



The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising

Author(s): Frank Sysyn

Source: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Neue Folge, Bd. 46, H. 4 (1998), pp. 531-545

Published by: [Franz Steiner Verlag](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41050234>

Accessed: 04/09/2014 20:34

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.



Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising

In 1888, the construction of a monument to Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi was finished in St. Sophia's Square in Kyiv.¹ From the proposal to build a monument in 1857 to its completion, thirty years later, numerous complications, including embezzlement of funds, delayed its erection. Controversy surrounded the images and political significance of the monument. When the first rector of Kyiv University, Mykhailo Maksymovych, proposed the monument in 1857 in an article commemorating the 200th anniversary of Khmel'nyts'kyi's death, he argued that if a monument existed in Moscow to Minin and Pozharskii, the leaders of the Russian anti-Polish resistance of 1612, one in Ukraine was certainly due to Khmel'nyts'kyi for having delivered his people from the Polish yoke. Two years later, he suggested that since the "Little Russian" Rozumovs'kyis, Zavadovs'kyis, Bezborodkos, and Troshchyns'kyis had failed to honor their fellow countryman, the Great Russians might wish to erect a monument in Kyiv or Pereiaslav in honor of the man who had torn Little Russia from the Polish Commonwealth and delivered it to Moscow.²

Views such as those of Maksymovych, a Ukrainian cultural leader, but a loyal tsarist subject, were sharply contested by Polish intellectuals. Michał Grabowski went so far as to call Khmel'nyts'kyi an ordinary rebel (*buntar*) similar to Pugachev, whom Catherine II had kept in a cage. His statement called forth a reaction from Mykhailo Iuzefovych that Khmel'nyts'kyi's proper place was a monument in St. Sophia's Square. The monument issue subsequently became a struggle between Polish nobles, Russian officials, and the Ukrainophile intelligentsia to impose their own image of the past and political program for the future. The Polish insurrection of 1863 further embittered the polemics so that the plan at one point projected Khmel'nyts'kyi's horse trampling a Polish nobleman, a Jesuit, and a Jewish leaseholder and a monument to be surrounded by four figures – Great Russia, White Russia, Little Russia, and Red Russia (Galicia, then a Habsburg possession) with an inscription "One, Indivisible Russia to Hetman Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi."³

By the 1880s, some Kievan churchmen, echoing the ambivalence of the seventeenth-century higher clergy about Khmel'nyts'kyi, questioned whether the monument should be placed in the sacred St. Sophia's Square at all. Iuzefovych, once a Ukrainophile, and now a Ukrainophobe, attributed this reluctance to Ukrainian intrigues, maintaining that Ukrainian leaders would support statues for "traitors" such as Vyhovs'kyi and Mazepa. He also disingenuously asserted that his original plan was directed not only against Polish claims to Ukraine, but also against Ukrainian separatism. Financial considerations and the decision of Tsar Alexander II determined that only a simple equestrian figure was erected in St. Sophia's

¹ I wish to thank the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung for its support of my research for this essay.

² See Maksymovych's *Vospominanie o Bogdane Khmel'nitskom* and *Pis'ma o Bogdane Khmel'nitskom*, in: *Sobranie sochinenii M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom 1. Kiev 1876, pp. 396–397 and 475–485.

³ For MYKOLA KOSTOMAROV's criticism of this proposal in "Novoe vremia" in 1869, see his *Neskol'ko slov o pamiatnike Khmel'nitskomu*, reprinted in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1994) no. 5, pp. 145–147.

Square, but the Hetman's mace pointing towards Moscow long continued to be interpreted differently by those who approved of and opposed Ukraine's ties with Russia.⁴

The controversy over the monument reflected both the disagreement about the man and his goals and the desire to appropriate his image that has gone on from 1648 to the present.⁵ Many Ukrainian households possess a reproduction of Mykola Ivasiuk's painting of Khmel'nyts'kyi's triumphal entry into Kyiv before Christmas of 1648 (early January, 1649 N.S.). Painted in 1912, Ivasiuk's work captured the popular romantic image of Khmel'nyts'kyi entering Kyiv on a white horse on his way to the Cathedral of St. Sophia to be blessed by the patriarch of Jerusalem and the metropolitan of Kyiv. But Ivasiuk's inspiration came from one of the earliest attempts to appropriate Khmel'nyts'kyi by the clergy and students of the Kyiv Collegium who greeted him with cries of Moses and well named "Bohdan," given by God, to deliver his people from the Polish servitude. Patriarch Paisios, who called him *Illustrissimus Princeps*, also had his own image of the leader of an Orthodox army who could deliver his people from the Turks. And not least there was Khmel'nyts'kyi managing his image and providing statements that he would free the Rus' nation and that while he had been born an insignificant man, God had raised him up to be the autocrat of Rus'.⁶

Other images also stem from the seventeenth century. From the Jewish chronicles and Jewish memorial services comes the persecutor and tormentor whose name should be blotted out.⁷ Polish publicists and authors of pasquinades depicted him as an Antichrist, cast him as a diabolic force, at times as a crocodile, or in a clear attempt to compromise him, associated him with the archrebel Cromwell, who in an apocryphal salutation labeled him, *terror et extirpator nobilitatis Poloniae fortalitorumque expugnator, exterminator sacerdotum Romanorum*.⁸

⁴ On the controversy over the monument, see OREST LEVYTS'KYI *Istoriia budovy pamiatnyka B. Khmel'nyts'komu u Kyiva*, in: *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* 16 (1913) no. 6, pp. 467–483; *Pamiatnik Bogdanu Khmel'nitskomu (istoricheskii ocherk ego sooruzheniia)*, in: *Kievskaiia starina* (1888) no. 7, pp. 145–155 and M. G. *Istoriia odnogo pamiatnika*, in: *Golos minuvshogo* (1913) no. 7, pp. 284–285.

⁵ For historiography on Khmel'nyts'kyi, see JOHN BASARAB *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study*. Edmonton 1982; the bibliographic note in MYKHAILO HRUSHEV'S'KYI *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*. Vol. 8, pt. 2. Reprint New York 1956, pp. 211–224; JANUSZ KACZMARCZYK *Bohdan Chmielnicki – Szatan czy mesjasz?*, in: *Studia Historyczne* 34 (1991) no. 3, pp. 369–385; OLGIERD GÓRKA *Bohdan Chmielnicki – jego historycy, postać i dzieło*, in: *Sesja naukowa w trzeczsetną rocznicę zjednoczenia Ukrainy z Rosją 1654–1954. Materiały*. Warsaw 1956, pp. 66–102; and the numerous mentions of Khmel'nyts'kyi in DMYTRO DOROSHENKO *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography and OLEXANDER OHLOBLYN Ukrainian Historiography 1917–1956*, in: *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* 5–6 (1957). One should also consult 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 Writings and Historical Research*. New York 1995, and my forthcoming critical review in the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*.

⁶ These scenes come from the diary of the Polish delegation to Khmel'nyts'kyi in January 1649. Written by WOJCIECH MIASKOWSKI, the text has been published many times, most recently in the collection *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: Dokumenty i materialy*. Tom 1–3. Moscow 1953–1954, here vol. 3, pp. 104–114.

⁷ On the Jewish chronicles, see BERNARD WEINRYB *The Hebrew Chronicles on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossack-Polish War*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 1 (1977) no. 3, pp. 153–177. The best known of the texts and the one with the most detailed discussion on the revolt and the hetman is that by Natan Hanover (Hannover), which appeared in Russian translation in 1878 thereby influencing non-Jewish writing on Khmel'nyts'kyi: S. MANDEL'KERN (trans.) *Rasskaz evreia sovremennika-ochevidtsa*. S.-Peterburg 1878.

