

A detailed portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, a Ukrainian Cossack leader. He is depicted from the chest up, wearing a black fur hat with two large white feathers and a red band. He has a dark mustache and is looking slightly to the left. He is dressed in a green tunic with gold buttons and a red cape. He holds a wooden staff with a large, ornate, golden headpiece decorated with red and blue gemstones. The background is dark and textured.

# STORIES OF KHMELNYTSKY

COMPETING LITERARY LEGACIES  
OF THE 1648 UKRAINIAN  
COSSACK UPRISING

EDITED BY  
AMELIA M. GLASER

## **Stories of Khmelnytsky**

**Stanford Studies on Central and Eastern Europe**

Edited by Norman Naimark and Larry Wolff

**Stories of Khmelnytsky**

*Competing Literary Legacies of the 1648*

*Ukrainian Cossack Uprising*

**Edited by Amelia M. Glaser**

Stanford University Press

Stanford, California

Stanford University Press  
Stanford, California

©2015 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University.  
All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system without the prior written permission of Stanford University Press.

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free, archival-quality paper

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stories of Khmelnytsky : competing literary legacies of the 1648 Ukrainian  
Cossack uprising / edited by Amelia M. Glaser.

pages cm--(Stanford studies on Central and Eastern Europe)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-8047-9382-7 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Khmel'nyts'kyi, Bohdan, approximately 1594-1657--In literature. 2. Cossack-Polish War, 1648-1657--Literature and the war. 3. Zaporozhians in literature. 4. Cossacks in literature. 5. Slavic literature--History and criticism. 6. Jewish literature--History and criticism. I. Glaser, Amelia, editor. II. Series: Stanford studies on Central and Eastern Europe.

PN57.K46S76 2015

809'.93358438024--dc23

2015011808

ISBN 978-0-8047-9496-1 (electronic)

Typeset by Bruce Lundquist in 11/13.5 Adobe Garamond

## Contents

|   |      |
|---|------|
| List of Illustrations   | ix   |
| Acknowledgments   | xi   |
| Chronology of Major Events Associated with the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the Depiction of Bohdan Khmelnytsky<br><i>Amelia M. Glaser and Frank E. Sysyn</i> | xiii |
| A Brief Note on Orthography and Transliteration   | xx   |
| Introduction. Bohdan Khmelnytsky as Protagonist:<br>Between Hero and Villain<br><i>Amelia M. Glaser</i>   | 1    |
| <b>Part I: The Literary Aftermath of 1648</b>   |      |
| 1 A Portrait in Ambivalence: The Case of Natan Hanover and His Chronicle, <i>Yeven metsulah</i><br><i>Adam Teller</i>                                     | 23   |
| 2 “A Man Worthy of the Name Hetman”: The Fashioning of Khmelnytsky as a Hero in the Hrabianka Chronicle<br><i>Frank E. Sysyn</i>                          | 36   |
| 3 A Reevaluation of the “Khmelnytsky Factor”: The Case of the Seventeenth-Century Sabbatean Movement<br><i>Ada Rapoport-Albert</i>                        | 47   |

**Part II: Khmelnytsky and Romanticism**

- 4 Apotheosis, Rejection, and Transference: Bohdan Khmelnytsky  
in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Romantic Literature 63  
*George G. Grabowicz*
- 5 Heroes and Villains in the Historical Imagination:  
The Elusive Khmelnytsky 89  
*Taras Koznarsky*
- 6 The Image of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Polish Romanticism  
and Its Post-Romantic Reflex 110  
*Roman Koropeckyj*

**Part III: Khmelnytsky and the Reinvention of  
National Traditions**

- 7 The Heirs of Tul'chyn: A Modernist Reappraisal of Historical  
Narrative 127  
*Amelia M. Glaser*
- 8 Hanukkah Cossack Style: Zaporozhian Warriors and Zionist  
Popular Culture (1904–1918) 139  
*Israel Bartal*
- 9 The Cult of Strength: Khmelnytsky in the Literature of  
Ukrainian Nationalists During the 1930s and 1940s 153  
*Myroslav Shkandrij*

**Part IV: Khmelnytsky in Twentieth-Century Mythologies**

- 10 Jews and Soviet Remythologization of the Ukrainian Hetman:  
The Case of the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky 169  
*Gennady Estraiikh*
- 11 On the Other Side of Despair: Cossacks and Jews in  
Yurii Kosach's *The Day of Rage* 182  
*Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern*
- 12 Khmelnytsky in Motion: The Case of Soviet, Polish, and  
Ukrainian Film 197  
*Izabela Kalinowska and Marta Kondratyuk*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Afterword   | 219 |
| <i>Judith Deutsch Kornblatt</i>                           |     |
| Notes   | 227 |
| Bibliography of Source Texts on the Khmelnytsky Uprisings | 271 |
| Contributors  | 283 |
| Index   | 285 |





# Illustrations

## Figures

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| I.1  | Mikhail Mikeshin, Model for memorial to Bohdan Khmelnytsky   | 2   |
| I.2  | Willem Hondius, Portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky (engraving; 1651)   | 14  |
| 5.1  | Front matter and portrait of Khmelnytsky from Bantysh-Kamenskii's <i>History of Little Russia</i> (1822)   | 91  |
| 6.1  | Jan Matejko, <i>Bohdan Khmelnytsky Pledging Allegiance at Zboriv</i> (watercolor; 1859)  | 115 |
| 8.1  | Members of the Hashomer organization—a postcard sent from Mandatory Palestine to Europe before World War II  | 142 |
| 9.1  | Mykola Ivasiuk (1865–1937), <i>Bohdan Khmelnytsky Entering Kyiv</i> (1912)   | 155 |
| 10.1 | Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Second Class  | 170 |
| 10.2 | Colonel Zalman Abramovich Frenkel (1908, Konotop–1986, Moscow), awarded the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Second Class by a decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, April 28, 1945 | 180 |
| 12.1 | Bohdan Stupka in the role of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Jerzy Hoffman's 1999 film <i>With Fire and Sword</i>  | 208 |

## Maps

|     |                                |      |
|-----|--------------------------------|------|
| I.1 | Map of Eastern Europe ca. 1650 | xxiv |
| I.2 | The Cossack Hetmanate ca. 1650 | 10   |

## Table

|     |   |     |
|-----|---|-----|
| 0.1 | Sample list of place names with linguistic variants | xxi |
|-----|---|-----|

## Acknowledgments

Scholars of the humanities often comment that we work in isolation. Editing this volume has, to the contrary, been an experience of ideal intellectual collaboration. All of the scholars whose work appears on these pages have also contributed to the conceptual underpinnings of this book, and without the benefit of their expertise this volume would not have the depth and breadth that the subject demands. I have learned much from speaking to each of them about the artistic and literary legacy of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and have sought their advice on editorial decisions. I want to mention a few individuals in particular: Frank Sysyn has read drafts of many of these chapters, including my own, and generously offered guidance on maps, sources, and the issues surrounding historiography. Taras Koznarsky has been a wise and meticulous editor and interlocutor. Adam Teller and Judith Kornblatt have helped to read my chapter and others'. George Grabowicz helped me formulate the project when it was still an idea.

I would like to thank the Judaic Studies Program at the University of California, San Diego, for bringing the contributors together for a conference in April 2012, allowing us to share early drafts of these chapters and to discuss the direction this book should take. The Judaic Studies Program also assisted me with funding for the completion of this volume. The Ukrainian-Jewish Encounters Initiative and the Russian, East European, and Eurasian Studies Program at UCSD cosponsored the 2012 gathering and the former awarded this volume a publication subvention. A Hellman Fellowship from UCSD allowed me to begin my research on this topic and to begin planning the volume.

I am grateful to Eric Brandt, Friederike Sundaram, Tom Finnegan, Mariana Raykov, and the rest of the team at Stanford University Press for their work on, and belief in, this project, as well as series editors Norman Naimark and Larry Wolff. Sibelan Forrester, Deborah Hertz, Izabela Kalinowska, Martha Kelly, Lisa Lampert-Weissig, Matthias Lehmann, William Propp, Steven Seegel, and Steven Zipperstein have given advice and guidance. Jeff Edelstein, Teresa Kuruc, and Yuliya Ladygina provided editorial and research assistance. My partner and role model, Eran Mukamel, has read, edited, encouraged, and given invaluable perspective.

Visualizing such a contentious region and time period is difficult. Thanks go to Kelly Sandefer of Beehive mapping for creating a usable, nuanced map of the region, and to Marko Stech and Frank Sysyn for permission to reprint Wendy Johnson's (of Johnson Cartographics) map of the Cossack Hetmanate from Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'* (vol. 9, book 1). For their permission to use images, thanks go to the State Russian Museum in St. Petersburg, the Russian State Historical Museum in Moscow, Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, Zodiak Jerzy Hoffman Film Production in Warsaw, the National Gallery in Lviv, and the Frenkel Family.

## **Chronology of Major Events Associated with the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the Depiction of Bohdan Khmelnytsky**

*Amelia M. Glaser and Frank E. Sysyn*

- Late 1400s–early 1500s. Cossacks arise on the Slavic-Turkic borderland. Zaporozhian Sich emerges on the Dnipro River.
1492. Expulsion of Jews from Spain and Italy. A small number of them settle in Poland.
1495. Archduke Alexander expels Jews from Lithuania. Many settle outside the Lithuanian border in Poland. Alexander later becomes king of Poland and allows Jews to return.
1569. The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is established through the Union of Lublin. The central Ukrainian lands are transferred from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Kingdom of Poland.
- 1587–1632. Reign of Sigismund III Vasa, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania.
- 1595 (?). Bohdan Khmelnytsky is born in the village of Subotiv, near Chyhyryn.
- 1595–1596. The Metropolitan, some of the hierarchs, and part of the Orthodox Metropolitanate of Kyiv accept the supremacy of the pope at the Union of Brest.
- 1598–1613. Time of Troubles in Muscovy. Polish-Lithuanian intervention with the participation of Zaporozhian Cossacks.
- 1610s. Khmelnytsky attends Jesuit Academy (in Jarosław or Lviv).

