in the second edition, and in later editions also took into consideration other sources—in particular the testimony of the Jewish eyewitness Nathan Hannover, once it became available in Russia (beginning with the fourth edition in 1884).⁴⁸

Generally, modern Ukrainian history writing evolved in the same direction. As Frank E. Sysyn has shown, with the advent of positivism, new liberal and socialist ideals entered Ukrainian populist historiography, gradually dissolving traditional anti-Jewish rhetoric.⁴⁹ The younger contemporary of Kostomarov and doyen of late nineteenth-century populist historiography, Volodymyr Antonovych, declined to perpetuate the story of the church lease. For him, "it was neither faith nor nationality that engendered a hostile attitude toward the Jews [during the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising],"⁵⁰ but the latter's exploitation of the "simple folk." In the debate over the projected Khmel'nyts'kyi monument in Kyiv in the 1880s, the aging Kostomarov successfully opposed the depiction of a Jewish corpse under the hooves of Khmel'nyts'kyi's horse.⁵¹ In 1890, a

younger populist historian, Oleksandra Iefymenko, published a long and generally sympathetic assessment of the German Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz in the leading journal of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, *Kievskaiia starina*.⁵²

The greatest Ukrainian historian of the early twentieth century, Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, understood the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising primarily as a social movement, with national and religious "motifs" present as well. Incidentally, Hrushevskyi shows great appreciation of Nathan Hannover's account of pre-war social antagonisms:

This Jew from Volhynia penetrated more deeply into the foundations from which the uprising developed and produced an even broader analysis of its social and ethnic causes than our own "Eyewitness," who, without concentrating on the general condition of enserfment, merely refers to some of its secondary symptoms and manifestations: the arbitrary behavior of the leaseholders, Jewish in particular . . . such superficial attention to various details of social relations under serfdom, with no thorough analysis of the primary class and ethnic antagonisms, is quite typical: we encounter it in other authors as well.⁵³

Thus, on the Jewish question, the subsequent development of Ukrainian historical thought tended to undo the initial influence of *Istoriia Rusov*. At the same time, the general importance of the book for a national narrative of Ukrainian history increased with time. As the general public "rediscovered" Cossack glory with the advent of glasnost in the late 1980s and early 1990s, *Istoriia Rusov* became a bestseller in Ukraine. The 1846 edition was reprinted in 1991 in a press run of 100,000 copies; in the following year, the translation into modern Ukrainian of *Istoriia Rusov* was printed in a run of 200,000 copies.⁵⁴ Significantly, however, the Ukrainian commentators of *Istoriia Rusov* read it primarily as an anti-tsarist, anti-Russian indigenous narrative of Ukrainian history. The anti-Polish pathos of the work, with its attendant anti-Uniate and anti-Jewish rhetoric, appears to be of almost no importance to the readers of the 1990s.⁵⁵ Thus *Istoriia Rusov*'s Jewish stereotypes have ceased to be a source of the historical imagination, becoming instead subjects for scholarly examination.

NOTES

1. *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846), pp. 1–24 [=Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh 1 (26 January 1846)].
2. For the traditional account of the find, see Oleksandr Lazarev'skyi [Aleksandr Lazarevskii], "Otryvki iz semeinogo arkhiva Poletik," *Kievskaiia starina* 1891 (4): 113n2. The literature on *Istoriia Rusov* is extensive. Monographs include M. Vozniak, *Psevdo-Konys'kyi i Psevdo-Poletyka? ("Istoriia Rusov" u literaturi i nautsi)* (Lviv, 1939); and E. Borschak, *La légende historique de l'Ukraine. Istoriia Rusov* (Paris, 1949). The most recent study by a Ukrainian scholar is V. V. Kravchenko, *Narysy z ukrains'koï istoriohrafii epokhy natsional'noho vidrodzhennia (druha polovyna XVIII–seredyna XIX st.)* (Kharkiv, 1996), pp. 101–157.
3. *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846), p. 204.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 6–7, 209.
5. *Ibid.*, pp. 209, 229.
6. The most recent work is by V. V. Kravchenko, *Poema vol'noho narodu ("Istoriia Rusiv" ta ii mistse v ukrains'kii istoriohrafii)* (Kharkiv, 1996). Twentieth-century researchers have focused on the work's anti-Russian elements, largely ignoring the author's even more vehement anti-Polish and anti-Tatar views.
7. Both Joel Raba and George Grabowicz give examples of negative images of Jews in *Istoriia Rusov*, but neither author analyzes the work in any detail. See Joel Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial: The Fate of the Jews in the Wars of the Polish Commonwealth During the Mid-Seventeenth Century as Shown in Contemporary Writing and Historical Research* (Boulder, CO, 1995), pp. 228–32; and George G. Grabowicz, "The Jewish Theme in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Ukrainian Literature," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed. Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton, 1988), pp. 330–31.
8. Portions of this article have been adapted from my larger work, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory," to be published in a special issue of *Jewish History*. I would like to thank Moshe Rosman and Adam Teller, the editors of the collection, for permission to draw on that work.
9. See Zenon Kohut, "The Development of a Ukrainian National Historiography in Imperial Russia," in *Historiography of Imperial Russia: Profession, Practice, and Interpretation*, ed. John T. Sanders (Armonk, NY, 1999), pp. 453–77.