⁸ For these interpretations, in addition to KACZMARCZYK *Bohdan Chmielnicki – Szatan czy mesjasz?*, see STEPHAN WELYCZENKO [VELYCHENKO] *Mało znany portret Bohdana Chmielnickiego*, in: *Studia Historyczne* 24 (1981) no. 2, pp. 303–308. On the Cromwell apocrypha, see LIUBOMYR VYNAR *Problema zv'iazkiv Anhlii z Ukrainoiu za chasiv het'manuvannia Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho 1648–1657*. London, Cleveland 1960.

The most important depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi was the creation of the Khmel'nyts'kyi cult in the Cossack Hetmanate. We have a number of paeans to the hetman written during his life, but our subsequent sources for a Khmel'nyts'kyi cult do not reemerge until 1693.⁹ The destruction of so many of the archives and libraries of the period and the limited scholarly study of the rhetoric handbooks of the seventeenth century may explain this gap. It is also true, however, that the Eyewitness Chronicle, Feodosii Sofonovych's *Khroinika*, and the Lviv Chronicle, the Ukrainian sources written soon after the uprising, do not cast Khmel'nyts'kyi in heroic proportions. It was with Hryhorii Hrabianka's history of the uprising, written about 1710, that Khmel'nyts'kyi emerged as the gifted and severe military leader who had freed his people. His wisdom as a leader is seen in speeches such as his debate with the Crimean khan.¹⁰ In Samiilo Velychko's answer of the 1720s to the seventeenth-century Polish epic by Samuel Twardowski, Bohdan is described once again as a Moses and truly named "Given by God" to deliver his people from the Polish yoke and to bring them to freedom. In the numerous letters of Khmel'nyts'kyi, which were likely penned by Velychko, he emerges as a wise and caring leader, ever mindful of the rights and liberties of his people. The funereal oration attributed to the purported secretary of Khmel'nyts'kyi, Samiilo Zorka, constituted the full heroic image of Khmel'nyts'kyi.¹¹ As in Hrabianka's work, which was also written after the Poltava debacle of 1709 and the imperial assault on Ukrainian autonomy, Velychko praised Khmel'nyts'kyi's decision to submit to the Russian tsar, thereby providing a positive model of Russian-Ukrainian relations, though Velychko called the relationship "protection" and insisted that the tsar's representatives had sworn an oath to uphold "Little Russian" rights and liberties.¹²

⁹ On the formation of the Khmel'nyts'kyi cult, see SERHII PLOKHY The Symbol of Little Russia: The Pokrova Icon and Early Modern Ukrainian Political Ideology, in: *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17 (1992) no. 1–2, pp. 171–188. The first panegyric is published in V. PERETTS *K istorii Kievo-Mogilianskoi: Panegiriki i stikhi k B. Khmel'nitskomu, I. Podkove, i arkh. Lazariu Baranovichu*, in: *Chteniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora-Letopistsa* 14 (1900) pp. 7–25.

¹⁰ Dijstija prezil'noj y ot" načala poljakov" krvavšoj nebyvaloj brany Bohdana Xmelnyckoho, hetmana zaporožskoho, s" poljaky za Najjašnijšyx" Korolej Polskyyx" Vladyslava, potom" y Kazymyra, v" roku 1648, otravovatysja načatoj y za lit" desjat' po smerty Xmelnyckoho neokončennoj, z" roznyx" litopyscov" y yz" diariuša, na toj vojni pysanoho, v" hradī Hadjaču, trudom" Hryhorija Hrabjanky, sobranaja y samobytnyx" starožylov" svīdytel'stvy utverždennaja. Roku 1710. Kiev 1854. A fragment censored out of the 1854 edition was published in 1894 by OLEKSANDR LAZAREVS'KYI [ALEKSANDR LAZAREVSKII] *Opushchennaia v pečati stranitsa iz letopisi Grabianki*, in: *Kievskaja starina* (1894) no. 11, pp. 297–300. The 1854 edition, as well as a 1793 partial publication unknown to the editors of the 1854 edition, have been reprinted, together with facsimiles of two manuscripts, in the Harvard Library in Early Ukrainian Literature 9: *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyts'kyi*. [Cambridge, Mass.] 1990. We still lack an adequate scholarly edition, which is particularly important because of the large number of texts. A modern Ukrainian translation of the text appeared in 1992: *Litopys hadiats'koho polkovnyka Hryhorija Hrabjanky*. Kiev 1992. Page references given here are to the 1854 edition. On Khmel'nyts'kyi's image, see in particular pp. 31–35, 61–67, 135–158.

¹¹ The *Skazanie o vojni kazackoj z poljakamy i reč Zynovija Bohdana Xmelnyckoho Hetmana Vojsk Zaporožskyyx* was published in the *Letopis' sobytiiv Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii v XVII veku*. 4 vols. Kiev (1848–1864). The first volume was published in a new edition in Kiev in 1926: Samiila Velychka *Skazanie o vojni kozatskoj z poljakamy*. Ed. by Kateryna Lazarevs'ka (= *Monumenta Litterarum Ucrainicarum* 16). In 1991 a modern Ukrainian translation by Valerii Shevchuk was published: Samiilo Velychko, *Litopys*. 2 vols. Kiev 1991, with an introduction by the translator. Volume, part, and chapter numbers are given here. On Khmel'nyts'kyi as Moses, see vol. 1, pt. 1, chp. 3. On the Poles' shock at losing Ukraine and Khmel'nyts'kyi's role, see vol. 1, pt. 6, chp. 7. On Khmel'nyts'kyi's attempts to advise his people how to avoid Tatar attacks, see vol. 1, pt. 7, chp. 1. On Khmel'nyts'kyi's death, Zorka's panegyric and Khmel'nyts'kyi's burial, see vol. 1, pt. 10, chps. 9–10.

¹² On Velychko's depiction of the Pereiaslav Agreement, see BASARAB *Pereiaslav 1654* pp. 70–74.

With the early eighteenth-century chronicles, the heroic image of Khmel'nyts'kyi that permeated the historiography, literature, and the painting of the Hetmanate had been set. It even survived the abolition of the Hetmanate at the end of the century and the emergence of new intellectual trends in Ukraine under the impact of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. By the time the *Istoriia Rusov* was written as a political historical tract for the pro-autonomist Ukrainian nobility of the early nineteenth century, not only was Khmel'nyts'kyi given a more elevated social status than the Cossack officer and simple noble background in Velychko, he also exemplified the characteristics of an enlightened monarch. Issues such as international law regulating the declaration of war, the right of peoples to freedom, and the historical and constitutional liberties of Ukraine guaranteed by oaths taken by the Russians at Pereiaslav intermix with discussions of Khmel'nyts'kyi's concern for the welfare of his people and his decision to punish only those Poles and Jews who had harmed the interests of the Ukrainian people.¹³

The early Cossack chronicles and *Istoriia Rusov*, along with historical folk songs, though their appraisal was more contradictory, formed the Ukrainian national revival's image of Khmel'nyts'kyi. In the 1840s and 1850s, these texts were published, though in many cases the leaders of the Ukrainian national revival first encountered them in manuscript copies. The image of Khmel'nyts'kyi, the sentiments of love of the Ukrainian fatherland, and the struggle for freedom against the Poles and the rights and liberties of the Little Russian people and the Cossacks that permeated all the works except the Eyewitness Chronicle found ready resonance among the national awakers.¹⁴ Hence by 1842, Mykola Markevych wrote his *Istoriia Malorossii*, basing himself on *Istoriia Rusov*.¹⁵ In addition, while *Istoriia Rusov* contained anti-Russian and anti-autocratic sentiments and while the defence of Little Russian liberties in the chronicles went against the later actions of the tsarist state, the positive evaluations of the submission to the Russian tsar and the relationship arranged at Pereiaslav offered a model through which the Ukrainian awakers could demonstrate that their movement could be accommodated in the tsarist state. Indeed, at a time when the tsarist government was shaken by the first Polish uprising and sought to disprove Polish claims to the southwestern provinces, the Cossack chronicles and the Ukrainian awakers provided a hero who had struggled against the Poles and proof that the territories were really Russian (East Slavic), albeit Little or South Russian. Hence Maksymovych could suggest that the Ukrainian hero deserved a monument from Russian society and the Russian state.