- 1613–1645. Mikhail I of Russia, the first Muscovite Tsar of the house of Romanov.
- 1619–1621. War between the Ottoman Empire and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Bohdan Khmelnytsky and his father Mykhailo take part in the Battle of Cecora (also known as the Battle of Țuțora). Khmelnytsky's father is killed. Khmelnytsky is captured and spends two years in Ottoman captivity.
- 1625–1630 and 1637–1638. Major Zaporozhian Cossack uprisings against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, culminating in Cossack defeat and a harsh ordinance restricting Cossack self-governance in 1638.
- 1632–1648. Reign of Władysław IV Vasa, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania
1637. Khmelnytsky becomes military chancellor of the Zaporozhian Host.
1638. Khmelnytsky participates in Cossack delegation to King Władysław IV.
1645. Khmelnytsky may have served in Cossack detachments in France.
- 1645–1676. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich rules Muscovy.
1646. Władysław IV Vasa solicits Cossack aid in the campaign against the Crimean Khanate and the planned war against the Ottoman Empire. Khmelnytsky is one of the Cossack envoys to the king.
1647. The Chyhyryn starosta Daniel Czapliński evicts Khmelnytsky from his estate.
1648. Khmelnytsky, assuming the post of hetman of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, allies with the Crimean Tatars and leads a Cossack revolt, igniting a general Ukrainian insurrection. The Cossacks defeat the armies of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.
1648. The uprising involves massacres of Jewish communities, including in Nemyriv on the twentieth of Nisan, a fast-day in honor of the martyrs of the Crusades. Rabbis later declare it a day of mourning for the Jewish victims of the Cossack uprising as well.
1648. Shabetai Tsevi first proclaims himself Messiah.

1648. The Cossack troops, led by Kryvonis and Hanzha, conquer Tul'chyn. Many Jews are killed in the process.
- Winter 1648–49. Khmelnytsky enters Kyiv and is acclaimed by the local clergy and populace as “Moses,” liberator of his people from Polish bondage, and de facto ruler of the nascent Cossack Hetmanate.
- 1648–1668. Jan Kazimierz is the last of the Vasa dynasty to rule Poland. He permits those Jews who were forcibly baptized in 1648 to return to Judaism.
1649. The Peace of Zboriv recognizes Hetman Khmelnytsky's and the Cossacks' control of much of Ukraine.
1651. The Cossack army is defeated at Berestechko by the Polish-Lithuanian forces. Khmelnytsky accepts Ottoman suzerainty.
1652. Khmelnytsky arranges the marriage of his son Tymish to the ruling family of Moldavia.
1653. Natan Hanover publishes *Yeven metsulah*, about the Jewish casualties of the 1648 uprising.
- 1653–1654. Khmelnytsky seeks the protection of the Tsar, enlisting Muscovite support against Poland-Lithuania.
- January 1654. The Treaty of Pereiaslav is concluded between Khmelnytsky with the Cossack leaders and representatives of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich of Russia.
1656. Poland-Lithuania and Muscovy declare a truce in Vilnius. Khmelnytsky seeks Swedish and Transylvanian support to preserve the Hetmanate.
1657. Khmelnytsky dies on July 26.
1665. Shabetai Tsevi, who already had a strong Jewish following, declares himself the Messiah.
1667. The Treaty of Andrusova divides the Ukrainian and Belarusian territories between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Muscovy, and divides the Cossack Hetmanate along the Dniipro River.



1681. Samuel Twardowski's great epic *Wojna domowa* (Civil War) is published.
- 1700s–1730s. The Cossack histories of Hryhorii Hrabianka and Samiilo Velychko are penned.
1708. Hetman Ivan Mazepa breaks allegiance to Peter I and sides with Charles XII of Sweden in the Great Northern War.
1709. The Swedish army is defeated at the Battle of Poltava, and Charles XII and Mazepa flee to the Ottoman territories with the surviving Swedish and Cossack troops.
1768. Gonta and Zalizniak lead the Koliivshchyna rebellion against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.
- 1772, 1793, 1795. Austria, Russia, and Prussia partition the Polish-Lithuanian state.
1775. The Zaporozhian Sich is destroyed under Catherine II of Russia.
1783. The Cossack Hetmanate is abolished.
1791. Catherine II of Russia establishes the Pale of Settlement in the western borderlands of the Russian empire.
1812. Napoleon invades Russia.
1825. Decembrist revolt.
- 1830–31. Polish November Uprising against the Russian empire.
1847. Imperial police arrest members of the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius.
1857. Mykola Kostomarov publishes his historical study about Bohdan Khmelnytsky; Maksymovych proposes a monument to Khmelnytsky in Kyiv.
1861. Tsar Alexander II liberates the serfs in the Russian empire.
1863. Valuev Circular: ban of publications in Ukrainian.
- 1863–64. Polish January Uprising.
1878. Solomon Mandel'kern publishes his Russian translation of Hanover's *Yeven metsulah*.

1881. Members of the revolutionary group “the People’s Will” assassinate Tsar Alexander II. Anti-Jewish pogroms follow this event, and many connect them to the massacres of 1648–49.
1884. Henryk Sienkiewicz publishes a historical novel, *Ogniem i mieczem* (*With Fire and Sword*), in Polish, about the Khmelnytsky uprising.
1888. Mikeshin’s Monument to Khmelnytsky, which Mikhail Yuzefovich commissioned, is unveiled on Kyiv’s St. Sophia Square in commemoration of nine hundred years since the Baptism of Rus’.
- 1898, 1904, 1905, 1907. The 250-year anniversaries of major events of the Khmelnytsky uprising are marked differently by Ukrainians, Jews, Poles, and Russians.
1904. Haim Nachmann Bialik publishes his poem “Be’ir ha Harega” (In the City of Slaughter), about the 1903 Kishinev pogrom. The first version is called “Ma’asa Nemirov” (A Tale of Nemirov) to satisfy the censors, thereby suggesting that the poem is about historical (rather than recent) events.
1905. Russian Revolution. A wave of anti-Jewish pogroms breaks out.
- 1906–1909. Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński publishes his negative biography of Khmelnytsky.
- 1912–1920. Viacheslav Lypynsky publishes works on Khmelnytsky as a Ukrainian statesman.
1917. The Bolshevik Revolution.
- 1917–1921. Ukrainian governments (the Ukrainian Central Rada, the Hetman state, and the Ukrainian National Directory) struggle to establish and maintain Ukrainian independence.
- 1917–1922. Civil and international wars involving Ukrainians, Russian White armies, Poles, Germans, and Bolsheviks. The fighting is accompanied by a renewed outbreak of anti-Jewish pogroms.
- 1917–1931. Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky publishes his monumental study of the Khmelnytsky era, as part of his *History of Ukraine-Rus’*.

1919. Sholem Asch publishes his Yiddish novel *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648*. The Warsaw branch of the Vilna Troupe has great success with Asch's dramatization of his novel the following year.
- 1920s–1930s. Soviet Marxist historiography negatively evaluates Khmelnytsky.
1922. The USSR is formed with the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic as one of its constituents.
1923. League of Nations recognizes Polish control of Western Ukraine.
1929. The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) emerges in Western Ukraine with the goal of establishing a Ukrainian nation state. In the 1940s Stepan Bandera will lead a radicalized faction of this group.
- 1932–1933. Soviet collectivization policies give rise to a massive famine, known as the “Holodomor” (extermination by hunger), in the Ukrainian territories.
1933. The Warsaw-based journal *Globus* serializes Isaac Bashevis Singer's Yiddish novel *Satan in Goray*, set just after the Khmelnytsky uprising. The novel garners unprecedented success and is republished in 1935 in its entirety without a subvention.
1939. Soviet Union occupies Western Ukraine after Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.
- 1941–1944. Nazi Germany occupies Ukraine, creating Reichskommissariat Ukraine.
1943. The Soviet Military “Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky” is established.
1943. The town of Pereiaslav is renamed Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky.
1948. Founding of the State of Israel.
1954. Three hundredth anniversary of the Pereiaslav Treaty celebrated as the “eternal reunification” of Ukraine with Russia. The Ukrainian town of Proskuriv is renamed Khmelnytsky. Ivan Krypiakevych's biography of Khmelnytsky, the only scholarly biography of a Ukrainian hetman permitted under Soviet rule, is published.

1991. Ukraine declares independence. The USSR is dismantled.
1996. The Ukrainian hryvnia banknotes enter circulation in Ukraine. Khmelnytsky's image appears on the five-hryvnia note.
2005. Bohdan Khmelnytsky's mace, on loan from Poland, is part of the ceremony to swear Viktor Yushchenko into the office of President of Ukraine.

## **A Brief Note on Orthography and Transliteration**

Relationships to Khmelnytsky are as numerous as the names and orthographies that identify the hetman. In this volume, we have chosen to use the modified Ukrainian transliteration “Bohdan Khmelnytsky.” However, where an author refers to a Polish text, we have used the standard Polish spelling, Bohdan Chmielnicki; Russian texts will refer to Bogdan Khmel’nitskii, and Ukrainian-language texts follow the more standard transliteration of Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi. Names of places also necessarily vary according to the political moment or perspective in question. Wherever possible, we have attempted to standardize the spelling of place names to correspond to the time period and literary context under discussion. Where this is ambiguous, we have opted either for the standard spelling of well-known place names in English or for the present Ukrainian spelling. Names of well-known individuals likewise follow the English spelling of their names, whereas the names of less-commonly-translated writers conform to either the Library of Congress (for Ukrainian and Russian) or the YIVO (for Hebrew and Yiddish) styles of transliteration. To ease pronunciation in our English-language narrative, we have modified the Russian and Ukrainian Library of Congress systems slightly by giving the initial vowel in all personal names as Yu, Ya, and Yo, rather than Iu, Ia, and Io.

