

Reconstructive Forgery: The Hadiach Agreement (1658) in the *History of the Rus'*

Serhii Plokhyy

Few events in Ukrainian and Polish history have provoked as many what-ifs as the agreement concluded between the Cossack hetman Ivan Vyhovsky and representatives of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth near the city of Hadiach in the autumn of 1658. Long before the rise of virtual and counterfactual history, historians in Poland and Ukraine defied the maxim of positivist historiography—that history has no subjunctive mood—and plunged into speculation on how differently the history of both countries would have turned out if, instead of fighting prolonged and exhausting wars, Poland-Lithuania and the Hetmanate had reunited in a new and reformed Commonwealth. Would this have stopped the decline of Poland, the ruin of Ukraine, Ottoman interventions, and the rise of Muscovy as the dominant force in the region?

The Union of Hadiach, as the agreement became known in historiography, had the potential to influence all these processes. It envisioned the creation of a tripartite Commonwealth—the Kingdom of Poland, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and a Principality of Rus', with the Cossack hetman as its official head. The union was the culmination of the activities of moderate forces among the Polish and Ukrainian elites and the embodiment of the hopes and dreams of the Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) nobility of the first half of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, the compromise that the union embodied was rejected by mainstream forces on both sides. The Commonwealth Diet ratified the text of the treaty with a number of important omissions, but even in that form it was viewed with suspicion and rejected by the Polish nobiliary elites, which could not reconcile themselves to the prospect of Orthodox Cossacks enjoying equal rights with Catholic nobles. On the Ukrainian side, the Cossack rank and file rejected a treaty that proposed to give all rights in the new Principality of Rus' to a limited number of representatives of the Ukrainian nobiliary and Cossack elites at the expense of the Cossack masses and rebel peasantry, which would have to submit once again to the noble landlords' jurisdiction and control.¹

¹ On the Union of Hadiach, see Vasyl Herasymchuk, "Vyhovshchyna i hadiatskyi traktat," *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenka* 87 (1909): 5–36, 88 (1909): 23–50, and 89 (1909): 46–91; Mykola Stadnyk, "Hadiatska uniiia," *Zapysky Ukrainskoho naukovooho tovarystva v Kyevi* 7 (1910): 65–85 and 8 (1911): 5–39; Waclaw Lipiński [Viacheslav Lypynsky], *Z dziejów Ukrainy: Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Włodzimierza Antonowicza, Paulina Święcickiego i Tadeusza Rylskiego*, wydana staraniem dr. J. Jurkiewicza, Fr. Wolskiej, Ludw. Siedleckiego i Waclawa Lipińskiego (Kyiv and Cracow, 1912), 588–617; Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 10 (New York: Knyhospilka, 1958), 288–359; Władysław Tomkiewicz, *Uгода hadziacka* (Warsaw: Instytut Badań Spraw Narodowościowych, 1937); Stanisław Kot, *Jerzy Niemirycz: W 300-lecie Ugody Hadziackiej* (Paris: Instytut Literacki, 1960); Andrzej Kamiński, "The Cossack Experiment in

Since its inception in the early nineteenth century, modern Ukrainian historiography has been largely positive in its assessment of the Union of Hadiach and its authors' actions and intentions. This applies particularly to the views of twentieth-century Ukrainian historians not subject to Soviet control. After the fall of the USSR and the collapse of Soviet historiography, whose practitioners condemned Vyhovsky as a "traitor to the Ukrainian people" and cited the Hadiach Agreement as proof of that treason, positive assessments not only of Vyhovsky but also of the Union of Hadiach made their way into historical writing. One of the deans of contemporary Ukrainian historiography, Natalia Yakovenko, sees the Hadiach Agreement as "a striking monument of the political and legal thought of its time, which, had it been realized, would indeed have had a chance of laying firm foundations for the future of the Polish-Lithuanian-Belarusian-Ukrainian community and renewing the Commonwealth by establishing new forms of coexistence for its peoples. This in turn would have guaranteed the protection of what had already been achieved—recognition of the right to freedom of the individual, property, and political expression."² The revival of interest in the agreement has been influenced, inter alia, by the increasing of Polish historiography, which has traditionally been friendly to the Union of Hadiach. For many Polish historians, the union has remained a symbol of Poland's civilizing mission in the East, religious tolerance, and ability to solve nationality problems within the context of a multiethnic state.³

This article examines the origins of the positive image of the Union of Hadiach in modern Ukrainian historiography, trying to understand how that image was created and the meaning it conveyed during the first decades of the Ukrainian cultural revival. At the centre of this discussion is the *History of the Rus' (Istoriia Rusov)*—a historical pamphlet that captivated the imagination of the Ukrainian elites of the 1820s, 1830s, and 1840s, when the Ukrainian national project took shape. If one were to seek the single most important work of Ukrainian nineteenth-century historiography, the *History of the Rus'* would certainly stand out. It also comes to mind as

Szlachta Democracy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: The Hadiach (Hadziacz) Union," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1, no. 2 (June 1977): 178–97, here 195–97; Janusz Kaczmarczyk, "Hadziacz 1658: Kolejna ugoda czy nowa unia," *Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainistyczne* 2 (1994): 35–42; Antoni Mironowicz, *Prawosławie i unia za panowania Jana Kazimierza* (Białystok: Orthdruk, 1997), 149–89; and Tatiana Yakovleva, *Hetmanshchyna v druhii polovyni 50-kh rokiv XVII stolittia: Prychyny ta pochatok Ruiny* (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1998), 305–23.