While the conservative former rector of Kyiv University never ran afoul of the tsarist authorities, he was mindful in making his proposals of the disaster that the Ukrainian movement had encountered in the late 1840s. The cultural activists, the poet Taras Shevchenko, the writer Panteleimon Kulish, and the historian Mykola Kostomarov had been arrested and imprisoned for their activities in the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood and the Ukrainophile movement had been smashed. Maksymovych timed his proposal not only to coincide with

¹³ The original edition of 1846 with attribution of authorship to Heorhii Konys'kyi, archbishop of Belarus, was reprinted in 1991: *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii*. Moscow 1846. Two Ukrainian translations have appeared: *Istoriia Rusiv*. Trans. by Viacheslav Diachenko. New York 1956 and *Istoriia Rusiv*. Trans. by Ivan Drach. Kiev 1991. Page citations are to the 1991 reprint of the original edition. See pp. 49–50, 58–60 (on Khmel'nyts'kyi's biography), 80 (on sparing Poles and Jews involved in handicrafts and useful professions), 96–97 (his decision not to seek a hereditary hetmancy), 105 (discussion of the declaration of war in international law), 119 (on the Russians swearing an oath at Pereiaslav), 139 (his care for his people), 141–142 (evaluation of his character at his death).

¹⁴ On the reception of the chronicles, see FRANK E. SYSYN *The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity*, in: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (1990) no. 3–4, pp. 593–607.

¹⁵ MYKOLA MARKEVYCH [N. MARKOVICH] *Istoriia Malorossii*. Tom 1–4. Moscow 1843–1843.

the 200th anniversary of Khmel'nyts'kyi's death but also with the period of liberalization that occurred after the death of Nicholas I and the ascension of Alexander II. But by the time Maksymovych wrote his appeal, the image of Khmel'nyts'kyi that he had taken over from the earlier Ukrainian tradition was already under attack and transformation. Certainly Shevchenko's depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi on the way to Pereiaslav as a calamity and the message of "O you drunken Bohdan," in which Ukraine says if she had known what he would do, she would have smothered him in the cradle, undermined his image as a wise leader as well as the model that the Ukrainian movement could use in arguing for toleration in the Russian Empire.¹⁶ Released from prison, Kulish became more cautious and conservative and certainly expressed his approval of 1654 as the inclusion of Ukraine in the Russian state, later even coining the description *vossoedinenie* (reunion or reunification). But finding his voice in the socially conservative Eyewitness Chronicle and influenced by Polish writings, Kulish became an opponent of the Cossacks and revolt in general. From the 1860s to the 1880s, Kulish developed a negative view of the Cossacks and Khmel'nyts'kyi increasingly at odds with the traditional Ukrainian cult and with the views of the new historical writing and the Ukrainian *intelligentsia*.¹⁷

It was Kostomarov who created the vision of the age in his biography of Khmel'nyts'kyi. First published in 1857, but appearing in three subsequent revised editions, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* was an attempt to present a vivid account of their past to the Ukrainian people.¹⁸ Kostomarov accepted the positive evaluation of Pereiaslav from the Cossack chronicles, but he also took from them a view that the Russian government had sworn an oath. Committed to populist and federalist visions, Kostomarov recounted events and legends from Khmel'nyts'kyi's life in the tradition of the eighteenth-century cult, but his real interest was the history of the people, above all the popular masses, not of the leader.¹⁹

One of the reasons that the Cossack chronicles and *Istoriia Rusov* had such a tremendous impact in the 1840s and 1850s is that they gave Ukrainians their own voice about their past. Seventeenth-century accounts had been overwhelmingly Polish or written by Central and West Europeans, largely based on Polish testimony. Hrabianka had filled this need to have a native account, and his works had circulated in numerous manuscript copies in the eighteenth-century Hetmanate, as did *Istoriia Rusov* in the early nineteenth century. Velychko's work had not enjoyed this popularity, but he most clearly set out to answer Polish views and complained of the poverty of his sources. Thus already by the 1720s, Ukraine was relatively poor in its own documentary sources for the 1640s and 1650s. The publishing of the chronicles and *Istoriia Rusov* seemed to compensate for this lack, just as the collection of folklore seemed to the Romantics to be giving the people their historical voice. Yet as modern scholarly methods took hold in the early nineteenth century and sources were published from Russian state and Polish state and private archives, the information in the Ukrainian works could frequently not be corroborated and was often disproved. Above all, Kostomarov's book, which had taken the eloquent letters of Khmel'nyts'kyi in Velychko as authentic, came under attack.²⁰

¹⁶ See V. I. IAREMENKO *Istoriiosofs'ki aspekty vidobrazhennia diial'nosti B. Khmel'nyts'koho u tvorchest'i T. H. Shevchenka*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1995) no. 4, pp. 100–113.

¹⁷ On the evolution of Kulish's views, see HRUSHEVSKYI *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, t. 8, pt. 2, pp. 218–219 and DOROSHENKO *A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography* pp. 146–158.

¹⁸ The work was first published in: *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1857) no. 1–8. Subsequent editions appeared in 1859, 1870 and 1884.

¹⁹ See I. A. PINCHUK *Postat' Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho v publitsystyts'i M. Kostomarova*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1994) no. 5, pp. 139–144.

²⁰ On the controversy over the letters, see MYKOLA PETROVSKYI *Pseudo-diariush Samiila Zorki*, in: *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* 17 (1928) pp. 168–204.

The attack was not only on scholarly grounds, but also involved the questions of Russian-Ukrainian and Polish-Ukrainian relations. As early as 1843, Vissarion Belinskii had attacked Markevych's *Istoriia Malorossii* on grounds that Ukraine did not properly have a history, the Cossacks had been agents of anarchy, and Ukrainian history was merely an episode or a side stream of Russian history. Belinskii did however praise Khmel'nyts'kyi as the one great man and statesman of Little Russia in that he understood that Little Russia could not exist as a separate state. The review was replete with disparaging remarks on the character of the Ukrainians and insistence that union with Russia opened the door of civilization to them.²¹ Subsequently, the student of Sergei Solov'ev, Gennadii Karpov, attacked early nineteenth-century Ukrainian historiography and Kostomarov in particular for their reliance on the *Istoriia Rusov* and the Ukrainian chronicles. But that criticism went so far in the case of Karpov as insisting that the Ukrainians concentrated on Khmel'nyts'kyi as a rebel and not as the constructive agent unifying Great and Little Russia.²² That charge came after Kostomarov seemed to revise his view of Khmel'nyts'kyi upon discovering that after Pereiaslav Khmel'nyts'kyi swore an oath to the Ottomans, and Kulish published his all out attack on Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossacks in 1889, based in large part on Polish sources and views.²³ Kulish compared Khmel'nyts'kyi to Attila, Ghengis Khan, and Tamerlane, charged that he was a traitor by nature and that he and the Cossacks were ready to accept Islam, and maintained that Khmel'nyts'kyi was the same sort of bandit as Razin and Pugachev and that had such a bandit appeared in Europe the development of humanity would have been delayed by centuries.²⁴

In his "Defense of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi," a review of Kulish's work that also discussed Kostomarov, Karpov compared Khmel'nyts'kyi with leaders such as George Washington and William of Orange as "true representatives of their peoples, fighters for freedom and for convictions against despotism, retrogression and aggression," a strange statement in the Russian Empire, especially in juxtaposing the hetman with the rebels who founded independent states. But Karpov meant this against Poland and then went on to praise the Ukrainian people for upholding what he called Khmel'nyts'kyi's pledge that "forever we might be one". While his comparison with George Washington was new, comparisons with William of Orange dated to the mid-seventeenth century, though then they had come as accusations from the Polish side against those who rebelled against lawful monarchs supported by non-Catholics and who sought support of foreign rulers.²⁵

²¹ For a discussion of Belinskii's views, see BASARAB Pereiaslav 1654 pp. 90–91 and ANDREA RUTHERFORD Vissarion Belinskii and the Ukrainian National Question, in: *The Russian Review* 54 (1995) pp. 508–512.