**TABLE 0.1.** Sample list of place names with linguistic variants

| <b>Belarusian</b>                          | <b>Polish</b>                                     | <b>Russian</b>                                 | <b>Ukrainian</b>               | <b>Yiddish</b>                        |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bielaja Carkava                            | Biała Cerkiew                                     | Belaia Tserkov'                                | Bila Tserkva<br>Yuriev (arch.) | Sadeh Lavan (Heb.)<br>Shvarts Tuma    |
| Berastse (arch.)<br>Brest<br>Brest-Litoŭsk | Brześć<br>Brześć Litewski<br>Brześć nad<br>Bugiem | Brest<br>Brest-Litovsk                         | Berestia<br>Berest'<br>Brest   | Brisk<br>Brisk de-Lite                |
| Čyhiryn                                    | Czehryń   | Chigirin                                       | Chyhyryn                       | Tsharhrin<br>Tsherin                  |
| Čanstachova                                | Częstochowa<br>Częstomir (arch.)                  | Chenstokhova<br>Chenstokhovo                   | Chenstokhova                   | Tshenstokhov                          |
| Dahapils<br>Dynaburh<br>Dzvinsk            | Dyneburg<br>Dźwinów<br>Dźwińsk                    | Borisoglebsk<br>Daugavpils<br>Dvinsk<br>Nevgin | Dauhavpils                     | Dinaburg<br>Dvinsk<br>Deneburg        |
| Gdan'sk                                    | Gdańsk  | Dantsig (arch.)<br>Gdans'k                     | Gdans'k                        | Dantsig<br>Gdansk                     |
| Hadziach                                   | Hadziacz  | Gadiach  | Hadiach                        | Hadyitsh                              |
| Kijeŭ                                      | Kijów   | Kiev   | Kyiv                           | Kiyev                                 |
| Krakaŭ                                     | Kraków  | Krakov   | Krakiv                         | Kroke                                 |
| Liublin                                    | Lublin  | Liublin  | Liublin                        | Lublin                                |
| L'voŭ                                      | Lwów  | L'vov  | L'viv                          | Lemberg<br>Lemberik<br>Lvov           |
| Mahilio                                    | Mogilew<br>Mohylew                                | Mogilev  | Mohylev<br>Mohyliv             | Molev<br>Moylev<br>Mohilov<br>Mogilev |
| Palonnaje                                  | Połonne   | Polonnoe                                       | Polonne                        | Polna<br>Polona<br>Polnoa             |
| Paznan'<br>Poznan'                         | Poznań  | Poznan'  | Poznan'                        | Pozne<br>Poyzn                        |
| Tul'čyn                                    | Tulczyn   | Tul'chin                                       | Nestervar (arch.)<br>Tul'chyn  | Tultshin                              |
| Vil'nia                                    | Wilno   | Vil'na   | Vil'na                         | Vilne                                 |
| Vitsiebsk                                  | Witebsk   | Vitebsk  | Vitebs'k                       | Vitebsk                               |
| Vrotslaŭ                                   | Wrocław   | Vrotslav<br>Breslavl' (arch.)                  | Vrotslav                       | Bresle<br>Bresloy                     |
| Zamasts'                                   | Zamość  | Zamoct's'                                      | Zamostia                       | Zamoshtsh                             |
| Iziaslaŭ                                   | Zasław  | Iziaslav                                       | Iziaslav<br>Zaslav<br>Zheslav  | Zaslav                                |
| Zbaraž                                     | Zbaraž  | Zbarazh  | Zbarazh                        | Zbarash<br>Zbarizh                    |
| Zboraŭ                                     | Zborów  | Zborov   | Zboriv                         | Zborov                                |



## **Stories of Khmelnytsky**





MAP I.1. Map of Eastern Europe ca. 1650. Courtesy of Beehive Mapping.

## Introduction

### Bohdan Khmelnytsky as Protagonist: Between Hero and Villain

*Amelia M. Glaser*

IN 1863 Mikhail Mikeshin, the artist renowned for designing the monuments to the “Millennium of Rus” in Novgorod and to Catherine II in St. Petersburg, proposed a design for a statue of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, to be erected near Kyiv’s St. Sofia cathedral.<sup>1</sup> The year coincided with the Polish insurrection of 1863, and Mikeshin’s early design blended imperialism with bellicose nationalism—Khmelnytsky holds a sword to the East, in defense of Russia, while his horse tramples a broken chain along with representatives of the Zaporozhians’ vanquished enemies: a Polish lord, a Catholic priest, and a Jewish leaseholder.<sup>2</sup> Before the horseman stand representatives of Khmelnytsky’s allies: a Russian, a Belarusian, a Galician (representing the Western lands known as Red Rus’), and a Ukrainian, alongside a seated Ukrainian *kobza* player.<sup>3</sup> The design was controversial on many levels and was prudently streamlined: due to a shortage of funds and concern about fueling ethnic tensions, Tsar Alexander II’s administration compelled Mikeshin to eliminate the images of allies and antagonists from the final monument. The sculptor also removed the inscription, which had read “A united, indivisible Russia—to Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky,” the names of Ukrainian Cossack heroes, and these lines from a Ukrainian folk song: “Oh, it will be better/oh, it will be more beautiful/When in our Ukraine/There are no Jews, no Poles/And no Union.”<sup>4</sup> (See Fig. I.1.) The final, unembellished monument that was unveiled in 1888 bore only the horseman with a short inscription.<sup>5</sup> Nonetheless, Mikeshin’s early draft offers an appropriately enigmatic portrait



**FIGURE I.1.** Mikhail Mikeshin, Model for memorial to Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Photo courtesy of the State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg, Russia.

of Khmelnytsky, a deeply controversial figure. Prominent Ukrainophiles, and not only ethnic minorities, had reason to oppose the valorizing of the hetman.<sup>6</sup> As Frank Sysyn has shown, “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.”<sup>7</sup> Although Mikeshin intended to present a vision of a united Rus’, his inclusion of multiple nationalities and religions in his original model suggests the relevance of Khmelnytsky to competing national and political narratives. Viewed from the vantage point of the Poles, Jews, Russians, and Ukrainians who are stakeholders in the Cossack uprising of 1648, the hetman emerges as either a hero or a villain in the stories that portray him.

The multiple literary accounts that we address in this volume are part and parcel of a single, fragmented, but nonetheless collective narrative, a narrative about the lands that make up present-day Ukraine and the still-troubled relationships with the territories that border them. The Ukrainian territories, caught between competing empires, would overlap at various points with the Polish Rzeczpospolita, the Crimean Khanate, the Habsburg lands, and the tsarist empire. Under the tsar, parts of the Ukrainian lands came to be known as Malorossiiia (“Little Russia”), and much of the region was included in the Jewish Pale of Settlement. Geographically speaking, this book is a literary history not only of present-day Ukraine but also of a larger region that includes modern-day Poland, Russia, Lithuania, Turkey, and Moldova. At the center of this collective narrative is a Cossack leader whose political life directly influenced Muscovy, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Ottoman Empire, as well as lands to the North and West. Khmelnytsky’s legacy continues to affect Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, and Russian national identity, and it appears most often in these literatures, but the uprising affected all of the communities living in the region, including Crimean Tatars and Armenians.

Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1595–1657), who, beginning in 1648, led the rebellion against the Polish magnates, claiming freedom and territory for the Cossacks, has been memorialized in Ukraine as a great general and God-given nation builder, cut in the model of George Washington and sometimes Moses. As the compromiser who swore an oath to the Russian tsar, ceding those territories to Muscovy, he has also been described as the son of the Antichrist, a devil, a Judas.<sup>8</sup> In Russia he has been viewed, albeit cautiously, as an important ally, his image a signifier for reunification of the Orthodox Great Russians, Little Russians (Ukrainians), and White

Russians (Belarusians) for the first time since Kyivan Rus'. Khmelnytsky has remained a symbol of Ukrainian freedom in independent Ukraine. When President Viktor Yushchenko was sworn into office in 2005 following the "Orange Revolution," the ceremony included a mace used by Bohdan Khmelnytsky, which the Warsaw Military Museum lent to Kyiv for the occasion. In Polish history Khmelnytsky was a prelude to the Deluge, a period of fighting, beginning shortly after the Cossack uprising, that would cost Poland a large portion of its population and vast territories, and Khmelnytsky came to be associated with his contemporary, the rebel Oliver Cromwell.<sup>9</sup> Jews have likened Khmelnytsky, as the hetman under whom thousands of Jews were massacred, to Haman and Hitler.<sup>10</sup> The conflicting semiotic values of Khmelnytsky, either as nation builder or as antagonist, have inhibited interethnic and political rapprochement at key moments throughout history.

This volume addresses, without attempting to resolve, the fundamental literary questions Khmelnytsky's image provokes: How can drastically different mythologies surround a single figure? What do these competing stories mean for our understanding of the past, present, and future of the nations of Eastern Europe? The figure of Khmelnytsky, in his various mythologized forms, has been important to the formation of all of the aforementioned groups' identities. Whether the historical figure is viewed as hero or villain, the idea of Khmelnytsky has bolstered national solidarity. Collective memories of the uprising have highlighted the affinities and rifts among the groups who share a geographic territory. Jews in the region often worked closely with Poles and were therefore seen as part of the infrastructure limiting the rights of Orthodox Christian peasants and Cossacks. There were, to be sure, some instances of cooperation and sympathy between Orthodox Christians and Jews, but Jews, given their economic and cultural affinities with the Poles, generally sided with the overlords.<sup>11</sup> Following the uprising, large numbers of Jews converted to Christianity and left their hometowns, effectively abandoning hundreds of communities. The Jewish chronicles composed in the wake of the events entered a canon of Jewish liturgical poems, becoming conflated, as Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi has pointed out, with the martyrdom of the Crusades.<sup>12</sup> A minor fast day commemorates the massacres.<sup>13</sup>