² See Natalia Yakovenko, *Narys istorii Ukrainy z naidavnishykh chasiv do kintsia XVIII stolittia* (Kyiv: Heneza, 1997), 212. Cf. idem, *Narys istorii serednovichnoi ta rannomodernoi Ukrainy*, 2nd ed. (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2005), 373–74.

³ See Andrzej Kamiński, *Historia Rzeczypospolitej wielu narodów, 1505–1795: Obywatele, ich państwa, społeczeństwo, kultura* (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000), 134–35. For a survey of the ideas that informed traditional Polish historiography, see Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, 10: 354–55. On the approaches dominant in modern Polish historiography, see A. B. Pernal, "The Union of Hadiach (1658) in the Light of Modern Polish Historiography," in *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, 988–1988*, 177–92, ed. Oleh W. Gerus and Alexander Baran (Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada, 1989).

the work that contributed most to the popularization of a positive image of the Union of Hadiach in modern Ukraine.⁴

The author of the *History of the Rus'* took the dry narrative inherited from the Cossack chronicles and filled it with heroes and their deeds. Readers brought up on the ideas of the Enlightenment and the works of the early Romantics found the kind of storytelling they craved in the pages of the *History of the Rus'*. Even so, its historiographic canvas and some of its important ideas harked back to past chronicles. That was certainly true of the work's protagonist—the Rus' nation, which had its origins in the writings of the seventeenth-century Ruthenian chroniclers. To be sure, the author of the *History of the Rus'* picked and chose from the historiographic tradition: for example, he insisted on the exclusive use of the Rus' name for his country and people while rejecting the term “Ukraine,” which had been just as current in the seventeenth century and was becoming increasingly popular in the eighteenth.⁵

Facts and ideas borrowed from previous authors had to fit the author's paradigm: if there were not enough facts, they could easily be invented in the manner of James Macpherson and his *Ossian*. Like Macpherson's Ossianic poetry and the historical forgeries of Václav Hanka, the *History of the Rus'* came into existence at a time of cultural upheaval and growing interest in the preservation of local heritage. All these mystifications were responses to a longing for (invariably glorious) local tradition, which was considered lost beyond recovery by any other means. The Ukrainian antiquarians of the first decades of the nineteenth century, like their Scottish and Bohemian counterparts, hoped for a miracle, a recovery of a national Homer, and a sort of miracle did indeed take place. It came in the form of “reconstructive forgeries”—freshly created literary and historical texts that recovered parts of the otherwise lost national narrative. The “signatures” of Ossian in Scotland and Konysky in Ukraine gave these works an authority and appeal they would otherwise have lacked.⁶

⁴ See *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii: Sochinenie Georgiia Koniskago, arkhiepiskopa Belorusskago* (Moscow, 1846; repr.: Kyiv: Dzvyn, 1991). The *History of the Rus'* was a mystification attributed to the Hetmanate-born Orthodox archbishop of Belarus Heorhii Konysky; his authorship was not challenged until the second half of the nineteenth century. There is an extensive scholarly literature on the *History*. For a survey, see Volodymyr Kravchenko, *Narysy z istorii ukrainskoi istoriografii epokhy natsionalnoho vidrozhennia (druha polovyna XVIII-seredyna XIX st.)* (Kharkiv: Osnova, 1996), 101–15; and idem, “*Istoriia rusiv u suchasnykh intepretatsiakh*,” in *Synopsis: Essays in Honour of Zenon E. Kohut*, 275–94, ed. Serhii Plokhly and Frank E. Sysyn (Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2005) = *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 29, nos. 1–2 (2004).

⁵ On the concepts of fatherland and nation in the *History of the Rus'*, see Frank E. Sysyn, “The Persistence of the Little Russian Fatherland in the Russian Empire: The Evidence from the *History of the Rus'* or of Little Russia (*Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii*),” in *Imperienvergleich: Beispiele und Ansätze aus osteuropäischer Perspektive. Festschrift für Andreas Kappeler*, 39–49, ed. Guido Hausmann and Angela Rustemeyer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009). On the use of the terms “Rus” and “Ukraine” in the *History of the Rus'*, see my article “Ukraine or Little Russia? Revisiting the Early Nineteenth-Century Debate,” *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 48, nos. 3–4 (September–December 2006): 335–53.

⁶ On historical and literary mystifications in Eastern Europe, see Nick Groom, *The Forger's Shadow: How Forgery Changed the Course of Literature* (London: Picador, 2002); Margaret

The anonymous author's interpretation of the Hadiach myth gives a fairly good idea of what the new generation of Ukrainian elites expected from the history of their land and of the way in which the author tried to meet those expectations. One of the challenges that that myth encountered in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was the growing anti-Polish sentiment in Ukraine and the Russian Empire at large. That new mood was fully reflected in the *History of the Rus'*, making it one of the most anti-Polish historical works ever produced in modern Ukraine. Judging by the introduction to the *History*, one of its major tasks was to debunk the "tales" of Polish and Lithuanian authors and their followers in Ukraine. The anonymous author set out to prove that Ukraine had been settled by the Rus' princes, not by the Polish kings; that Little Russia had fought numerous battles with Poland for its liberation, joined the Russian state of its own free will, and deserved recognition for its martial deeds.⁷ Could the Hadiach myth really fit this historiographic paradigm?