²² See GENNADII KARPOV N. Kostomarov kak istorik Malorossii. Moscow 1871; GENNADII KARPOV V zashchitu Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo, in: *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiikh pri Moskovskom universitete* (hereafter *Chteniia OI DR*) 148 (1889) sect. 2, pt. 2, pp. 1–104 and the discussion in BASARAB Pereiaslav 1654 pp. 105–107. Karpov's charge could hardly fit Kulish, who was developing into a staunch advocate of Ukraine's political integration into Russia.

²³ N. I. KOSTOMAROV Bogdan Khmel'nitskii, dannik Ottomanskoi Partii, in: *Vestnik Evropy* (1878) no. 12, pp. 806–817 and PANTELEIMON KULISH Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'shi, 1340–1654. Tom 1–3. Moscow 1888–1889, which appeared simultaneously in the *Chteniia OI DR*. The Kostomarov article in 1878 had been seen by Iuzefovych as part of the Ukrainophiles' plot to disparage the hetman because they opposed his act at Pereiaslav.

²⁴ KULISH Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'shi, vol. 3, pp. 271, 381, 273.

²⁵ For Karpov's comparison see IDEM V zashchitu Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo p. 104. For early Polish comparisons, see a 1654 text in STEFANIA STANISZEWSKA-OCHMANN Piśma polityczne z czasów panowania Jana Kazimierza Wazy 1648–1668. Vol. 1: 1648–1660. Wrocław [etc.] 1989, pp. 133–134.

Thus one can speak of a Russian image of Khmel'nyts'kyi forming in the middle and late nineteenth century.²⁶ It agreed with the old Ukrainian tradition that Khmel'nyts'kyi was a great man for having conducted a struggle against the Poles and the Catholics and for having brought about the Pereiaslav Agreement. It diverged from the traditional Ukrainian view in its negative evaluation of the rank and file Cossacks and in ignoring the issue of Little Russian rights and privileges. It also emphasized the importance of Russian emissaries' reports as the major sources for the period, not only in contrast to the Ukrainian chronicles but also in contrast to Polish sources. There were however dissenting voices. Petr Butsinskii, a history professor of Kharkiv University, wrote that from the beginning Khmel'nyts'kyi had never wished to come close to Muscovy and that far from being a statesman he had the perspective of a Polish nobleman and for his material interest he had brought ruin to his land and people. Using Polish sources found by Kostomarov, he also shared some of the Ukrainian populists' social attitudes, if not their evaluation of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising.²⁷

Yet at the same time new views of the past were appearing in Polish historiography. The seventeenth-century negative assessment of Khmel'nyts'kyi and the uprising prevailed as virtually the only view until the end of the eighteenth century. In the early nineteenth-century, Polish historiography was strongly influenced by Romanticism and by new social thought, and the new critique blamed the fall of the old Commonwealth on the egoism of the magnates and the oppression of the lower classes. Therefore positive evaluations of the Cossack rebellions as social movements in Polish history began to appear, in particular because Polish history was otherwise bereft of peasant and popular uprisings. Joachim Lelewel saw the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising as potentially a positive force for change in the old Commonwealth and virtually ignored the Ukrainian national character of the revolt. He saw Khmel'nyts'kyi as favorable to the Commonwealth but failing to win the Cossacks' support as well as following policies that lost the support of the popular masses.²⁸ Other Polish historians criticized the seventeenth-century Commonwealth without Lelewel's sympathy for the popular masses. In 1869, the Lviv historian Karol Szajnocha published a discussion of the years 1646 and 1648 that constituted a condemnation of the egoism of old Poland's magnates. Although he was committed to the concept of the Polish civilizing mission, above all of the "Polish plough," Szajnocha's criticism of the magnate order went so far that Khmel'nyts'kyi virtually figured as an agent of just retribution.²⁹ These views were never the only ones among Polish intellectuals as Grabowski's attack on the project to erect the Khmel'nyts'kyi monument and the criticism of Szajnocha's depiction of the Cossacks demonstrated.

In the 1870s, the works of the Lviv historian Ludwik Kubala, a cycle of carefully documented historical works on the 1640s and 50s as well as a biography of Jerzy Ossoliński,

²⁶ One can see the antecedents of this view in Peter I's statement that all the hetmans except for Khmel'nyts'kyi and the then current hetman Ivan Skoropads'kyi had been traitors. This limitation of the possible cast for "Little Russian" heroes had been seconded by Catherine II's assertion that once the office of hetman was abolished the very memory of the age would disappear, though with no positive statement about Khmel'nyts'kyi. See ZENON KOHUT *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: The Absorption of the Hetmanate, 1760s–1830s*. Cambridge, MA, 1988, p. 104.

²⁷ P. N. BUTSINSKII *O Bogdane Khmel'nitskom*. Kharkiv 1882.

²⁸ See KACZMARCZYK Bohdan Chmielnicki – szatan czy mesjasz?, pp. 372–373 and MARIAN SEREJSKI *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej*. Pt. 1: od połowy XVIII w. do roku ok. 1860. Łódź 1954, pp. 88–89. The influence of Lelewel on Ukrainian populism and views on Khmel'nyts'kyi has not been fully explored.

²⁹ KAROL SZAJNOCHA *Dwa lata dziejów naszych, 1646, 1648*. 3 vols. Warsaw 1877 (= *Dzieła Karola Szajnochy* 8–10). See SEREJSKI *Zarys historii historiografii polskiej*, pt. 1, pp. 99–100 and GÓRKA Bohdan Chmielnicki p. 72.

began to appear.³⁰ Devoid of the social perspectives and critical attitude toward the old Commonwealth of earlier Polish historians, the works of Kubala analyzed why the Polish state and elite had faced such difficulties in the mid-century, but with clear sympathy for the state and the elite. These accounts of a period of strife and conflict, with its numerous memorable personages, became a source for Henryk Sienkiewicz's trilogy, including *Ogniem i mieczem* (With Fire and Sword, 1883–84). But in Sienkiewicz's recasting of Kubala's history, the struggle became one between good and evil and civilization and anarchy, in part as a reflection of the views of the Warsaw historian and his teacher Julian Bartoszewicz.³¹ Sienkiewicz sought to lift the spirits of his fellow Poles by recounting a valorous past. In these influential novels, Khmel'nyts'kyi was a demonic force opposed by the noble Jeremi Wiśniowiecki.