10. See Hans Rothe, ed., *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facsimile mit einer Einleitung* (Cologne, 1983).
11. On the Cossack chronicles, see Frank E. Sysyn, "Concepts of Nationhood in Ukrainian History Writing, 1620–1690," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10(3–4) December 1986: 393–423; idem, "The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14(3–4) December 1990: 593–607.
12. *Letopis' Samovidtsa* (Kyiv, 1878; reprinted Munich, 1972), pp. 3–5.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 12–13.
14. Mykhailo Hrushevskyy, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, pt. 2 (Kyiv, 1922; reprinted New York, 1956), pp. 124–25.
15. Hryhorii Hrabianka, *Deistviia prezel'noi i ot nachala poliakov krvavshoi nebyvaloi brani Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo, getmana zaporozhskogo, s poliaki* (Kyiv, 1854) [reprinted in Hryhorij Hrabjanka's "The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj" (Cambridge, MA, 1990), p. 30 (314) {=Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, 9}].
16. Samiilo Velychko, *Litopys*, trans. with an introduction by Valerii Shevchuk (Kyiv, 1991), vol. 1, p. 80.
17. Hrabianka, *Deistviia prezel'noi*, pp. 32, 48, 51, 52.
18. Velychko, *Litopys*, pp. 84, 89.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 84n150; cf. also p. 10.
20. Frank Sysyn, "A Curse on Both Their Houses: Catholic Attitudes toward the Jews and Eastern Orthodox during the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising in Father Pawel Ruszel's *Fawor niebieski*," in *Israel and the Nations: Essays Presented in Honor of Shmuel Ettinger* (Jerusalem, 1987), pp. xvii–xviii, xxiii.
21. Hrushevskyy, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, pt. 2, pp. 120–21.
22. Joel Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial*, pp. 111–12, quoting *Historia belli Cosacco-Polonici authore Samuele Grondski de Grondi*, ed. K. Koppi (Pest, 1789), pp. 32–33.
23. Stefan Lukoms'kyi [Lukomskii], "Sobranie istoricheskoe," in *Letopis' Samovidtsa*, pp. 371–72. Orest Levytskyi has argued that Lukoms'kyi planned to continue his narrative with his own translation of Twardowski's *Wojna domowa*, the text of which was eventually lost (cf. Levytskyi's "Introduction" in *ibid.*, p. xi).
24. M. J. Rosman, *The Lords' Jews: Magnate-Jewish Relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth During the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), pp. 109–110.