Apparently it could, though not without certain difficulties and transformations. The Union of Hadiach emerges from the pages of the *History of the Rus'* in a version most unexpected for anyone familiar with its actual history and the texts of the agreement. Indeed, the anonymous author offers the most counterfactual account of the union ever written. First of all, we learn from the *History* that although the treaty was based on the Hadiach articles, it was not negotiated at Hadiach at all, but in the town of Zaslav (a.k.a. Zaslavl). Second, its principal Ukrainian initiator was not Yurii Nemyrych or Ivan Vyhovsky, but Yurii Khmelnytsky, who allegedly lost his hetmancy for agreeing to the union's conditions. The text of the agreement presented in the *History of the Rus'* finds little corroboration either in contemporary versions of the treaty or in the variant summarized by the Polish historian Samuel Twardowski and later used by the Cossack historians Samiilo Velychko and the author of the Hryhorii Hrabianka Chronicle.

According to the *History*, the treaty was mainly concerned with the rights and prerogatives of the Rus' nation, not with the hetman or the Cossack state—the two subjects that took centre stage in the account of the agreement in the Hrabianka Chronicle. The Rus' nation of the *History of the Rus'* came from the same Sarmatian stock as the Polish nation and occupied the principalities, or palatinates, of Kyiv, Chernihiv, Siversk, and Volodymyr. It was equal to the Polish and Lithuanian nations under the king's rule. Its leader was the Cossack hetman, who assumed supreme command in wartime and held the title of prince of Rus' or Sarmatia. The hetman was the commander in chief of a forty-thousand-strong army and had the right to recruit additional troops from volunteers and Zaporozhian Cossacks. He also supervised the regional governors or palatines, conducted elections to the General Council, and was in charge of the defense and internal security of the Rus' land. That land participated in wars conducted by the

Russett, *Fictions and Fakes: Forging Romantic Authenticity, 1760–1845* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); K. K. Ruthven, *Faking Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and Susan Stewart, *Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994). On literary mystifications in Russia and Ukraine, see George G. Grabowicz, "National Poets and National Mystifications," in *Literární mystifikace, etnické mýty a jejich úloha při formování národního vědomí: Sborník příspěvků z mezinárodní konference konané ve dnech 20.–21.10.2001*, 7–24, ed. Blanka Rašticová = *Studie Slováckého muzea: Uherské Hradiště* 6 (2001).

⁷ See *Istoriia Rusov*, 4.

Polish Crown only by express agreement. The right to elect the hetman and the palatines belonged exclusively to the local Cossack elite (“knights”); foreigners were excluded. The treaty guaranteed the equality of all representatives of the Rus' knightly estate and nation with their Polish counterparts, and the equality of the “Rus' Catholic, or Greek, religion” with the “Polish or Roman Catholic” one.⁸

What should one make of this account of the Union of Hadiach? It certainly tells more about the anonymous author's views than about the agreement. Still, in order to reconstruct those views, one must be able to separate what the author borrowed from his sources from what he contributed himself. Thus the first step in recovering the “value added” component of a given narrative should be the identification of the sources the author used. A detailed study of those sources remains a task for the future. However, research by previous generations of scholars about the *History of the Rus'* indicates its close relation to two eighteenth-century Ukrainian texts—the *Short Chronicle of Little Russia*, published in St. Petersburg in 1777 by Vasyl Ruban, a native of the Hetmanate,⁹ and the *Chronicle of Little Russia*, published in French as the second volume of Jean-Benoît Scherer's *Annales de la Petite-Russie* in Paris in 1778.¹⁰ Both monuments actually represent different versions of the same basic text, the *Brief Description of Little Russia*, by far the most popular chronicle in eighteenth-century Ukraine.¹¹

While the author of the *History of the Rus'* made use of the *Short Chronicle of Little Russia* for his coverage of the eighteenth century, he appears to have drawn on Scherer's *Annales de la Petite-Russie* for his account of the Union of Hadiach. Scherer's version of the Hadiach story begins with the Polish mission that came to Vyhovsky to confirm his title of hetman and enact the agreement he had negotiated earlier, together with Yurii Khmelnytsky, at Hadiach. Scherer lists the conditions of the treaty, which included recognition of the hetman's authority over Ukraine as a whole,

⁸ Ibid., 143–45. On the treatment of the Union of Hadiach in the Cossack chronicles of the first decades of the eighteenth century, see my article “Hadjač 1658: The Origins of a Myth,” in *Nel Mondo degli Slavi: Incontri e dialoghi tra culture. Studi in onore di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff*, vol. 1: 449–58, ed. Mario Di Salvo, Giovanna Moracci, and Giovanna Siedina (Firenze: Firenze University Press, 2008).

⁹ See *Kratkaia letopis Mal'ia Rossii s 1506 po 1776 god* (St. Petersburg, 1777). On the parallels between the *Short Chronicle* and the *History of the Rus'*, see Mykhailo Vozniak, *Psevdo-Konysky i Psevdo-Poletyky* (“Istoriia Rusov” v literaturi i nautsi) (Lviv and Kyiv: Ukrainska Mohyliansko-Mazepynska akademiia nauk, 1939), 135–59.