The multiple literary narratives surrounding Khmelnytsky as an individual, but more specifically as the leader of the 1648 uprising, compete with one another and feed each other. The image of Khmelnytsky

as a historical hero was especially important in the Soviet Union, where a narrative of a historically united Ukraine and Russia was essential to fostering patriotism across a border tainted by years of imperial domination. Within Russian historiography, the Cossack uprising culminated in the 1654 Pereiaslav agreement between the Cossacks and the Tsar. In Ukraine Khmelnytsky's image has since 1996 graced the five-hryvnia note, but collective memory of the leader is far from simple. The Ukrainian national anthem, "Shche ne vmerla Ukraina" (Ukraine has not yet died), excerpts an 1862 poem by Pavlo Chubynsky. The original poem contains the line, "Oh, Bohdan, Bohdan / Our great hetman! / For what purpose did you give Ukraine / to the evil *Moskals*?" [*Oi Bohdane, Bohdane / Slavnyi nash het'mane! / Na-shcho viddav Ukrainu Moskaliam pohanym?!*] We see similarly anti-imperialist sentiments in the Ukrainian Romantic poet Taras Shevchenko, whose 1845 *The Great Crypt* (*Velykyi l'okh*) is a mystery, narrated by three souls of Ukrainian women who have been damned for inadvertently helping Russia subordinate Ukraine. The first soul belongs to a young woman who, crossing paths with Khmelnytsky as he traveled to meet with the Tsar's emissaries for the treaty of Pereiaslav, accidentally caused the death of her entire family. In this text, Khmelnytsky freed the Ukrainians only to enslave them to Russia, although the piece ends with the hope that Ukraine will again be free.<sup>14</sup> The figure of Khmelnytsky would remain a tragic national motif for Shevchenko, who in 1859 wrote "If only you could, drunken Bohdan / see Pereiaslav now!" [*Iakby-to ty, Bohdane p'iany, / Teper na Pereiaslav hlianuv!*], referring to Russia's incremental removal of Ukrainians' rights in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.<sup>15</sup> As Mykola Borovyk showed in his 2012 study of shared authority, although twenty-first-century schoolchildren overwhelmingly ranked Khmelnytsky as Ukraine's most important historical figure, when listing the most tragic events in the nation's history they also place Khmelnytsky's signing of the Pereiaslav treaty near the top, second only to the famine (*Holodomor*) under Stalin in 1932–33.<sup>16</sup>

The Cossacks themselves have been the subject of mythologies in both Ukraine and Russia. Serhii Plokhy proposes that "[the Cossack myth] now serves to assert Ukraine's historical uniqueness and independence."<sup>17</sup> Judith Kornblatt has discussed the "ontologically 'free Cossack', [which] became codified as part of Russia's self-image."<sup>18</sup> The Cossack wars, though devastating for the Polish state and its nobility, became an important theme in Polish literature, providing a legacy of battles

that would fuel the baroque imagination.<sup>19</sup> Despite the fact that 1648 is remembered as a Jewish tragedy, as Israel Bartal shows in the present volume, Jews also valorized Cossacks as embodying the spirit of a free nation.<sup>20</sup> A small but visible society of twenty-first-century Zaporozhian Cossacks was present in Ukraine's pro-Western Maidan demonstrations in 2013–14. Interestingly, among the anti-Maidan demonstrators in Eastern Ukraine in Spring 2014 were Don Cossack units. That is to say, even in the most recent Russian-Ukrainian dispute, both sides eagerly claimed the legacy of free Cossacks.

Cossack societies date back to the years just after the Mongol invasion, when wanderers and bandits populated the Southern Ukrainian steppe. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania took this territory from the Golden Horde in the fourteenth Century, but it remained largely unregulated. In the fifteenth century, the Turkic word *Cossack*, meaning “freeman” or “bandit,” increasingly referred to Slavic Cossacks.<sup>21</sup> The most important Cossack societies to develop were the Don Cossacks in Russia, and the Zaporozhian Cossacks in Ukraine. The Zaporozhians maintained a fortified Cossack host known as a “Sich,” located in the lower regions of the river Dnieper.<sup>22</sup>

The Zaporozhian Cossacks were a self-governed group of men with their own system of leadership, the highest officer being the hetman. The brotherhood included registered Cossacks, who reported to the Polish crown and sometimes served as border militia; and nonregistered Cossacks who, to quote Subtelny, “owned little more than did peasants.”<sup>23</sup> These groups included peasants who fled serfdom and found their way to the Sich. The Polish government sought ways to maintain control over both registered and nonregistered Cossacks. The desire among Zaporozhian Cossacks to increase the number of registered Cossacks, the desire for the rights to elect their own leader (*starshyna*), as well as the desire to defend Orthodox Christian practices against the infringement of Polish Catholic norms led to a number of revolts in the first decades of the seventeenth century.<sup>24</sup> An unsuccessful Cossack uprising of 1637 led to a harsh ordinance of 1638, with a drastic decrease in the Cossack registry: the Polish authorities sought to disable the Cossacks as a united force.<sup>25</sup>

The Ukrainian historian Mykhailo Hrushevsky wrote at the turn of the twentieth century, “Khmelnysky's personal biography is as short on concrete verifiable facts as it is immeasurably long on the legends that enveloped him hard on the heels of his first appearance in the broad arena, making him the beloved hero of all kinds of tales and fictions, and later

of works of poetry and belles-lettres as well.”<sup>26</sup> For historians of Ukrainian nationhood like Hrushevsky, the stories of Khmelnytsky were at least as important to a national narrative as the facts of his life. Similarly, Russian, Jewish, and Polish histories have a prominent place for the myth of the hetman and relatively little to say about the hetman himself. Extant sources suggest that Khmelnytsky was born in 1595 to parents with Cossack roots, probably in addition to some noble roots.<sup>27</sup> He was most likely educated in a Jesuit academy (for lack of an Orthodox academy), studying poetics and rhetoric under Andrzej Humel Mokrski, and completing his schooling around 1620.<sup>28</sup> He was certainly highly literate in Latin and Polish, and it is possible that in addition to Slavic languages he spoke French.<sup>29</sup> Bohdan’s father was killed in 1620 in the Battle of Țuțora, and the Turks imprisoned Bohdan for two years. We know that soon after his release he took over his father’s estate and married Hanna Somkivna, the daughter of a Pereiaslav Cossack officer, in 1625. Over the next decade and a half, the couple had three daughters and two sons.

Khmelnytsky, who had served as a registered Cossack near his home in Chyhyryn, may well have participated in the uprisings of 1630 and 1637.<sup>30</sup> However, there could not have been concrete evidence of his involvement in the rebellions, since the Poles allowed him to become a captain (*sotnyk*) of the Chyhyryn Cossacks.<sup>31</sup> During this time, Khmelnytsky was engaged in diplomatic efforts, meeting with the French ambassador to Warsaw in 1644, and participating in a small Cossack delegation to King Władysław IV, who in 1646 sought Cossack support for a campaign against the Ottomans. Although the king did not carry out his war plans, he is believed to have promised to restore the Cossacks’ pre-1638 privileges.

Belletristic authors have made much of the so-called Czapliński (Czaplicki) affair, embellishing myths surrounding a family drama that took place in 1647. Daniel Czapliński, the Polish vice-*starosta* in Chyhyryn, was supposedly in competition with Khmelnytsky for a woman known as Helena. Not only did Czapliński succeed in wooing Helena, he appropriated Khmelnytsky’s family property in Subotiv and badly beat his son, possibly causing his death soon after. Khmelnytsky applied to the local court, the Polish Senate, and eventually to King Władysław himself, but he was unsuccessful at all steps of the Polish legal system. Moreover, the Chyhyryn *starosta* and great landowner Alexander Koniecpolski not only helped to block the Cossack’s appeals within the Polish legal system but



also had Khmelnytsky arrested on his return from Warsaw. Khmelnytsky managed to escape and fled to the Zaporozhian Sich, where he was later elected hetman. We must recall, as Magocsi puts it, that “it was not a personal quarrel over ‘Helena of the steppes,’ but the ever-present social, religious, and national tensions in seventeenth-century Ukraine” that led to the 1648 uprising.<sup>32</sup> Nonetheless, the local rivalry and family tragedy that the Czaplinski affair encompasses offered artists an intriguing synecdoche for the mounting tension between the Cossacks and the Polish authorities.

Khmelnytsky’s military success was a product of his skills as a negotiator and as a warrior.<sup>33</sup> In the early months of 1648, an alliance with the Crimean Tatars afforded Khmelnytsky decisive victories over the Polish Commonwealth, setting the stage for a peasant war and the large-scale Cossack uprising that began that summer. In the course of a few months, the Cossacks took control of the Kyiv and Chernihiv palatinates, as well as Pyliavtsi in Right Bank Ukraine, and Lviv and Zamość in the West. By November 1648 Jan Kazimierz, “a candidate acceptable to the Cossacks,” was elected to the Polish throne.<sup>34</sup> Thus the campaign resulted in unprecedented political as well as territorial advances for the Cossack hetman. The mass popular revolt ended with the Treaty of Zboriv in 1649. This agreement forced the Poles to recognize Khmelnytsky as the leader of the Zaporozhians, and it increased the number of registered Cossacks; it banished the Polish army, as well as the Jews, who were viewed as assistants to the Poles, from the Kyiv, Bratslav, and Chernihiv regions; and it increased the privileges of the Orthodox Church. Both sides, however, quickly prepared for continued war, this time leading to the Cossacks’ defeat at Berestechko and a new, less favorable treaty at Bila Tserkva.

The balance of powers in Europe shifted during Khmelnytsky’s hetmancy, and this had much to do with his relations with neighboring empires. The steppes of the lower Dnieper, home to the Zaporozhian Cossacks, bordered Orthodox Christian Muscovy to the North and East, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to the West and North, Transylvania and Moldavia to the Southwest, and to the South the Ottoman Empire, which included the Tatar Khanate on the Crimean Peninsula. Throughout the course of his hetmancy, Khmelnytsky engaged in negotiations with the many empires and states that lay claim to Cossack lands or offered hope of protection. Allegiances in the region changed constantly in the years just before and after the uprising.