In many ways, Kubala, Bartoszewicz, and Sienkiewicz reflected the new more positive attitude to the Polish state and society that came to dominate Polish historiography, with the Cracow pessimist school being replaced by the more optimistic Warsaw school. Taking part in the altercation between Karpov and Kulish, the Warsaw historian Tadeusz Korzon came down strongly on the side of Kulish's criticism of Khmel'nyts'kyi in an 1892 review article that went on to depict the hetman in dark tones as the leader of a "hellish dance".³² He was especially incensed by Karpov's comparisons with George Washington and William of Orange, instead of Batu or Tamerlane. However the new pride in the old Commonwealth was seen in his rebuttal of Kulish's contention that Khmel'nyts'kyi had brought down the Cossack Republic and the Commonwealth with his insistence that the Commonwealth had weathered the storm. By the time Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński published his biography of Khmel'nyts'kyi, Ukrainian-Polish relations were poisoned by increasing confrontation in Galicia, in which the 250th anniversary of the revolt in 1898, celebrated by the Ukrainians, and the 250th anniversary of the lifting of the second siege of Lviv in 1905, celebrated by the Poles, played a major role.³³ Rawita-Gawroński represented a new tendency of racist nationalism in Polish thought, which included using the past to demonstrate that Ukrainians were unfit for statehood. In his diatribe against Khmel'nyts'kyi, which won an award from the Cracow Polish Academy of Sciences, he devoted all efforts to demonstrating that such a man could not have been a Polish noble, imputing Jewish ancestry to him.³⁴ He denied Khmel'nyts'kyi thought, talent, and success.³⁵

Thus by the time Kubala completed a life of study of the Khmel'nyts'kyi period with a positive evaluation of the hetman in 1910 as a leader and a statesman, his voice was fully out

³⁰ For a discussion of Kubala's works, see BASARAB Pereiaslav 1654, pp. 118–123.

³¹ On the influence of Bartoszewicz, in part through his articles in the *Encyklopedia Powszechna*, see GÓRKA Bohdan Chmielnicki pp. 72–73.

³² TADEUSZ KORZON O Chmielnickim: Sądy PP. Kulisza i Karpova, in: *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 4 (1892) pp. 34–79, especially pp. 76–79. The degree to which Kulish was influenced in forming his view of Khmel'nyts'kyi by his friend Grabowski and in the 1870s by Warsaw historians during his stay there must be fully explored. It would appear that his views on Khmel'nyts'kyi merely reenforced already forming views in Polish historiography and were used by Korzon and others in making polemical points. On the mercurial and controversial Kulish, see GEORGE LUCKYJ Panteleimon Kulish: A Sketch of his Life and Times. Boulder 1983.

³³ FRANCISZEK RAWITA-GAWROŃSKI's volumes appeared after the opposing celebrations: vol. 1: Bohdan Chmielnicki do elekcyi Jana Kazimierza (Lviv 1906) and vol. 2: Bohdan Chmielnicki od elekcyi Jana Kazimierza do śmierci (Lviv 1909), but he had already published the popular brochure IDEM 1655–1905. Krwawy gość we Lwowie. Lviv 1905. Also see his booklet Bohdan Chmielnicki i jego polityka. Warsaw [n.d.]. *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenko* 24 (1898) was an anniversary issue entirely devoted to the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising.

³⁴ See RAWITA-GAWROŃSKI Bohdan Chmielnicki, vol. 1, pp. 40–42.

³⁵ See in particular his comparison with Stenka Razin, *ibidem* pp. 16–21.

of tune with Polish society and historical writing. Kubala returned to the old comparison of Khmel'nyts'kyi with Cromwell that Kulish had revived in the 1880s,³⁶ but he did so to praise rather than to damn Khmel'nyts'kyi. He saw Khmel'nyts'kyi as dominant in Eastern Europe as Cromwell had been in Western Europe, but saw Khmel'nyts'kyi's task as so much more difficult because of the geographic situation of Ukraine and the need to create an administrative structure. In his ability to maintain control over his subordinates, his creativity in transforming the international scene, and his charismatic personality, Khmel'nyts'kyi, who according to Kubala had brought Poland to her knees and continued to frighten her from the grave, was one of the great men of his age.³⁷

In fact, Kubala's evaluation was remarkably similar to that of the statist school in Ukrainian historiography that emerged just before the First World War, although without its sympathy for the revolt. The center of Ukrainian historical studies had moved from Kyiv to Lviv in 1894 with the creation of a chair at the University of Lviv held by Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi. Hrushevs'kyi brought with him the populist tradition of his own professor, Volodymyr Antonovych, a tradition that focused interest on the people and denigrated great leaders and states. The 250th anniversary celebrations led both men to write general pieces on the revolt that were relatively positive about the hetman, though Hrushevs'kyi still criticized his reluctance to rely on and represent the interests of the popular masses.³⁸ Nine years later, when Hrushevs'kyi wrote a piece marking the 250th anniversary of Khmel'nyts'kyi's death, he reacted to the Polish attacks on the hetman during their celebrations in 1905 and asserted that no Polish leader of the time equalled Khmel'nyts'kyi.³⁹ Yet although he pointed out the great talents of the hetman as a leader, diplomat, and administrator, he still believed Khmel'nyts'kyi had reacted to rather than shaped events. In 1912 Hrushevs'kyi returned to the issue of the depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi in order to rebut articles appearing in the Russian nationalist Ukrainophobe periodical *Kievlianin* that sought to depict Khmel'nyts'kyi as their (the "Bohdanites") hero in contrast to the Ukrainian "separatists" Mazepa. In the heat of the polemic, he made his most positive statement on Khmel'nyts'kyi as national hero. He declared Khmel'nyts'kyi a bearer of the idea of Ukrainian statehood and pointed out that the alliance with the Swedes undertaken by Mazepa merely followed Khmel'nyts'kyi's

³⁶ Korzon found this comparison in the work of Kulish, which accompanied a publication of the heading of the apocryphal letter of Cromwell to Khmel'nyts'kyi, particularly effective, though he like Kulish assumed the heading was authentic, see: KORZON O Chmielnickim p. 66.

³⁷ See LUDWIK KUBALA *Wojna moskiewska. Szkice historyczne. Seria III.* Warsaw 1910, pp. 1–46 (pp. 7–18 on Khmel'nyts'kyi).

³⁸ V. B. ANTONOVYCH [ANTONOVICH] K kharakteristike deial'nosti Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo, in: *Chteniia v Obshchestve Nestora-Letopistsa* 13 (1899) pp. 101–104 and MYKHAILO HRUSHEVS'KYI Khmel'nyts'kyi i Khmel'nychchyna, in: *Zapysky Naukovoho tovarystva im. Shevchenko* (hereafter ZNTSh) 24 (1898) pp. 1–30. A more positive depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi by OREST LEVYTS'KYI had appeared in the important volume of biographies of hetmans: Bogdan Khmel'nitskii, in: *Istoricheskie deiateli Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii v biografiakh i portretakh.* Kiev 1883, pp. 6–25. Financed by the landowner Vasyli' Tarnovs'kyi and written primarily by Volodymyr Antonovych, the volume served as an important codification of information on Ukrainian national leaders. In general, when Ukrainian historians wrote popular pieces for the general public, in part to further Ukrainian national consciousness, they were more positive about Khmel'nyts'kyi and the other hetmans. This can be seen in Hrushevs'kyi's writings.

³⁹ MYKHAILO HRUSHEVS'KYI Bohdanovi rokovyny, in: *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* 10 (1907) pp. 207–212. Appearing to refer to the marking of 1898, Hrushevs'kyi called the attitude of Galician Ukrainians to the events of the mid-seventeenth century more straightforward since they represented the struggle against the Poles, while for the Russian-ruled Ukrainians the depiction and the marking of the event presented more problems, presumably because of their different relations with the Poles. He also pointed out that the declaration of Khmel'nyts'kyi as a hero by Iuzefovych and the supporters of tsarist Russia had alienated the supporters of the Ukrainian movement from this traditional Ukrainian hero.

policies.⁴⁰ Yet despite this statement, Hrushevs'kyi remained true to his populist convictions and ambivalent about the leader Khmel'nyts'kyi.