¹⁰ See Jean-Benoît Scherer, *Annales de la Petite-Russie*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1778); Ukrainian trans.: *Litopys Malorosii, abo Istoriia kozakiv-zaporozhtsiv ta kozakiv Ukrainy abo Malorosii*, trans. Viktor Koptilov (Kyiv: Ukrainskyi pysmennyk, 1994), on-line at <litopys.org.ua>. On the parallels between Scherer's version of the *Brief Description* and the *History of the Rus'*, see Mykhailo Hrushevsky, “Z istorychnoi fabulistyky kintsia XVIII v.,” repr. in *Ukrainskyi istoryk*, nos. 110–15 (1991–92): 125–29; Oleksander Ohloblyn, “‘Annales de la Petite-Russie’ Sherera i ‘Istoriia Rusov,’” *Naukovyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoho vilnoho universytetu* 5 (1948): 87–94; and Ivan Dzyra, “Vplyv ‘Litopysu Malorosii’ Zhana Benua Sherera v ‘Istarii Rusiv,’” *Problemy istorii Ukrainy XIX–pochatku XX st.*, 2003, no. 6: 412–25.

¹¹ One of the eighteenth-century Ukrainian historians who used the text of the *Short Chronicle* as a source on the Union of Hadiach was Oleksander Rigelman, who wrote his historical chronicle of Ukraine in the 1780s. See his *Litopysna opovid pro Malu Rosiiu ta ii narod i kozakiv uzahali* (Kyiv: Lybid, 1994), 276–77.

the election of the hetman and senators by the Cossacks from among their own candidates, and the right of the Cossack Host to remain neutral in wars conducted by the Poles. Scherer also considered the agreement to have resulted from a Polish plot. He wrote that although Vyhovsky accepted the agreement, many Cossacks were more skeptical in their assessment of Polish intentions, suspecting that the Poles would renege on their promises. Thus it was Vyhovsky, not the entire host, who was blamed for entering into an agreement with the deceitful Poles.¹²

The author of the *History of the Rus'* was generally much more positive in his assessment of the Union of Hadiach than Scherer. He did not interpret it as a Polish ploy, noting only that it was rejected by the Cossack Host, provoked accusations against Yurii Khmelnytsky, and cost him the hetmancy. With reference to the conditions of the union, the anonymous author wrote: "But when they were announced, representatives of the officers and rank-and-file Cossacks, having learned of a change of such importance and so shameful to all, immediately abandoned the hetman, heaping abuse on him, cursing his base behaviour and villainous intentions, and returned to the town of Chyhyryn."¹³ These were harsh words of condemnation, but the author of the *History of the Rus'* gave no indication that he shared the sentiment he described. Like all Ukrainian chroniclers before him, he preferred to blame Ivan Vyhovsky for the union while sheltering Yurii Khmelnytsky from direct criticism. According to the *History of the Rus'*, the younger Khmelnytsky was rejected by the Cossack Host but found support among the Zaporozhian Cossacks, who were unhappy with the union with Russia largely because they were routinely insulted by Russian soldiers during joint military campaigns.

In this conflict between the Zaporozhians and the Muscovites, the anonymous author sided with the former. "Those [Muscovite] soldiers," he wrote, "then still in gray topcoats and bast shoes, unshaven and bearded, that is, in their full peasant aspect, nevertheless had an incomprehensible arrogance or some kind of vile habit of giving contemptuous names to all peoples, such as *poliachishki*, *nemchurki*, *tatarishki* [derogatory names for Poles, Germans and Tatars], and so on. According to this strange habit, they called the Cossacks forelocks and topknots, and sometimes brainless topknots, and this sent the Cossacks into frenzies of rage; they often quarreled and fought with the soldiers, and finally the Cossacks became irreconcilably hostile and breathed a constant aversion to them." It is hard to escape the impression that by telling this story, which depicts the Cossacks as victims of culturally inferior but arrogant Muscovite soldiers, the author of the *History of the Rus'* was not only trying to exonerate Yurii Khmelnytsky but also to justify his union with Poland.¹⁴

Scherer is partly responsible for the major confusion the author of the *History of the Rus'* created in his account of the Union of Hadiach. In an apparent effort to make sense of the complex history of the removal of Yurii Khmelnytsky from the hetmancy and the ascension of Ivan Vyhovsky to that office, the author seized on the reference in the chronicle used by Scherer to Khmelnytsky as one of the negotiators of the Hadiach Agreement. It seems that the author was unsure whether it was Bohdan Khmelnytsky or his son Yurii who negotiated the deal. Thus the author mentioned Bohdan

¹² See Scherer, *Annales de la Petite-Russie*, vol. 2.

¹³ *Istoriia Rusov*, 144.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 145.