The Khans ruled the Tatar-dominated Crimean Peninsula. This group had helped to convert many of the groups on the peninsula to Islam.<sup>35</sup> A warrior nation like the Cossacks, the Tatars provided soldiers for the Ottoman Empire for various campaigns in Europe and the Caucasus.<sup>36</sup> Initially, the Zaporozhians played a crucial role in protecting the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth against invasion by the Ottomans, and specifically against Tatar slave raids. However, in the uprising of 1648 the Cossacks were allied with the Crimean Khan Islam Giray III.<sup>37</sup> During the final years of his life, Khmelnytsky, longing for an expanded Cossack state and a weakened Catholic Poland, shifted his allegiances toward the Protestant world (including Sweden, Transylvania, and Protestants in Lithuania) and away from the Islamic Ottoman Empire and Crimean Khanate.<sup>38</sup>

Of the many rebellions of the seventeenth century, 1648 effected the greatest geopolitical change. (See Map I.2.) Khmelnytsky enjoyed rare success as a leader, successfully establishing a new order in the Ukrainian Hetmanate. His son's marriage to the Moldavian ruler's daughter is evidence that his contemporaries came to accept him to some degree as a ruler, albeit grudgingly. The greatest sign of his lasting influence is his establishment of a new social, political, and cultural order. To understand the importance of 1648 to Ukrainian history is to recall that the event led to establishment of a new Cossack state, the Zaporozhian Host, which was first recognized by Poland in 1649 at Zboriv.<sup>39</sup> The national importance of the event to Ukrainian self-determinacy thereafter is obscured within Russian historical narrative, which focuses on 1654, the year Khmelnytsky, as hetman of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, swore an oath to Muscovy, moving Tsar Aleksei closer to achieving a long-standing Muscovite goal of reuniting the Orthodox lands of the former Kyivan Rus'.<sup>40</sup> The Pereiaslav treaty was politically important enough to the Soviet Union that Khrushchev succeeded in formally ceding the Crimean Peninsula to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1954, the three-hundredth anniversary of Pereiaslav. However, Khmelnytsky lived until 1657, and the years between 1654 and his death saw continued development of the Cossack Hetmanate, and of Cossack diplomatic policy away from Muscovy. Subsequent hetmans were unable to match the success of 1648. The period from Khmelnytsky's death to 1686 came to be known as a time of ruin, witnessing, according to Paul Magocsi, "an almost complete breakdown of order."<sup>41</sup> The Cossack state, caught between Poland and Muscovy, was divided by competing spheres of influence.



MAP I.2. The Cossack Hetmanate ca. 1650. Map by Wendy Johnson of Johnson Cartographics (Edmonton, Alberta). Reprinted with permission from Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, Vol. 9, Bk. 1. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2008.

## The Literary Khmelnytsky: Twelve Case Studies

The present volume juxtaposes literary accounts of Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian, Polish, Russian, Yiddish, and Hebrew, in hopes of illustrating the creation of a historical hero or villain. Taken together, the literature produced in these languages, from the time of the Cossack uprisings of 1648–49 to the present day, illustrates how an individual can simultaneously be cast in utterly different (albeit equally monochromatic) shades. By examining competing mythologies surrounding Khmelnytsky, the authors of this study collectively question the political and aesthetic implications of imagining a Cossack past in the immediate aftermath of the campaign, during the Ukrainian cultural revival of the nineteenth century and Ukraine's twentieth-century struggle for independence from Russia. The twelve chapters included in this volume focus on contested memory and the emergence of cultural products. These products include national symbols, such as the Soviet "Order of Khmelnytsky" medal, as well as literary texts that focus debates around memory, nationality, and violence. The goal is to collectively examine the importance of the tales about a Cossack leader and the 1648 uprising to coexisting East European literatures. In addition to examining the function of the Cossack hero in four distinct cultural traditions (Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, and Russian), the case studies presented here develop a comparative approach to literary history that overcomes the limitations inherent in national myths and identity politics.

The inherently multidisciplinary nature of this topic requires an interdisciplinary approach. Although most studies of the Khmelnytsky uprising relate to one distinct community that it affected, this volume aims to highlight the problems with a monolithic approach to literary history. Collaboratively, we have attempted to nuance, on the one hand, the vision of Khmelnytsky as a hero or villain. Both these portrayals of the hetman are exaggerated. On the other hand, we have sought to show how Khmelnytsky has been viewed as a synecdoche specific to the Polish-Ukrainian-Russian borderlands. The chapters that follow explore how 1648 has offered the seeds of a founding myth for numerous nations sharing this region.

Responses to the Cossack uprisings have influenced, and been influenced by, the politics of history and memory. The literary case studies that make up this book are divided into four periods. The first section addresses the century following the Khmelnytsky uprising: across literary traditions we see a blending of literature and historiography. The second section focuses on representations of Khmelnytsky in Romantic literature. In the

third section, we deal with modernist images of Khmelnytsky, including as a polarizing force in national solidarity movements. The fourth and final section addresses the role of Khmelnytsky during the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. A broad view of the evolution of stories surrounding the uprising, from the seventeenth century to the present, offers insight not only into the changing myths surrounding Khmelnytsky but also into the competing and coexisting literary narratives from the contested territories that would become the modern Ukrainian state. It is worth briefly outlining key literary treatments of Khmelnytsky since 1648, which will provide context for the chapters that make up this volume.

The 1648 uprising yielded an immediate proliferation of Jewish chronicles, many of which can be considered works of literature in their own right. Although some of the chronicles produced in this early period were written as memoirs and others as histories, most of them came to serve a religious purpose: to commemorate the dead, “to pray for the forgiveness of sins . . . , to ask God for deliverance from exile and, often, to call for revenge on their enemies.”<sup>42</sup> Many commemorative Yiddish books about 1648 have been lost.<sup>43</sup> Those that have survived include a poem by Yoysef ben Eliezer Lipman of Postits’s *Kine al gzeyres hakehiles deKaK Ukrayne* (Dirge About the Calamity That Befell the Holy Community of Ukraine; Prague, 1648, and Amsterdam, c. 1649).<sup>44</sup> The poem laments the violence wrought on a Jewish community and compares the 1648 massacres to historical Jewish tragedies: “Just as Amalek, Krivonos has done” [*glaykh az amalek hot giton kriv'a noz*].<sup>45</sup> As Adam Teller states in Chapter One in this volume, in the Jewish chronicles from the immediate aftermath of 1648, Maksym Kryvonis (Russian and Yiddish: Krivonos), a Cossack leader under Khmelnytsky, is portrayed as the antagonist responsible for the most brutal attacks on Jews and Poles. Among the Hebrew chronicles published across Europe in the immediate aftermath of the uprising are Meir of Szczepreszyn’s *Tsok ha-‘itim* (Kraków, 1650), Gavriel Schussberg’s *Petaḥ teshuvah* (Amsterdam, 1651), Shabetai ha-Kohen’s chronicle in verse *Megilat ‘efah* (Scroll of Gloom; Amsterdam, 1651), Shmuel Feivel ben Natan of Vienna’s *Tit ha-yaven* (The Mire; Amsterdam, 1650), and Avraham ben Shmuel Ashkenazi’s *Tsar bat rabim* (Sorrows of the Many; Venice). The best known of these chronicles, Natan Neta Hanover’s Hebrew-language *Yeven metsulah* (The Abyss of Despair), was published in 1653 in Venice.<sup>46</sup> Adam Teller demonstrates that Hanover, a skilled storyteller, was exploring the factors that led the Cossack leader not only to rebel against the

Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but also to turn his anger on the Jews. As Teller shows, Hanover, by presenting us with a portrait of Khmelnytsky, albeit a multifaceted one, led later Jewish writers to attribute the massacres of 1648 directly to the hetman.

Texts in a variety of languages appeared soon after the Khmelnytsky campaign and would influence those writers who came after.<sup>47</sup> Ukrainian clerical histories that mention the uprising include the work of the Kyivan monk Feodosii Sofonovych from 1672–73.<sup>48</sup> Cossack chronicles from the late seventeenth century include Roman Rakushka-Romanovsky's *Eyewitness Chronicle* (written between 1672 and 1702), which focuses on “the Polish persecution of the Orthodox and oppression of the Cossacks” as well as on the injustices perpetuated by Jewish leaseholders and liquor merchants.<sup>49</sup> Key political actors of the period kept notes on the Cossack uprising and its aftermath.<sup>50</sup> Monastic chronicles were recorded in the Catholic cloisters in Lviv and elsewhere, many of them appearing in published form only in the nineteenth century.<sup>51</sup> In this period, the Dutch engraver and cartographer Willem Hondius created the first known portrait of Khmelnytsky. (See Fig. 1.2.) Hondius, who had left The Hague for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, was the royal engraver in the court of Władysław IV Vasa.<sup>52</sup> The most important literary work of the seventeenth century to deal with the uprising was Samuel Twardowski's 1681 epic poem *Wojna domowa* (Civil War), which served as a source text for later works. During the century following the uprising, a great number of texts appeared in Polish, Ukrainian, and Latin. Only in the nineteenth century did monographs begin to appear in Russian.<sup>53</sup> The geographical, professional, and national diversity of the authors of these early texts attests to the importance of the uprising across social strata and across Europe.

The turn of the eighteenth century saw the writing of a series of Ukrainian chronicles, which were eventually published in the nineteenth century. These include a largely fictionalized chronicle by Samiilo Velychko (1670–1728), and the chronicle kept by Hryhorii Hrabianka (1686–1737/8), which has been preserved in differing redactions and manuscripts.<sup>54</sup> Hrabianka's was the most widely disseminated of the chronicles in Ukraine and is the subject of Chapter Two. Frank Sysyn demonstrates that the work, though historically called a chronicle, is actually a narrative history with similarities to Baroque literature. Early twentieth-century scholars such as Ivan Franko and Mykola Zerov viewed Hrabianka's text as one of the first major prose works of modern Ukrainian literature. Sysyn examines the depiction



FIGURE I.2. Willem Hondius, Portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky (engraving; 1651)

of Khmelnytsky as a hero in the Hrabianka Chronicle. He also treats that image's impact on subsequent Ukrainian historiography and literature.