As Hrushevs'kyi trained a generation of students, whose primary research greatly assisted their teacher's work on his *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, which reached the Khmel'nyts'kyi period in vol. 8, written just before and during the First World War and was completed in volume 9, part 2, published in 1931, he found that they did not share his populist views. They were influenced by Polish historiography and its national and statist stances, as well as its cult of heroes. The comparative perspective that their examination of foreign archives and diplomatic history gave them and their political and state-building attitudes made the younger historians much more positive about Ukrainian elites and state-building in the past. Therefore, they evaluated Khmel'nyts'kyi with very different criteria. The process that was already under way in Lviv was catalyzed by Viacheslav Lypyns'kyi and the appearance of *Zdziejów Ukrainy* in 1912. Like Antonovych, Lypyns'kyi was born into the Polish Right-Bank nobility. But while Antonovych had broken with his noble and Catholic past in 1861 in order to throw his lot in with the Ukrainian masses, Lypyns'kyi retained his social attitudes and religious beliefs as he argued that the Polish nobles must belong to the land they lived on and sympathize with Ukrainian aspirations. Not a student of Hrushevs'kyi, he had studied in Cracow and was influenced by Polish neo-Romantic historiography. In his work, he demonstrated how many nobles had supported the revolt and how many national and state-building elements were contained in the events of 1648–1657. Citing Kubala's evaluation of the hetman, Lypyns'kyi portrayed Khmel'nyts'kyi as a great statesman and state-builder, who notwithstanding his agreement with Moscow had sought to establish a European state of corporate orders in Ukraine. Thus for Lypyns'kyi, Khmel'nyts'kyi's break from the popular masses was to his credit.⁴¹ In his influential Ukrainian-language book, *Ukraina na perelomi*, published in 1920, he declared Khmel'nyts'kyi one of the brilliant statesmen of Eastern Europe and maintained that he had done more for Ukraine than "Peter justifiably called the Great" had done for Russia since while Peter had europeanized a Tatar state structure, Khmel'nyts'kyi had created a new European state and reconstituted a nation (*natsiia*).⁴²

It was Hrushevs'kyi who wrote the most comprehensive work on the age of Khmel'nyts'kyi, but it was Lypyns'kyi who shaped the Ukrainian non-Soviet vision of the hetman in the twentieth century. Hrushevs'kyi carefully assessed fact and legend in the hetman's biography, though the destruction of his special studies on the Khmel'nyts'kyi legends during the Bolshevik bombardment of Kyiv in 1918 was a major loss to studies of Khmel'nyts'kyi. The extremely harsh evaluation of Khmel'nyts'kyi that Hrushevs'kyi gave in volume 9, pt. 2 of *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* must be placed in the context of his dissatisfaction with the grow-

⁴⁰ MYKHAILO HRUSHEVS'KYI Na ukrains'ki temy: 'Mazepynstvo' i 'Bohdanivstvo', in: *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* 15 (1912) pp. 94–102.

⁴¹ VIACHESLAV LYPYNS'KYI [WACŁAW LIPIŃSKI] (ed.) *Z dziejów Ukrainy*. Kiev, Cracow 1912. Much of the material in *Z dziejów Ukrainy* is written by Lypyns'kyi, including the monograph STANISŁAW MICHAŁ KRZYCZEWSKI *Z dziejów walki szlachty ukraińskiej w szeregach powstańców pod wodzą Bohdan Chmielnickiego* (R. 1648–1649) *ibidem* pp. 147–513. It is written under the influence of German and Polish neo-Romantic biography writing and describes Krychevs'kyi as an exemplar of the nobles who joined the revolt. Khmel'nyts'kyi is discussed on pp. 147–150 (evaluation) and 253–261 (issue of noble descent). Interestingly Lypyns'kyi joins Hrushevs'kyi in faulting Khmel'nyts'kyi for not trusting internal forces enough, but while for Hrushevs'kyi this meant the popular masses, for Lypyns'kyi this meant the stratified Ukrainian national society that supported the revolt.

⁴² *Ukraina na perelomi: Zamitky do istorii ukrains'koho derzhavnogo budivnytstva v XVII-im stolittii*. Vienna 1920, pp. 145–151, see also p. 121 on the goal of building a European state.

ing new cult of the hetman, as well as his now outmoded populism.⁴³ He denied Khmel'nyts'kyi's plans and diplomatic skill, and he returned to his earlier critique of his failure to serve the interests of the masses in a depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi as a Scythian chieftain.⁴⁴ Despite the great authority of Hrushevs'kyi, his most talented students outside the Soviet Union, Ivan Kryp'iakevych and Myron Korduba, rejected his evaluation, as the former wrote his studies on the state of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the latter placed seventeenth-century Ukraine in an international and comparative context.⁴⁵

The increasing body of research by Ukrainian scholars and the changed political situation in independent interwar Poland stimulated a major controversy on the issue of the evaluation of heroes among Polish historians. In the early 1930s, the Orientalist Olgiard Górka questioned the historical veracity of Sienkiewicz. Part of his critique sought to incorporate the findings of Ukrainian historians and to revise downward estimates of the number of Tatars who fought along with Khmel'nyts'kyi. But in declaring that now that Poland was independent, Polish historians could finally rid their culture of the myths of Sienkiewicz that had been so important in preserving Polish patriotism during the Partition period, Górka unleashed a storm of controversy. Above all, his condemnation of Wiśniowiecki as a false hero for Polish youth was roundly rejected. The emotional nature of some of Górka's commentaries and errors in sources permitted many historians to criticize his work, but the real issue was that as late as the 1930s even most Polish professional historians were unwilling to reconsider the Khmel'nyts'kyi period.⁴⁶ After World War II, Górka continued his critique of Polish historiography with a positive short biography of Khmel'nyts'kyi.⁴⁷

In Soviet Ukraine, the newly formed Marxist historiography of the 1920s, led by Matvii Iavors'kyi, had seen Khmel'nyts'kyi as having seized a revolutionary opportunity, but as a representative of a new exploiting class.⁴⁸ With the destruction of traditional historiography and of Ukrainian Marxist historiography in the late 1920s and early 1930s, Soviet historiography of the 1930s condemned the Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalist" glorification of Khmel'nyts'kyi. But while the founder of Soviet Marxist historiography, Mikhail Pokrovskii, had condemned the Pereiaslav Agreement as an act of Russian imperialism, in the new Soviet historiography it was declared a lesser evil than other alternatives (1937). In addition, the Stalin cult was accompanied by the rehabilitation of historical figures such as Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great. With the annexation of Western Ukraine in 1939 and the onset of World War II, the evaluation of Khmel'nyts'kyi and of the Pereiaslav Agreement changed significantly. Khmel'nyts'kyi was the only non-Russian included in the Moscow series of illustrious lives, though his biographer Osip Kuperman (pseudonym K. Osipov) still held to the lesser evil doctrine.⁴⁹ By 1941 the progressive significance of the "annexation" of

⁴³ It should also be compared with the more positive evaluation he gave in the booklet *Bat'ko kozats'kyi Bohdan Khmel'nt's'kyi*. Kiev 1909.

⁴⁴ HRUSHEVS'KYI *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, t. 9, pt. 2 (reprint New York 1956) pp. 1497–1506, including criticism of Lypyn's'kyi's views.

⁴⁵ See IVAN KRYP'IAKEVYCH *Studii nad derzhavoiu Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, in: *ZNTSh* 138–140 (1925) pp. 65–81, 144–145 (1926) pp. 109–140, 147 (1927) pp. 55–80, 151 (1931) pp. 111–150 and MYRON KORDUBA *Der Ukraine Niedergang und Aufschwung*, in: *Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte* 6 (1932) pp. 30–60, 192–230, 358–385, especially pp. 377–381, a review of Hrushevs'kyi's vols. 7–9.