Khmelnysky as the negotiator of the Hadiach articles but presented that information as not entirely reliable: it was divulged to the younger Khmelnytsky by the Poles. In the *History of the Rus'* Yurii Khmelnytsky figures as the main promoter and victim of the union, which he accepted on the basis of the Hadiach Articles at the Congress of Zaslav. There the articles were guaranteed not only by representatives of Poland but also of the Habsburg and Ottoman empires—a “true” international congress, not unlike those the European powers conducted in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The participation of representatives of the great powers certainly lends prestige and international legitimacy to the agreement in this account, but why did the “congress” take place in Zaslav? There may never be an answer to this question, but from the viewpoint of the author of the *History of the Rus'* it probably made sense to “organize” a congress featuring representatives of the Cossacks, Poles, Habsburgs, and Ottomans in a town that he mentioned repeatedly as a Ukrainian-Polish-Ottoman border point. Besides, Zaslav was designated as the capital of a new imperial vicergency immediately after the Second Partition of Poland in 1793.¹⁵

The anonymous author of the *History of the Rus'* was clearly an admirer of the Hadiach Articles. He returned to them again and again in his text, writing about Yurii Khmelnytsky's second election to the hetmancy, his appointment as prince of Sarmatia by the Ottomans, and the election of Mykhailo Khanenko as hetman.¹⁶ Each time he referred to the Hadiach or Zaslav Articles, he mentioned that they had been approved and guaranteed by representatives of the great powers. It was easy for the author of the *History of the Rus'* to endorse the agreement, given that not only the Zaslav Congress but also most of the Hadiach text was of his own creation. Most of the text of the Hadiach Agreement as it appears in the *History of the Rus'* came from a source that had nothing to do with the 1658 union. This was the text of the Zboriv Agreement of 1649, which appears about a hundred pages before the account of the Union of Hadiach. That text, in turn, had little to do with the actual text of the agreement, but neither was it a product of the anonymous author's pure imagination.

Why would someone create a forgery by recycling a document cited earlier in the same work? It would appear that the anonymous author thought of himself as a careful researcher of historical fact, not a literary criminal. His sources claimed that the Hadiach Articles had originally been proposed by Bohdan Khmelnytsky. In fact, Hrabianka, who may have been known to the author through other versions of his abridged chronicle, stated that these were Khmelnytsky's “well-known” articles. The only well-known articles of the old hetman to which the author seems to have had access were the ones negotiated at Zboriv. He presented a long and elaborate history of the negotiation of the Pereiaslav Agreement, but summarized its text in a few relatively short sentences. Thus he used an apocryphal text of the Zboriv Agreement in his possession to reconstruct the text of the Hadiach Articles. In his view, the latter could not be less advantageous to the Cossacks than their precursor, the Treaty of Zboriv. A comparison of the texts of the Zboriv Agreement and the Union of Hadiach, as presented in the *History of the Rus'*, leaves little doubt that if the latter text was a creation of the author of the *History*, the former (or at least parts of it) had

¹⁵ See *Istoriia Rusov*, 129–30, 143–44; and “Iziaslav (Zaslav),” in *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, vol. 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

¹⁶ *Istoriia Rusov*, 150, 157, 170.

a different author. The text of the Zboriv Agreement is full of Ukrainisms, many of which the author of the *History of the Rus'* corrected in his reconstruction of the Hadiach Articles. For example, a passage from the text of the Zboriv Agreement, "From now on the Ruthenian nation is and shall remain independent of all but itself and its government," was rendered in the text of the Union of Hadiach as "Let the Ruthenian nation and its land ... remain free, depending on themselves and their government."¹⁷ Each of the texts has its share of Ukrainian linguistic influences, but the most obvious ones, like "From now on ... is and shall remain independent of all but itself," are to be found only in the text of the Zboriv Agreement. The anonymous author of the *History of the Rus'* clearly had a much better command of Russian than the authors of some of his sources.

The author of the *History of the Rus'* was evidently prepared to improve not only the language of his sources but also their content. He began his version of the Hadiach Agreement not with a reference to the abolition of the church union, as did Hrabianka and his editors and continuators, but with a chapter affirming that the Rus' nation was free, that it was joining other "Polish nations" as equals, and that all earlier conflicts between them should be forgiven and forgotten. In essence, the first clause of the new Hadiach Agreement, with its emphasis on the Rus' nation, was little more than a conflation of the first two clauses of the alleged Zboriv Agreement. It declared the anonymous author's primary interest in the history of the Rus' nation and his readiness to interpret major events of the Cossack past as episodes of that history. The author borrowed from the alleged text of the Zboriv Agreement, transferring to his text of the Union of Hadiach provisions that stipulated the independence of the Rus' government; the supreme authority of the hetman, elected exclusively by his own Cossack Host (without the involvement of foreigners; the numerical strength of the Cossack Host (forty thousand, plus an unlimited number of volunteers); and, finally, the Rus' nation's right to defend its homeland and to choose whether to participate in the Commonwealth's wars or remain neutral. The provision on the equality of the Orthodox and Catholic churches may have come from the apocryphal text of the Zboriv Agreement or from any of the accounts of the Hadiach Agreement that the author had in his possession.

The author also made some additions to the apocryphal text of the Zboriv Agreement and dropped some of its provisions, turning his version of the Hadiach Articles into a document inspired by, but still very different in its political message from, the text of the agreement. Interesting in this regard is the author's definition of the territory claimed by the Rus' nation. If in the case of the Zboriv Agreement the Rus' nation's western boundary was defined by the Horyn River (a historically correct border of the Hetmanate), in the case of the Hadiach Agreement the territory claimed by the Rus' nation included the "principalities or palatinates" of Kyiv, Chernihiv, Siversk, and Volodymyr(-Volynskyi). The author was clearly a patriot of the Siversk land. Although there was a medieval Novhorod-Siverskyi principality and, for a brief period, an eighteenth-century governorship of Novhorod-Siverskyi, no palatinate of Siversk ever existed. More important in retrospect is that the author claimed for his Rus' nation all the Ukrainian lands attached to the Russian Empire as a result of the partitions of Poland, including Volhynia.