In his 1933 novel *Der Sotn in Goray*, the Yiddish novelist and Nobel laureate Isaac Bashevis Singer drew a direct connection between the destruction Khmelnytsky's Cossacks wrought on Jewish communities and the messianic Sabbatean movement that followed it, a movement that many view as equally catastrophic to, if not more than, the massacres under Khmelnytsky.<sup>55</sup> Singer's depiction of the Sabbateans is in keeping with early historiography of the movement, which presented the Khmelnytsky uprising as the main trigger for the mid-seventeenth-century mass messianic-kabbalistic movement of Shabetai Tsevi. In Chapter Three Ada Rapoport-Albert considers this historiographical tradition against Gershom Scholem's claim that events in Ukraine were too local and too distant from the birthplace of the Sabbatean movement to account for the remarkable receptivity to its gospel throughout the Jewish world. Rapoport-Albert reevaluates the contribution of the "Khmelnytsky factor" to our understanding of Sabbateanism. Among the links between Shabetai Tsevi and the events of 1648 is Shabetai Tsevi's third wife, Sarah, who was reputedly an orphaned refugee from one of the communities devastated by Khmelnytsky's troops.

The Khmelnytsky uprising had a strong effect on the literary and historical documents of the turn of the nineteenth century. At a moment when the rise of national consciousness was paramount, writers of different ethnic groups described the Khmelnytsky uprising with an eye to their own developing national literary traditions. In this period, kobzar guild members cultivated and popularized epic poems known as *dumy*. As Natalie Kononenko has shown, songs about the uprising led by Khmelnytsky make up one of the three central categories of *dumy* to appear in collections.<sup>56</sup> In Ukrainian literature the essential contemporary text that deals with Khmelnytsky is the *Istoriia rusov* (History of the Rus' People, written ca. 1800–1820s and published in 1846), which culminates in the "official" perspective of the Hetmanate, a perspective going back to the school drama *Mylost' Bozhiiia Ukrainu . . . svobodyvshaia* (God's Grace . . . which has freed Ukraine) of 1728, which, as George G. Grabowicz shows in Chapter Four, deifies Khmelnytsky.<sup>57</sup> Grabowicz offers a comparative approach to the major pre-Romantic and Romantic writers in Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish. As Grabowicz demonstrates, the trope of national leader or national symbol was applied more regularly to Khmelnytsky in this period,



as reflected in two Polish dramas titled “Bohdan Chmielnicki,” by Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz (1817) and by Tymon Zaborowski (1823), as well as in Decembrist writings, particularly those of F. Glinka and K. Ryleev. The historicist interest in Khmelnytsky that dominated in the early part of the century soon gave way to a poetics emphasizing the folk, the national cause, and the structures of mythical thought. Here Khmelnytsky becomes more marginal, if not entirely absent, from depictions of the Cossack Ukrainian past. Nikolai Gogol, for example, deals at length with Cossacks in his Ukrainian fiction but does not specifically write about Khmelnytsky. The great Ukrainian Romantic Taras Shevchenko portrays Khmelnytsky as a tragic figure who turned Ukraine over to the Tsar at Pereiaslav.

Taras Koznarsky, in Chapter Five, examines the stock repertory of heroic qualities assigned to Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian historical narratives of the first decades of the nineteenth century. Koznarsky argues that the cult of Khmelnytsky was crucial to the self-perception, mobilization, and self-promotion of the Ukrainian elites in the Russian empire. That is to say, it served to legitimize the Ukrainian historical narrative itself. Khmelnytsky functioned as an antidote to the stigma of Mazepa the traitor, an image ingrained in the self-perception of Ukrainian elites as well as in the Russian popular imagination. Koznarsky demonstrates the mirrorlike connection between Khmelnytsky the hero and Mazepa the villain at the level of the structure of their biographies, attributes, and agencies in Ukrainian historical narratives.

In Chapter Six, Roman Koropecykj focuses on Polish Romantic literature and its legacy, demonstrating that Khmelnytsky, who is an object of interest to such pre-Romantics as Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz and Tymon Zaborowski, also plays a role in Romantic historiography, as seen in the works of Joachim Lelewel. However, other Cossack legacies overshadow Khmelnytsky’s story. For almost all of the Polish Romantics writing about Ukraine and the Cossacks, the stories of Ivan Gonta and Maksym Zalizniak, two Cossack leaders of the 1768 Koliivshchyna rebellion against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, largely displace the events of a century earlier. Koropecykj explores possible reasons for the erasure, particularly in view of the literary revival of the figure of Khmelnytsky by the post-Romantic Henryk Sienkiewicz in his 1883–84 historical novel *Ogniem i mieczem* (With Fire and Sword).

Following the nation-building trends of the Romantic period, the late nineteenth century ushered in a reinvention and reassessment of na-

tional traditions. This is apparent in politics, historiography, and art. This period saw republication of historical texts about Khmelnytsky, including Solomon Mandel'kern's 1878 Russian translation of Hanover's *Yeven metsulah* in 1883 and a fourth edition of Nikolai Kostomarov's 1857 *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* in 1884, both of which influenced reappraisals of Jewish-Slavic relations. The pogroms of 1881–82 that followed the assassination of Alexander II played no small part in the concern, among Jewish writers, about the history of anti-Jewish violence in the same region. One Jewish-born modernist who revived Hanover's Hebrew account of the uprising was the Russian symbolist poet Nikolai Minskii (pseudonym for N. M. Vilenkin). In Chapter Seven, I examine Minskii's retelling of the massacre at Tul'chyn in his Russian-language play in verse, "Osada Tul'china" (The Siege of Tul'chyn), which appeared in the St. Petersburg Jewish literary journal *Voskhod* in 1888 (the same year Mikeshin's monument was unveiled in Kyiv's St. Sophia Square for the nine-hundred-year anniversary of the baptism of Rus'). Minskii emphasizes Jewish resistance to the Cossacks and creates a heroic Jewish figure, a Marrano named Josif de Kastro, who flouts Ashkenazi passivity to fight the Cossacks. Avrom Reisin translated this play into Yiddish in 1905. Many aspects of Minskii's version of the Tul'chyn episode would reappear in twentieth-century Jewish narratives about 1648, including Sholem Asch's 1919 *Kiddush ha-Shem*, which describes the uprising as a test of Jewish protagonists, revealing unexpected acts of bravery and heroism in the face of destruction.

Not all modern Jewish treatments of 1648 are lachrymose. In Chapter Eight, Israel Bartal addresses lesser-studied positive images of the Ukrainian struggle for independence as depicted in the writings of several Jewish radical Zionists at the beginning of the twentieth century. Positive images of Cossacks found their way to Palestine and had considerable influence on the emerging Israeli popular culture. The Cossack warrior served as a model for the "regeneration" of a "New Jew," claimed, for example, by members of Labor Zionism in Palestine. The Eastern European "other"—the horrifying enemy of the *shtetl* Jew, had transformed in the minds of some of the "Second Aliyah" pioneers (1904–1918) who settled in Palestine into an ideal example of heroism, simple rural life, and unlimited national commitment. Furthermore, they tended to apply some supposedly Cossack traits to the Middle Eastern Bedouin.

Of course, the Khmelnytsky episode played an important role in the consolidation of Ukrainian national identity in the early twentieth century.

In Chapter Nine, Myroslav Shkandrij examines portrayals of the Ukrainian leader in light of the nationalist discourse that developed in the 1930s and 1940s. The nationalist writer and publisher Dmytro Dontsov encouraged writers to portray historical heroic figures. Not everyone followed Dontsov's guidelines, as an examination of expatriate novels by Panas Fedenko, Yurii Lypa, and Semen Ordivsky indicates. In the later 1940s Yurii Kosach produced portrayals that were a critique of authoritarian nationalism. Shkandrij compares these depictions to those in Soviet Ukrainian fiction produced at this time, notably to the novels of Ivan Le and Iakiv Kachura.

The remythologization of Khmelnytsky in the twentieth century took a number of forms. In October 1943, the Soviet Army recognized the importance of Ukrainian Cossackdom as a constituent of the usable past by introducing the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. This was the only Soviet military order named after a non-Russian historical personality. The role of Khmelnytsky as a heroic unifier was further emphasized in the same year when the town of Pereiaslav, site of the 1654 Pereiaslav Treaty, was renamed Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky. In Chapter Ten, Gennady Estraiikh analyzes the reaction of Soviet and non-Soviet Jews to Khmelnytsky's elevated position in the official hierarchy of national heroes.

Since World War II, Ukrainians and Jews have sought to revisit the historical relationship between the two peoples. Twentieth-century Ukrainian writers and poets, including Natan Rybak, Pavlo Zahrebel'nyi, Lina Kostenko, and Vasyl Shevchuk, have sought to place the Ukrainian-Jewish encounter during the years of 1648–49 beyond the traditional narrative of Jewish victimization. In Chapter Eleven, Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern focuses on a semiforgotten two-volume novel, *Den' Hnivu* (The Day of Rage), which the Ukrainian novelist Yurii Kosach wrote in a displaced persons camp during World War II and published in 1947 in Germany. Kosach, nephew of the Ukrainian poet Lesia Ukrainka, creates a fictionalized version of the Khmelnytsky uprising. Kosach depicts Jews as people who understood the reasons for the *sviatyi hniv* (holy rage) of the rebels and found ways to help them. Forgotten by the Diaspora literati because he was believed to have cooperated with the Soviet Union, and by the Ukrainian critics because he was an émigré Diaspora writer, Kosach challenged the established Ukrainian and Jewish ethnocentric narratives of 1648–49.

In the final chapter of this volume, Izabela Kalinowska and Marta Kondratyuk discuss film portrayals originating within a number of na-

tional and political contexts. They examine the historical and cultural ramifications of Khmelnytsky as a character in Igor (Ihor) Savchenko's *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* (1941), Jerzy Hoffman's *With Fire and Sword* (1999), and Mykola Mashchenko's *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* (2007). Although in each work the particulars of the world around the hetman conform to the ideological circumstances of the film's making, Khmelnytsky emerges as a positive character in all of them. The chapter offers insight into how an enigmatic historical figure has retained a heroic image, not only for the Ukrainians and Russians but for Poles as well.

The period since Ukrainian independence has cast Khmelnytsky as a needed national symbol. As Frank Sysyn has shown elsewhere, "The Soviet icon of 'Reunification' has been replaced with the statist school's image of statesman and national hero."<sup>58</sup> As the following chapters show, a heavily mythologized figure like Khmelnytsky can imply either a national or an internationalist narrative. At first glance, Khmelnytsky's appearance in the different literary traditions presented here highlights the irreconcilability of diverse cultures sharing a single territory. Closer examination of these representations exposes the interconnected nature of unique cultural narratives.