⁴⁶ OLGIERD GÓRKA "Ogniem i mieczem" a rzeczywistość historyczna. Warsaw 1934, and the new edition with a bibliography of responses published by Wiesław Majewski in Warsaw in 1986.

⁴⁷ GÓRKA *Bohdan Chmielnicki*.

⁴⁸ MATVII IAVORS'KYI *Istoriia Ukrainy*. 2 pts. Kiev 1923–1924, here pt. 2, pp. 83–104.

⁴⁹ K. OSIPOV *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*. Moscow 1939, republished in a revised edition in 1948.

Ukraine was being lauded. During the war, in part to inspire Ukrainian loyalty, the Order of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi was created (10 October 1943).⁵⁰

In the post-war period, Stalin's toast to the Russian people denoted an increasing emphasis on the benevolent influence of the Russians on the other peoples of the Soviet Union even in the distant past. By 1951 the links with Russia were no longer merely a positive good, but a "great blessing." The full reevaluation of Khmel'nyts'kyi and the link of Ukraine and Russia came with the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Agreement in 1953 and 1954, which Stalin's successors saw as cementing the relation of Russia and Ukraine. The celebrations took on all-Union dimensions, extended to the entire Communist bloc, and affected every aspect of life from the writing of operas to the renaming of collective farms.⁵¹ The city of Proskuriv and the oblast of Kamianets'-Podil's'kyi were rechristened Khmel'nyts'kyi. The theses on this event approved by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which were a programmatic statement on Ukrainian history and Russian-Ukrainian relations, declared: "In the war of liberation the Ukrainian people were led by an outstanding statesman and soldier, Bogdan Khmel'nitsky. The historic merit of Bogdan Khmel'nitsky lies in the fact that, while expressing the age-old aspiration and hope of the Ukrainian people close unity with the Russian people and while giving leadership to the process of building of Ukrainian statehood, he correctly understood its purposes and prospects, realized that the salvation of the Ukrainian people could only be achieved through unity with the great Russian people, and worked perseveringly for the reunion of Ukraine with Russia."⁵² With Kulish's phrase of reunion or reunification resurrected and the traditional Russian view restored, Khmel'nyts'kyi now became the icon of Russian-Ukrainian unity, albeit with the *Theses* permitting a few obeisances to Ukrainian sentiment such as his leadership in the process of state-building, though not in the formation of a state.

The massive celebrations required a scholarly publication, thus permitting or in some ways requiring the rehabilitation of Ivan Kryp'iakevych and the appearance of *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*, a work he had ready in manuscript and one of the better scholarly works to appear in post-World War II Ukraine, once one discounts its mandatory political statements and some dictated interpretations.⁵³ Although it contained considerable information on the hetman, it was in fact a monograph on Ukraine in the mid-seventeenth century, in many ways a successor to Kostomarov's work, though written under much stricter censorship. As a member of the statist school, Kryp'iakevych evaluated Khmel'nyts'kyi highly as is apparent on a careful reading of the text, though some of the declared reasons stemmed not from Kryp'iakevych's views but from the new official dogmas. Thus the book contained a passage: "Bourgeois-nationalist historians could not correctly judge the role of the individual in history. They tendentiously evaluated the role of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi in the liberation war, characterizing the hetman as a man with a nobiliary world view and keeping fully silent about the close, deep relations of Khmel'nyts'kyi with the popular masses."⁵⁴ Thus Khmel'nyts'kyi became a flawless Soviet hero, on the side of Russia and the masses.

⁵⁰ On Marxist and Soviet writings on Khmel'nyts'kyi, see BASARAB *Pereiaslav 1654* pp. 162–179.

⁵¹ JOHN RESHETAR *The Significance of the Soviet Tercentenary of the Pereyaslav Treaty*, in: *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States* 4 (1955) pp. 981–994.

⁵² Quoted from *Theses on the 300th Anniversary of the Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia (1654–1954)*. (Moscow 1954) as reprinted in BASARAB *Pereiaslav 1654* pp. 273–274.

⁵³ I. P. KRYP'IAKEVYCH *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Kiev 1954. Fortunately Kryp'iakevych's son, Roman, kept the original text and it was published in 1990 with an enlightening introduction on the practices of Soviet-era Ukrainian scholarly publishing by Iaroslav Isaevych. I. P. KRYP'IAKEVYCH *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Sec. corrected and enlarged edition. Lviv 1990.

⁵⁴ IDEM *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Kiev 1954, p. 10.

Outside the Soviet Union, Khmel'nyts'kyi continued to attract interest. While the popular text written by George Vernadsky in 1941 had more to do with Vernadsky's Ukrainian roots than with a deeper trend in Russian émigré or American historiography, post World War II Polish historians began to rethink the hetman and his period.⁵⁵ Initially, this rethinking, which included attention to the popular masses in history, was dictated by the new Communist rulers' striving for uniformity in the bloc. When Olgierd Górka was able to present his positive image of Khmel'nyts'kyi in the celebratory conference on the "Union of Ukraine with Russia," the tones of the new order must have put off Polish scholars rather than propagate his pre-war views.⁵⁶ Soon however the reconsideration stemmed from the growing strength of Polish historiography on the seventeenth century, including a scholarly reappraisal of Sienkiewicz. In particular, Zbigniew Wójcik's general and widely read work on the Ukrainian Cossacks constituted a basic reevaluation of Ukrainian history and Khmel'nyts'kyi.⁵⁷ By the time that Janusz Kaczmarczyk's biography of Khmel'nyts'kyi appeared in 1988, it was evident that in Polish historiography the views of Kubala rather than those of Rawita-Gawroński dominated, though with a new understanding of social issues and the national aspects of the uprising.⁵⁸ Perhaps even more important was that Khmel'nyts'kyi and the events of the mid-seventeenth century had lost their symbolic importance for Polish identity and Polish-Ukrainian relations, though the discussion on the filming of Sienkiewicz's *With Fire and Sword* in 1997 demonstrated that on a popular level they did still have some resonance.⁵⁹

In the thaw of the late 1950s and 1960s, Ukrainian historians were able to publish a number of valuable articles and studies that made for a more nuanced depiction of Khmel'nyts'kyi, albeit without scratching, much less smashing, the official Soviet icon.⁶⁰ With the pogrom of Ukrainian historians in 1972, almost all original research on the period came to an end and the trend of idolatry of the Soviet Khmel'nyts'kyi and all things Russian continued.⁶¹ Emblematic of the period was the existence of Ukrainian dissident historical literature by Mykhailo Braichevs'kyi that challenged the official dogma of "Reunion" and discussed Khmel'nyts'kyi as a historical person.⁶² For the broader Ukrainian public the first discussion on Khmel'nyts'kyi came not from historical works but from literature. In 1983, the well-known Ukrainian writer Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi published his *Ia, Bohdan* (I, Bohdan), a novel that sought to present a psychological portrait of the hetman.⁶³ In a debate reminiscent of the

⁵⁵ GEORGE VERNADSKY *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine*. New Haven 1941. In some ways, the seed for a reevaluation in Polish historiography were already sown before the war by the decision to have MYRON KORDUBA write the entry on Khmel'nyts'kyi in *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*. Vol. 3. Cracow 1937, pp. 329–334.

⁵⁶ GÓRKA *Bohdan Chmielnicki*. It should be noted even at this time, Polish historiography showed a certain independence from Soviet dictates and avoided the term "reunion."