¹⁷ Ibid., 94, 143.

In political terms, the major departure from the apocryphal text of the Zboriv Agreement was the anonymous author's emphasis on the powers of the hetman and the rights of the nobility ("knights"). He declared that in wartime the hetman could become an autocratic ("samovlastnyi") prince of Rus' and Sarmatia, a title apparently based on the one Yurii Khmelnytsky used in the 1660s. The author of the *History of the Rus'* referred to it in relation to Khmelnytsky's installation as ruler of Ukraine by the Ottomans, allegedly on the basis of the Hadiach Articles. He considered the provision about the hetman's absolute powers to be one of the most important articles and made reference to it in his account of the installation of Mykhailo Khanenko as hetman—again, allegedly, on the basis of the Hadiach Articles. According to the author's variant of the articles, the hetman supervised the activities of the elected palatines and was in charge of elections to the General Diet—an institution not mentioned in the text of the alleged Zboriv Agreement. The anonymous author replaced the agreement's provisions stipulating the election of the hetman and the government by the Cossack officers and the whole host, or even the population at large, with references to election by the nobility ("knights") alone.¹⁸

The major omission concerned the provision for the abolition of the church union. Although that provision appeared in all the sources on the Union of Hadiach available to the anonymous author—the two versions of the *Brief Description of Little Russia* and the apocryphal text of the Zboriv Agreement—it was dropped in his account of the Hadiach Agreement. Did the author—who, as students of the *History of the Rus'* have shown, was influenced by Enlightenment ideas—prefer toleration to violence in the sphere of church-state relations, or was he trying to accommodate new members of the Rus' nation, which now included largely Uniate Volhynia? None of these assumptions helps explain the strong anti-Uniate statements elsewhere in the *History of the Rus'*. Did the author simply forget to "adjust" the anti-Uniate tone of his sources to fit his own enlightened views on the subject? We lack answers to these questions and must leave them open for now. It seems quite obvious, however, that the author dropped all references to the church union not because he gained access to the version of the Treaty of Hadiach approved by the Polish Diet in 1659, which indeed did not stipulate the liquidation of the Uniate Church, but for ideological reasons. While the author was quite limited in his selection of historical sources, there were almost no bounds on his imagination and ability to create texts reflecting the ideas, tastes, and preferences of his own era.¹⁹

A careful reader of the *History of the Rus'* might conclude that the Rus' nation emerged from the Hadiach Agreement with a larger territory than the one provided by the Treaty of Zboriv, with a much more powerful hetman who could act as an independent prince in wartime and a much stronger elite that deprived the Cossack Host of the right to elect its hetman and local governors. The numerical strength of the Cossack Host remained the same, as did the status of the Rus' nation in the Commonwealth. The only negative feature of the agreement in this account, it would seem, was its association with Ivan Vyhovsky. The anonymous author continued the well-established tradition of Cossack historical writing that distanced the good agreement from the evil Vyhovsky. He added another negative feature, referring to

¹⁸ Ibid., 143–44, 157, 170.

¹⁹ Cf. the texts of the Zboriv and Hadiach agreements in *ibid.*, 94–95, 143–44.

Vyhovsky as an ethnic Pole (“*prirodnyi poliak*”)—in a world of rising nationalism, this served to explain Vyhovsky’s treasonous actions better than earlier references to his Polish schooling and sympathies.²⁰

The image of the Hetmanate that emerges from the text of the Hadiach Articles as presented by the author of the *History of the Rus'* may be distant from mid-seventeenth-century realities, but it was fairly close to what prevailed—or, at least, to what the Cossack officers wanted—in the mid-eighteenth century. Strong rule by the hetman; the political dominance of the Cossack elites; the establishment of a local Diet—all these were features of the reform program for the Hetmanate advanced by the last hetman, Kyrylo Rozumovsky. This was the image remembered and cherished by the Ukrainian nobility at the turn of the nineteenth century.²¹ The anonymous author ascribed special importance to the Rus' nation, depicted as equal to other nations, its rights not only recognized by the Polish Crown but also guaranteed by the major European powers. This was a nation that tolerated other major religions in the spirit of the Enlightenment, and whose own religion was tolerated in return. It was a nation of which the reader could be proud, and the author of the *History of the Rus'* could also be well satisfied, knowing that the goal declared in the introduction to the work—to render due homage to the glorious deeds of the Rus' nation and its leaders—was well served by his account of the Hadiach Agreement.²²

The introduction proposed that such homage could best be rendered by narrating the numerous battles of the Rus' nation against the Poles, but the anonymous author’s treatment of the Union of Hadiach proved that agreements concluded with the Poles, presented in an appropriate light, could do just as well. Indeed, the author of the *History of the Rus'*—the most anti-Polish work in Ukrainian historiography—managed to appropriate even the myth of Hadiach for his purpose. While the author clearly located his Rus' nation within the Russian imperial historical space, he needed the Polish “other” to fully define his people within that space. His account of the Cossack wars with Poland was meant to emphasize the importance of the Rus' nation for the empire, while the Cossack treaties with the Polish kings—evidence of the seriousness with which the Cossacks were treated in the Commonwealth—gave the Rus' nation a claim to special status in the imperial setting. Both elements promoted national pride among the Ukrainian elites, thereby contributing to the process of nation building in modern Ukraine. Myths like that of Hadiach were indispensable to the success of the national project. The author’s treatment of the Hadiach myth in the *History of the Rus'* shows him adapting it to the requirements of a national narrative—a new genre of historical writing establishing itself in a world characterized by the rise of exclusive national identities.