# **Part I**

## **The Literary Aftermath of 1648**



# 1

## A Portrait in Ambivalence

### The Case of Natan Hanover and His Chronicle, *Yeven metsulah*

*Adam Teller*

IN 1994, YO'EL RABA, a Polish-born Israeli scholar, wrote a comprehensive survey of the historiography surrounding the Jews' fate during the Khmelnytsky uprising, which he called *Between Remembrance and Denial*.<sup>1</sup> Though written in the State of Israel at the end of the twentieth century, this work of monumental scholarship was firmly in a Jewish historiographical tradition whose roots go back at least to the Middle Ages, because it focused very narrowly on issues of Jewish martyrology.<sup>2</sup> Raba's goal was to see how the fate of the Jews massacred in the uprising was reflected in historical depictions of the events from the seventeenth century to the twentieth. His analysis was given a clearly twentieth-century aspect by his decision to use a nationalist framework to analyze his sources: these were largely divided into Jewish, Polish, or Ukrainian writings, setting up not just comparisons but confrontations between the three.

In fact, Raba framed his whole work around the question of Holocaust denial—dedicating the book “To the memory of the victims of the Holocaust which is denied while the survivors are still alive.” In this highly emotive context, what Raba saw as the downplaying of Jewish suffering in writings on the seventeenth century became subsumed in the category of Holocaust denial.

Though contemporary reviews were quick to critique Raba's work for this, new approaches to understanding the events were neither suggested nor developed.<sup>3</sup> It is my goal here to reconsider how the Jews' part in the uprising—and particularly their attitude toward it—developed. In order to do this, I shall look beyond the vivid descriptions of death and destruction



in the Jewish historical chronicles composed in the 1650s to the portrayal of Ukrainians, Cossacks, and particularly Bohdan Khmelnytsky himself.

Five short Hebrew chronicles and one “historical song” in Yiddish were published in these years. One other remained in manuscript, to be published only at the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>4</sup> For the most part, these were extremely short texts, focusing almost entirely on the sufferings of the Jews and paying little or no attention to the broader historical context in which they occurred. Two of them—*Tsok ha-‘itim* by Meir of Szczepreszyn and *Petaḥ teshuvah* by Gavriel Schussberg of Rzeszów—contained a certain degree of detail that could shed some light on the larger picture.<sup>5</sup> Only one, however, *Yeven metsulah* by Natan Neta Hanover of Zasław, paid significant attention to the developments in the non-Jewish world that led up to the outbreak of the uprising and shaped its course. I shall, therefore, focus most of my discussion on this text.<sup>6</sup>

Hanover, the author, who fled his hometown in the face of the Cossack assault of summer 1648, joined the stream of Jewish refugees spreading across Europe, passing through the Holy Roman Empire and Amsterdam, and ending up in Italy in 1652. He eventually reached Venice, where he published his chronicle. He was a talented writer, having previously made his living as a preacher, and he put his literary skills to excellent use in his historical chronicle. After completing the text, Hanover seems to have received rabbinical ordination in Italy, since he took up the post of rabbi first in Jassy in 1660, and subsequently in Ungarisch Brod, where he was killed during the Ottoman push to Vienna in 1683.<sup>7</sup>

*Yeven metsulah* is written in limpid Hebrew prose, eschewing the flowery language beloved of the rabbinic authors of his generation. Though the book quotes from the classical sources of Jewish culture to add depth to its narrative, it refers much more to the Bible, well known from the weekly synagogue readings, than to the complex Talmudic text. As a result, though uneducated Jews who did not know any Hebrew would not have been able to read *Yeven metsulah*, it was not necessary to be a full-blown Talmudic scholar in order to understand it. This undoubtedly led to its popularity with a relatively wide audience and to as many as four editions before 1800.<sup>8</sup>

Hanover’s skill as a writer meant that his prose was of such deceptive simplicity that many generations of historians have taken it as a wholly credible firsthand testimony of events.<sup>9</sup> It is only recently that more critical readings have begun to reveal the levels of artifice in the text, and the literary means he employed to get his messages across.<sup>10</sup>

The book itself is quite short. After an author's foreword, the text is divided into three sections. It opens with an historical introduction, which discusses the political, religious, economic, and military background to the events, starting from the accession of Zygmunt III in 1593. The body of the book focuses largely on the massacres of the Jews in various towns. Structured episodically, descriptions of the strategic and political maneuvering of the Polish and Ukrainian camps are used to connect the various sections, providing some explanation of how the events unfolded. The third and final section of the text consists of an encomium to the Polish-Jewish society supposedly destroyed in the uprising.

This tripartite structure, as well as the wealth of detail—particularly of events in the non-Jewish world—marked Hanover's text out from the chronicles that preceded it. The extent to which Hanover had read the Jewish texts published before his own is not entirely clear. He had certainly read *Tsok ha- 'itim*, for he lifted phrases and even sections directly from it.<sup>11</sup> As far as the other works go, it is simply impossible to tell. However, even a cursory comparison reveals that Hanover's was a highly original work, written in its own way and taking an independent line in describing and explaining events.

This is abundantly clear even in the foreword he appended to his text. In it, he claimed that the events of the uprising had been foreseen by no less a prophet than King David, who had written a series of allusions to them into the book of Psalms. He did so with numerology: by substituting a number for each letter of the verses he quoted, Hanover could add them up and then show how other phrases directly linked to the uprising had letters that made the same arithmetical total. Although his math was often quite shaky, many of the phrases he used featured the name of Khmelnytsky quite prominently. For example, he showed that the verse "I am sunk in the deep mire" (Psalms 69:3) had the same value as the phrase "Khmel and the Tatars joined together with the Orthodox Christians." Thus, in Hanover's presentation, Khmelnytsky was playing a crucial—and Divinely ordained—role in the events. Of course, this did not endear Khmelnytsky to Hanover, who heaped traditional Jewish invective on him, calling him "the oppressor Khmel, may his name be blotted out, [and] may God send a curse upon him."<sup>12</sup>

One remarkable thing about this portrayal is that Hanover's was the only published text to give Khmelnytsky such a central role. Most of the others mentioned him, but it was generally only in passing as hetman of

the Cossack forces, often without invective. In fact, the popular chronicle *Megilat 'efah* did not mention Khmelnytsky at all!<sup>13</sup> Thus, the fact that in the Jewish communal memory Khmelnytsky came to be identified not just as the leader of the Cossacks but as an archetypal and murderous enemy of the Jews should be seen as a direct result of Hanover's writing.<sup>14</sup>

This being so, it might have been expected that Hanover would present Khmelnytsky and the Ukrainians in an unsympathetic light throughout his chronicle. Such was not the case. Though hostile, Hanover's portrayal was multifaceted, and in one or two places even ambivalent, suggesting a much more complex attitude toward the man and especially his cause.

This can be seen in the historical introduction to the book. There, Hanover explained the motivations of both the Cossacks and the Ukrainian masses in joining the uprising. In this discussion, the Jews, though they appeared, were not central. Hanover identified three major causes of the unrest: the Counter-Reformation policy of Zygmunt III<sup>15</sup> and his successors, which discriminated against the Orthodox Church in Ukraine; the economic exploitation of the peasants as part of the Polish colonization of the region; and the Cossacks' struggle to improve their status and conditions of service. His descriptions emphasized the degradation caused to the Ukrainian peasants: "the Orthodox people became gradually impoverished. They were looked upon as lowly and inferior beings and became the slaves and the handmaids of the Polish people and of the Jews."<sup>16</sup>

His descriptions of an earlier rebellion might even be said to have evinced a measure of sympathy for the Ukrainians: "there arose an Orthodox priest, named Nalevaiko, to avenge the cruel treatment accorded his people, whom he exhorted in the following words, 'How long will you keep silent at the cruelties perpetrated by the Polish people?'"<sup>17</sup> Another rebel, Pavluk, whose 1637 uprising was the first to target Jews, was also described as avenging the wrong done to his people.<sup>18</sup> For Hanover, then, these rebellions were, in fact, responses to genuine wrongs inflicted on the Ukrainian population. He understood the complexity of these events and was not willing to ignore it even when Jews had been attacked.

On the issue of economic exploitation too, which formed a major part of the Jews' income in Ukraine, Hanover's attitude toward the peasants was quite sympathetic. He described their situation, using a verse from Exodus (1:14): "Their lives [i.e., those of the Ukrainian peasants] were made bitter by hard labor, in mortar and bricks, and in all manner of services in the house and the fields." He continued: "So wretched and lowly

had they become that all classes of people, even the lowliest among them [i.e., the Jews.—A.T.], became their overlords.”<sup>19</sup> In this short section, Hanover displayed a highly relativist stance, which allowed him to identify with the suffering Ukrainians and speak, as it were, in their voice as they described the Jews as “the lowliest of people.” It was a highly unusual tactic in premodern Jewish writing, enabling him to give voice to the religious humiliation felt by the Orthodox in the face of Jewish empowerment during the Polish colonization of Ukraine. Beyond this, however, it actually recast relations between the Jews and their neighbors in a new light: in this reading, the Ukrainian peasants had become the suffering Children of Israel and the Jews the cruel Egyptians!

Hanover was not the only one to notice this reversal. Joel Sirkes, the leading rabbinical authority of the previous generation, who had served as rabbi in a number of Ukrainian communities before taking on the prestigious Kraków rabbinate, wrote, “Cries of oppression are emanating from gentiles in most areas, that the Jews are lording it over them and controlling them like kings and noblemen.”<sup>20</sup> Sirkes’s teacher, Rabbi Feyvish of Kraków, also expressed himself on this point. Criticizing the Jewish *arendarze* who leased entire noble estates, and kept them at work on the Sabbath day, he wrote: “when the Jews were enslaved in Egypt, they took care not to work on the Sabbath. How much the more so now when *we are not the slaves but the masters*, should we take care to keep the Sabbath day holy.”<sup>21</sup> Once again, the rabbi was describing the reversal of the Egyptian slavery: the Jews had become the Egyptian masters, the Ukrainian peasants the Israelite slaves.