⁵⁷ ZBIGNIEW WÓJCIK *Dzikie Pola w ogniu*. Warsaw 1960 appeared in two subsequent editions.

⁵⁸ JANUSZ KACZMARCZYK *Bohdan Chmielnicki*. Wrocław [etc.] 1988.

⁵⁹ See the articles by FRANK SYSYN, IAROSLAV HRYTSAK, and by JAN WIDACKI in the daily "Gazeta Wyborcza" 17–18 May 1997. It is significant that the daily thought to commission articles on this issue, in part because of its potential sensitivity for Ukrainian-Polish relations. Widacki represents a continuation of many pre-war Polish attitudes, including the cult of Wiśniowiecki. See JAN WIDACKI *Kniaź Jarema*. Katowice 1984.

⁶⁰ See in particular, I. P. KRYP'IAKEVYCH *Sotsial'no-politychni pohliady Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1957) no. 1, pp. 97–105 and F. P. SHEVCHENKO *Istorychne mynule v ostyntsi B. Khmel'nyts'koho*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1970) no. 12, pp. 126–132.

⁶¹ The last emanation of the Soviet image was the biography by VOLODYMYR ZEMLYNS'KYI [VLADIMIR ZEMLINSKII] *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* published in Moscow in 1989 in the same series – *Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei* – that the Osipov biography had appeared in.

⁶² M. IU. BRAICHEVS'KYI *Pryiednannia chy voziednannia?* Toronto 1972.

⁶³ PAVLO ZAHREBEL'NYI *Ia, Bohdan. Spovid' u slavi*. Kiev 1983.

Polish debate of the 1930s over Sienkiewicz, Zahrebel'nyi's novel unleashed a storm of controversy over its sources and factual accuracy. Some loyal Soviet writers such as Borys Oliinyk criticized the work for undermining the reputation of the instrument of Russian-Ukrainian unity.⁶⁴ Other Ukrainian *literati* such as Viacheslav Briukhovets'kyi and Mykola Zhulyns'kyi defended the craft of fiction. Most interesting was the reaction of the historian Volodymyr Serhiichuk who criticized the work for its potential negative influence on Ukrainian youth.⁶⁵ For this Ukrainian patriot, writing before one could conceive of the *glasnost'* that would come in a few years there was an implicit affirmation of Górká's view that one should not challenge national myths when under foreign occupation. However distorted the image, Khmel'nyts'kyi constituted one of the few symbols permitted Ukrainian identity in the Soviet period.

With the onset of *glasnost'*, the Soviet image of the icon of "Reunion" was challenged. Sources such as the Cossack chronicles were published, frequently in modern Ukrainian translation, and hitherto unavailable works, including those that had appeared abroad, became available and were republished. The printing of an uncensored and ideologically undistorted version of Ivan Kryp'iakievych's work in 1990 did much to undermine the Soviet Khmel'nyts'kyi. In the political conflicts of the period, however, pro-Russian groups that wanted to maintain Soviet unity once again declared themselves Bohdanites. While the reprinting of segments of Hrushevs'kyi's writings, including his multi-volume history of Ukraine-Rus', were the major event in rebuilding Ukrainian historical identity, it was thinking of the statist school that found most fertile ground, particularly after the declaration of Ukrainian independence. Khmel'nyts'kyi as state-builder figured in the new works by Valerii Smolii and Volodymyr Stepankov.⁶⁶ These expected overtones of breaking the Soviet image and seeing the Hetmanate of Khmel'nyts'kyi's time as a predecessor of the Ukrainian state were in evidence during the celebration in 1995 of the 400th anniversary of Khmel'nyts'kyi's customarily accepted birthdate that was supported by the Ukrainian state.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, the growing flood of studies on the hetman and his period, including the reprinting in 1997 of Hrushevs'kyi's more critical views in his history, made the hetman's image less uniform. Other historical questions such as the national character of Kyivan Rus', figures such as Ivan Mazepa and Symon Petliura, and the events of World War II were more likely to serve as subjects of symbolic dispute.

Despite the considerable contributions to the study of the period by Russian historians such as Lev Zaborovskii, Gennadii Sanin, and Tatiana Iakovleva, they did not begin an active reconsideration of the Russian image of Khmel'nyts'kyi. The major work to appear on the hetman was a reprinting of Kostomarov's biography marking the 340th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Agreement, with publication information declaring to the readers that the book would convince them that the decision of the people of Ukraine to unite with Russia in 1654 was not a mistake.⁶⁸ Thereby the work so attacked by Russian historians in the nineteenth

⁶⁴ BORYS OLIINYK [BORIS OLEINIK] *Istoriia ne liubit sueslov'ia... Zametki o strannostiakh khudozhestvennogo vymysla*, in: *Sovetskaia kul'tura* 21 (1986).

⁶⁵ VOLODYMYR SERHIICHUK *Ia, Bohdan z tochky zoru istoryka*, in: *Dnipro* (1987) no. 10, pp. 110–119. The article contains bibliographic information on other participants in the debate.

⁶⁶ V. A. SMOLII, V. S. STEPANKOV *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi: Sotsial'no-politychnyi portret*. Kiev 1993 and their *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi: Khronika, zhyttia ta diial'nosti*. Kiev 1994.

⁶⁷ See the special issue of *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1995) no. 4.

⁶⁸ The publication information in fact mistakenly declares 1994 the 300th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Agreement. It praises Kostomarov's use of sources. After informing the reader that certain "social activists" now viewed the "historical decision" at Pereiaslav as mistaken, it goes on to say that the unprejudiced reader will see that it was the only way possible for Ukraine to preserve its culture and national dignity. N. I. KOSTOMAROV *Materialy i issledovaniia. Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*. Moscow 1994.

century was seen as presenting more acceptable views than those current in Ukrainian historiography of the 1990s. At a conference of Russian and Ukrainian historians in Moscow, curiously held in January 1995 to mark the 340th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Council, sharp exchanges occurred, a sign of increasing divergence of interpretations between two now equal national historiographies.⁶⁹

By the approach of the 350th anniversary of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising, it appeared that the hetman's image had lost some of its critical significance. His portrait had joined the new national iconostasis, the series of leaders on the hryvnia notes, but he was not even as controversial as Hrushevs'kyi, not to speak of Mazepa, whose inclusion elicited protests in some Communist quarters. While it could be assumed that historiography in Ukraine about Khmel'nyts'kyi would continue to be affected by the issues of state-building and nation-building, the very successes in these processes, albeit limited, relieved history of some of its relevance. New contacts with the outer world, typified by the increasing attention to comparative history of revolts and questions of early modern European history were changing history writing in Ukraine.⁷⁰ The very fact that Kaczmarczyk's biography had appeared in Ukrainian translation and that Ukrainian scholars took part in an international conference in Israel in early 1998 on the Jewish massacres of 1648–1649 signified the new openness. The age-old problem of lack of sufficient sources to define Khmel'nyts'kyi's character, thought, and plans remained. It appeared, however, that as the importance of the image receded, the possibility for the creative exploration of these questions increased.

⁶⁹ V. M. HOROBETS', T. V. CHUKHLIB *Mizhnarodna naukova konferentsiia, prysviachena 340-richchiu Pereiaslavs'koi rady*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1995) no. 5, pp. 146–150. One may speculate whether this belated attention was the result of an increasing awareness in Russia of the changes in Ukrainian historiography brought about by Ukrainian independence and the need to treat its new viewpoints and Ukraine seriously.

⁷⁰ See V. S. STEPANKOV *Ukrains'ka revoliutsiia 1648–1676 rr. u konteksti evropeis'koho revoliutsiinoho rukhu XVI–XVII st.: Sproba porivnial'noho analizu*, in: *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* (1997) no. 1, pp. 3–21.