The *History of the Rus'* played an important role in the development of Ukrainian historiography, serving as a bridge between eighteenth-century Cossack historical

²⁰ See *ibid.*, 143.

²¹ On Rozumovsky’s attempted reforms in the Hetmanate, see Zenon E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1988), 86–94.

²² See *Istoriia Rusov*, iii–iv.

writing and modern Ukrainian historiography of the nineteenth century. Its impact on Taras Shevchenko and his generation of Ukrainian nation builders has been well documented. It is safe to say that the *History of the Rus'* was one of the most influential historiographic texts of the Ukrainian cultural revival.²³ When the first modern history of Ukraine by Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamensky (1822) was criticized for being little more than a history of one Russian province, Ukrainian authors turned to the *History of the Rus'* in search of the authentic flavour of Ukrainian history.²⁴ Mykola Markevych, the author of the multi-volume *History of Little Russia* (1842–43), used the *History of the Rus'* not only for patriotic inspiration but also as a historical source, never doubting the authenticity of its data.²⁵ Along with Bantysh-Kamensky's narrative, Markevych's *History* remained the only synthesis of the Ukrainian past available in the Russian Empire until the publication of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *Survey History of the Ukrainian People* (1904).²⁶ Thus its influence on the formation of Ukrainian historical and national identity can hardly be exaggerated.

For better or worse, like Shevchenko's poetry, Markevych's *History* disseminated not only the ideas but also the confusions created by the anonymous author of the *History of the Rus'*. The history of the Union of Hadiach was one of the primary beneficiaries and victims of that process. If Bantysh-Kamensky preferred to ignore the account of the Hadiach/Zaslav Agreement in the *History of the Rus'*,²⁷ Markevych was at pains to reconcile the text of the Hadiach Articles that he found there with the text that he knew from the so-called Frolov Chronicle. Nor could Markevych find corroboration of the anonymous author's claim that the Union of Hadiach had been concluded by Yurii Khmelnytsky, as opposed to Ivan Vyhovsky. Ultimately Markevych printed both texts of the Hadiach Treaty available to him. The first text, taken verbatim from the *History of the Rus'*, he called the Zaslav Articles. He referred to the second, taken from the Frolov Chronicle, as the Hadiach Articles. Both treaties were allegedly negotiated by Vyhovsky, whom Markevych, following the author of the *History of the Rus'*, called a Pole. "The ambitious, money-grubbing Vyhovsky, foreign by birth to Little Russia, indifferent to the welfare of a people to which he was not related, did not fail to betray Ukraine, which had done him a great favour," wrote Markevych, adding a dose of mid-nineteenth-century populism to the anonymous author's nationalism.²⁸

²³ On the influence of the *History of the Rus'* on Ukrainian literary and cultural figures, see Vozniak, *Psevdo-Konysky i Psevdo-Poletyka*, 5–60.

²⁴ See my *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (University of Toronto Press, 2005), 153–55.

²⁵ See Nikolai Markevich, *Istoriia Malorossii*, 5 vols. (Moscow, 1842–43); and Mykola Markevych, *Istoriia Malorosii* (Kyiv: In iure, 2003). Markevych referred to Heorhii Konysky as the author of the *History of the Rus'*—a belief shared by everyone familiar with it until the second half of the nineteenth century.

²⁶ Mikhail Grushevsky, *Ocherk istorii ukrainskogo naroda* (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia polza, 1904).

²⁷ Bantysh-Kamensky used a copy of the Hadiach Articles from the archive of the College of Foreign Affairs in Moscow. See his *Istoriia Maloi Rosii ot vodvoreniia slavian v sei strane do unichtozheniia getmanstva* (Kyiv: Chas, 1993), 225–26.

²⁸ Markevich, *Istoriia Malorosii*, 250. The "Zaslav Articles" introduced into historiography by the author of the *History of the Rus'* and further popularized by Markevych were considered authentic

Continuing a long-established tradition in Ukrainian historical writing, Markevych distanced Vyhovskyy from the treaties (now two) the latter had negotiated. Indeed, Markevych was the first author to praise them openly for the benefits they offered the Cossacks. Commenting on the Hadiach Articles, which he took from a source other than the *History of the Rus'*, Markevych wrote: "And what would Little Russia be in reality if the Hadiach Articles could actually have been fulfilled at some point? We have our own troops, our own academies, schools, printshops, our own government, our own currency, our own faith; the hetman distributes awards, confers noble status, and acts as commander in chief even of the Polish armies in Ukraine. We have the right to make an alliance with the Crimea but not with Muscovy; we have our own trade; our own navigation; we are even entitled to maintain neutrality in wars between the Kingdom of Poland and other states—this is no longer a protectorate; it is an independent power; a separate state within a state."²⁹