25. *Istoriia Rusov* mentions the Tmutorokan stone, which was found in 1792. (This point was originally made in an article by Anatolii Iershov, "Do pytannia pro chas napysannia 'Istorii Rusov,' a pochasty i pro avtora ii," *Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevs'koho* (Kyiv, 1928), vol. 1, pp. 288–89.) Since news of the find would have taken considerable time to circulate in the eighteenth century, it is highly likely that the work was written after the second partition of Poland. Many scholars think that *Istoriia Rusov* was written or edited as late as 1815–1825. See O. Ohloblyn, "Istoriia Rusov," *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, vol. 2 (Toronto, 1988), p. 360.
26. Michael F. Hamm, *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800–1917* (Princeton, 1993), pp. 55–81.
27. Cf. John Doyle Klier, *Russia Gathers Her Jews: The Origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia, 1772–1825* (DeKalb, IL, 1986), chs. 3–4.
28. *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846), pp. 40–41.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 48–49.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 40–41. The translation is adapted (with minor changes) from Grabowicz, "The Jewish Theme," p. 331.
31. "Notwithstanding a certain interest in this matter, no documentary evidence of Jewish leasing of churches or any related conflicts has been uncovered so far. The blaming of Jews for such misdeeds emerges relatively late in [Ukrainian] historical tradition, but this accusation comes to occupy a prominent and permanent place among the arguments of this historical antisemitism." (Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 8, pt. 2, p. 126).
32. Il'ia Galant, "Arendovali li evrei pravoslavnye tserkvi na Ukraine?" *Evreiskaia starina* 1 (1909): 71–87.
33. Judith Kalik made this claim during the discussion of her paper, "The Orthodox Church and the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth," at the International Conference "Gezeirot Tah-Tat—East European Jewry in 1648–1649: Context and Consequences" at Bar-Ilan University, 18–20 May 1998.
34. *Istoriia Rusov*, p. 52. The Jews are again referred to as Polish spies on p. 106.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 67, 74.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
39. *Ibid.*

40. Ibid., pp. 80, 82.
41. Ibid., p. 118.
42. Ibid., p. 122. To substantiate his defense of Cossack rights and privileges, the author claimed that Ukraine's treaty of union with Muscovy in 1654, like Lithuania's union with Poland in 1569, contained a clause whereby the Cossack state united with Muscovy "as equal with equal and free with free" (ibid., pp. 6–7, 209).
43. The most recent study of *Istoriia Rusov's* influence on Markevych is Kravchenko's *Narysy z ukrains'koï istoriohrafii epokhy natsional'noho vidrodzhennia*, pp. 232–56.
44. Mykola Markevych [Nikolai Markevich], *Istoriia Malorossii* (Moscow, 1842), vol. 1, pp. 121, 127–28, 171, 191.
45. For a more detailed discussion, see Grabowicz, "The Jewish Theme," pp. 327–43.
46. Mykola [Nikolai] Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoe znachenie iuzhno-russkogo pesennogo tvorchestva," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, 21 vols. in 8 bks. (St. Petersburg, 1903–1906; reprint, The Hague, 1968), vol. 8, p. 809.
47. "Iudeiam," *Osnova* 1 (1862): 43–44. The English translation is adapted, with minor changes, from Roman Serbyn, "The *Sion-Osnova* Controversy of 1861–1862," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Aster and Potichnyj, p. 99.
48. Mykola [Nikolai] Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (St. Petersburg, 1904), pp. 638–50.
49. Frank E. Sysyn, "The Jewish Factor in the Khmelnytsky Uprising," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations*, ed. Aster and Potichnyj, p. 46.
50. V. B. Antonovych, *Pro chasy kozats'ki na Ukraïni* (Kyiv, 1991), p. 118.
51. Mykola [Nikolai] Kostomarov, "Neskol'ko slov o pamiatnike Khmel'nitskomu," *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* 5 (1994): 145–47 [originally published in the newspaper *Novoe vremia* in 1869].
52. H. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, vol. 10: *Die Geschichte der Juden von der dauernden Ansiedlung der Marranen in Holland (1618) bis zum Beginne der Mendelssohnschen Zeit (1750)*, 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 1896); Oleksandra Iefymenko [Aleksandra Efimenko], "Bedstviia evreev v Iuzhnoi Rusi XVII v. (Po povodu knigi Grettsa 'Istoriia evreev ot epokhi Gollandskogo Ierusalima do padeniia frankistov')," *Kievskaiia starina* 6 (1890): 397–408 (Iefymenko used the Russian translation of one of the earlier editions).
53. Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*, vol. 8, pt. 2, pp. 119–20.

54. *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846; reprinted Kyiv, 1991); *Istoriia Rusiv*, trans. Ivan Drach, introduction by Valerii Shevchuk (Kyiv, 1991).
55. Fedir Shevchenko, "Z liubov'iu do Ukraïny," *Literaturna Ukraïna* 14 June 1990: 6; Valerii Shevchuk, *Kozats'ka derzhava: etiudy do istorii ukrains'koho derzhavotvorennia* (Kyiv, 1995), pp. 296–348; Iaroslav Dzyra and Mykola Shudria, "Chyia zh naspravdi 'Istoriia Rusiv'?" *Slovo Prosvity* 6 (June 1996): 8–9.