This was the most positive assessment that a mid-nineteenth-century Ukrainian historian could give of any treaty of the past. It certainly expressed the feelings of generations of Cossack chroniclers before him, who had so faithfully copied the conditions of the Union of Hadiach into their works but were never able to express openly the reasons why they cherished that document so much. Markevych was not entirely free of self-censorship in this regard. To explain why the union was rejected by the Cossack Host and never implemented, he stated that the promises the Poles gave were insincere and meant to deceive the Cossacks. Commenting on the "Zaslavl Articles" taken from the *History of the Rus'*, Markevych added a national dimension as well: "In those articles we see one of two things: either senselessness or treason. They conform neither to common sense nor to politics; nevertheless, they conformed to the characters of the two nations whose rivalry would remain unresolved even today had it not been for Khmelnytsky. One was the pursuer, the other the pursued; one boundlessly proud, the other grateful but self-regarding; one giving promises that could not be fulfilled, the other having lost his former credulity. Their disunion was irrevocable, their friendship, beyond recovery."³⁰ Through his interpretation of the Hadiach Agreement, Markevych contributed to the "nationalization" of Ukrainian history. He also prepared the ground for the interpretation of the Union of Hadiach as a treaty that guaranteed Ukraine full autonomy, if not outright independence—a view shared to one degree or another by most Ukrainian historians and political thinkers of the twentieth century.

There is something fascinating about unfinished lives, unfulfilled promises, and unrealized agreements. People want to know how history would have turned out if those incomplete projects had come to fruition. The Union of Hadiach is no exception to that rule, and it still attracts the attention of historians of Eastern Europe. Today some of them regard the union as a monument to shattered dreams of the peaceful coexistence of two nations that missed their chance to achieve an understanding and paid a high price for their failure. Others see in it a failed attempt of one nation to re-establish control over the other. Whatever the current interpretations, the

by some historians as late as the 1880s. One of them was Nikolai I. Pavlishchev, the author of *Polskaia anarkhiia pri Yane Kazimire i voina za Ukrainu*, 3 vols., 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1887).

²⁹ Markevich, *Istoriia Malorosii*, 260.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 251.

myth of Hadiach seems alive and well three and a half centuries after the event. It no longer addresses the needs, interests, and fears of royal houses or social estates, but it serves the interests of nations. It seems that myths never die: they only reappear in new guises.

SERHII PLOKHY (PLOKHII) is the Mykhailo S. Hrushevsky Professor of Ukrainian History at Harvard University and a consulting editor of the Hrushevsky Translation Project at the CIUS. He is the author of *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern* (2001), *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (2003, with Frank E. Sysyn), *Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (2005), *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus* (2006), *Ukraine and Russia: Representations of the Past* (2008), and *Yalta: The Price of Peace* (2010).

NATALIA PYLYPIUK is a professor of Ukrainian literature and culture at the University of Alberta. She is the author of articles about the works of Hryhorii Skovoroda, Kasiian Sakovych, other early modern Ukrainian authors, and Ihor Kalynets and Vasyl Stus; and the co-author of *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Hryhorii Skovoroda* (2009).

OSTAP SEREDA is a senior research fellow at the Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Lviv. He is the author many articles about the Ukrainophiles, Populists, Old Ruthenians, Russophiles, Ukrainian-Polish relations, and national identity in nineteenth-century Galicia. He has co-edited several Ukrainian collections of historical articles.

MYROSLAV SHKANDRIJ is a professor of Ukrainian and Russian literature at the University of Manitoba. He is the author of *Jews in Ukrainian Literature: Representation and Identity* (2009), *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire From Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times* (2001), and *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s* (1992); the translator of Mykola Khvylovy, *The Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine: Polemical Pamphlets, 1925–1926* (1986) and Serhii Zhadan's *Depeche Mode* (2011); the editor of *Futurism and After: David Burluk, 1882–1967* (2008) and *The Phenomenon of the Ukrainian Avant-Garde, 1910–35*. (2001); and the co-editor of *Khrestomatiiia z ukrainskoi literatury v Kanadi* (2000).

ROMAN SOLCHANYK was the senior analyst for Ukraine and Soviet nationality issues at the RFE/RL Research Institute in Munich from 1977 to 1994. Now a resident of Santa Monica, California, he is the author of many articles about politics and society in Soviet and post-Soviet Ukraine and of *Ukraine and Russia: The Post-Soviet Transition* (2000). He compiled and edited *Ukraine: From Chernobyl' to Sovereignty. A Collection of Interviews* (1992); and is the co-editor of *Ukrainska suspilno-politychna dumka v 20 stolitti: Dokumenty i materialy*, 3 vols. (1983) and *Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe: Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk* (2001).

FRANCES SWYRIPA is a professor of Canadian history at the University of Alberta. She is the author of *Storied Landscapes: Ethno-Religious Identity and the Canadian Prairies* (2010), *Wedded to the Cause: Ukrainian-Canadian Women and Ethnic Identity, 1891–1991* (1993), and *Ukrainian Canadians: A Survey of Their Portrayal in English-language Works* (1978); and the co-editor of *Sisters or Strangers?: Immigrant, Ethnic and Racialized Women in Canadian History* (2004), *Edmonton: The Life of a*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.