These texts seem to show that Jewish leaders were aware that the Jews’ role in settling the Ukraine on behalf of the Polish Crown had brought them great power, which was arousing serious antagonisms among the Ukrainian peasantry. More than that, however, the texts that cast the Ukrainians as the Children of Israel being ruled over by the Egyptians/Jews might seem to have been expressing some identification or sympathy with the peasants’ plight. It seems reasonable, therefore, to suggest that among the Jews of mid-seventeenth-century Ukraine there were those who did not view their participation in the colonization as a wholly positive thing, and who identified with the plight of the local population.

Hanover himself seems to have suggested such a possibility in the next section of his chronicle. Before he plunged into the bloody descriptions of the Jewish massacres, he gave his own take on the background

to Khmelnytsky's decision to embark on the uprising. He did so by telling the complex story of the future hetman's relations with the magnate Koniecpolski family, which owned the estates on which he lived. Though it did not agree in every detail with the picture arising from other sources, Hanover's story certainly had much in common with them. It described Khmelnytsky's difficult relations with the aged Stanisław Koniecpolski and their continuation with his son, Aleksander, and his wife Joanna Barbara Zamoyska. Khmelnytsky's betrayal of the Koniecpolski campaign against the Tatars was described, as was the subsequent confiscation of Khmelnytsky's property, his imprisonment, pardon, and finally flight.<sup>22</sup>

There was, however, one way in which Hanover's story departed dramatically from all the other sources: the roles that he ascribed to Jewish actors were unique to his narrative. Hanover mentioned two Jews who were instrumental in the events. The first was Zechariah Sobilenki, who worked in the Koniecpolski administration as the *arendarz* (and so governor) of Khmelnytsky's hometown of Chyhyryn. When Zechariah heard Khmelnytsky boast of his betrayal of Koniecpolski's Tatar campaign, he informed his noble lord, who had the Cossack imprisoned. The second Jewish figure was called Jacob Sobilenki, the same surname as the first.<sup>23</sup> Jacob was one of Khmelnytsky's confidants and helped him secure his release from prison by accusing the first Sobilenki of lying. Once free, Khmelnytsky fled to the Cossack homeland of Zaporozhia, where, in Hanover's narrative, he soon became hetman of the Cossack forces and embarked on the uprising.<sup>24</sup>

At first glance, the point of this story is quite unclear: apart from giving Jews a role in events, it did not really explain Khmelnytsky's hostility toward them, since after all, though he was betrayed by one Jew, he was saved by another. The issue of the name is also intriguing: Sobilenki was by no means a common Jewish name. Why would both characters have had the same, rather strange name? Though there will probably never be a satisfactory explanation for this, one point does seem to be clear. One of the Sobilenkis in the story had an obvious pro-Polish orientation as a faithful servant of the Koniecpolski family, while the other had a pro-Ukrainian orientation, helping Khmelnytsky evade the harsh fate that the Polish magnate had in store for him. This story, then, seems to tell the reader that in the period leading up to the uprising, some Ukrainian Jews supported the Polish colonizers while others sympathized with Khmelnytsky and the Ukrainian cause.

Within a short time, of course, the Jews' sufferings at the hands of the Cossacks—and particularly the Ukrainian masses—put an end to

those sympathetic voices. In the text, Hanover explained this with a story. Once he had become hetman, Khmelnytsky “sent secret messages to all the provinces, and to every place where groups of the Ukrainian people lived to be prepared for the appointed time, to gather together and stand for their lives; to destroy, slay, and kill all the Jews, and all the Polish army which would attack them.” The conspiracy could not be kept secret, however, because “When this became known to the Jews through their friendly Ukrainian neighbors, and also through their own spies . . . they notified their lords, the nobles . . . who befriended the Jews exceedingly and became united with them in one band.”<sup>25</sup>

This version of events, as retold by Hanover, finds support in a non-Jewish source, the chronicle of Samuel Grądzki, a Polish chronicler, who seems to have written his text in the 1670s (though it was only published more than a century later): “On his return from the Tatars,<sup>26</sup> however, Khmelnytsky did not cease doing what had to be done [acting] prudently and completely silently. However, on the basis of what others did, those Jews trusted by the Cossacks, as well as others of them, [who were their] enemies . . . soon began to report back to the terrestrial nobles, from whom they obtained almost all the taverns by means of *arenda*.”<sup>27</sup> Here, Grądzki notes not only the divided Jewish opinion toward the Cossacks (some were confidants, others enemies) but also the fact that as the preparations for the uprising began to gather steam, the Jews felt that they had to throw in their lot with the ruling Polish regime, which provided their livelihood.<sup>28</sup>

The Jews in Ukraine did not back away from this decision, despite the terrible disasters of the early Polish campaign and the many treacheries the Jewish communities suffered at the hands of the *szlachta*. In discussing the massacre at Tul’chyn, many of the Jewish chronicles related how the Jews there debated taking vengeance on the Polish nobles who had betrayed them to the Ukrainians, but rejected the idea for fear that it would destroy their positive relations with the king and nobility.<sup>29</sup> This enhanced pro-Polish attitude was expressed in Hanover’s text, in other ways, too: the ambiguous portrayals of the early sections give way to an openly hostile depiction of Khmelnytsky as the man responsible for the mass murder of the Jews.<sup>30</sup>

In fact, Hanover’s is the only Jewish chronicle to give a portrait of Khmelnytsky. As we have seen, it viewed him as the major architect of the Jewish massacres. External sources do not really bear out this view. Though Jewish economic activity was often mentioned among the

Cossack grievances in documents written by Khmelnytsky, it was rarely prominent.<sup>31</sup> It seems really only to have been when the Cossack military uprising turned into a broad popular rebellion that the peasants' economic grievances and religious hatred led to widespread anti-Jewish violence. This was recognized by all the other Jewish chronicles, which reserved their greatest vituperation for the Orthodox masses.<sup>32</sup> Hanover alone preferred to point the finger directly at the Cossack hetman as the man responsible for all the bloodshed.

The best descriptions of Khmelnytsky in Hanover's text can be found in the places that discussed his interactions in non-Jewish society. He was portrayed as a wealthy man of noble descent, an officer in the Cossack army, who had his own estate on which he farmed cattle.<sup>33</sup> Like some of the Polish chroniclers, Hanover characterized Khmelnytsky as a soft-spoken man, whose gentle tones belied his sly and treacherous nature. He associated this characteristic with the Ukrainian population in general, calling Khmelnytsky "a man plotting iniquity, in the manner of all Ukrainians, who at first appear to the Jews as friends . . . beguiling them with soft and kind speech, while they lie with their words and are deceitful and untrustworthy."<sup>34</sup>

Hanover's portrait of his antihero shows him as a charismatic leader and fiery orator. Khmelnytsky emerges as a man of excellent political skills and remarkable diplomatic abilities.<sup>35</sup> The text makes great play of the Cossack leader's antagonistic relations with the Polish nobility, though the *Koniecpolskis* are shown treating Khmelnytsky with a high-handed aggression, not really called for by his behavior.

The hetman's attitude toward the king, on the other hand, is shown in quite a different light. Hanover devotes space to describing Khmelnytsky's intervention in the royal election of late 1648 on behalf of Jan Kazimierz,<sup>36</sup> which he portrays as decisive. The newly crowned king's request for an immediate ceasefire evinces, in Hanover's words, this reaction: "when the King's letter advising him to return home reached him, he welcomed . . . [it] with joy and immediately returned home."<sup>37</sup> Moreover, according to Hanover, the only reason that Khmelnytsky renewed his campaign in the spring of 1649 was his understanding that Jan Kazimierz himself had broken the ceasefire.<sup>38</sup> Duplicitous Khmelnytsky might be in Hanover's portrayal, but he is also shown as remaining faithful to his lord, the king.

Hanover's descriptions of Khmelnytsky have much in common with those found in the non-Jewish chronicles. This raises the question as to their basis. Like most Jewish authors of the period, Hanover did not cite

his sources to any great extent. The only book he mentioned was the Jewish historical chronicle *Zemah David*, published some fifty years earlier.<sup>39</sup> It is clear that he had read the contemporary chronicle, *Tsok ha-‘itim*, though he did not quote it directly.<sup>40</sup> He cast only one section of his narrative—the story of the flight from Zasław—as a first-person eyewitness account, suggesting that this was the only event in which he himself had participated.<sup>41</sup> In retelling the massacre of Narol, he noted revealingly: “A woman who survived told me that several hundred women and children, and a few men survived the carnage. They had no food for five days and ate human flesh.”<sup>42</sup> One can probably assume that most of the stories of Jewish experiences during the uprising he had heard from survivors too, either while still in Ukraine or from other refugees he had met during his wanderings.

This does not, however, explain the sources of his extremely detailed, and often surprisingly accurate, knowledge of events in the non-Jewish world. It is unlikely that he had read the only Polish chronicle of events that appeared before his own, Jan Pastorius’s *Bellum Scythico-Cossacicum*.<sup>43</sup> Written in Latin, Pastorius’s book was published in Gdańsk in 1652, a time when Hanover was already outside Poland.<sup>44</sup> That being so, a more likely source of information for a Ukrainian Jew, such as Hanover, would have been personal contacts with non-Jews, both Poles and Ukrainians.

In his account of his own experiences during the uprising, Hanover described how news of events, including army movements and strategies, were common knowledge among the Jews, who decided on this basis whether to remain in town or to flee. Though the narrative told of information arriving with Jewish messengers or as unattributed rumors, on one occasion it quoted verbatim (in Hebrew translation) the words of a Polish official, Wiszowaty, governor of Polonne.<sup>45</sup> Once again, what is important is not the historicity of this specific event, but the picture that Hanover painted. It was of a Jewish community very well informed by its Polish neighbors of events and interested in learning about each new development—presumably because their very lives might depend on it.

Hanover has also left us at least a hint of his connections with Cossacks. In his introduction to his first book, the sermon *Ta‘ame sukkah*, published in Amsterdam in 1652, he bemoaned the poverty of his education. He had not been able to study, he wrote:

due to the great disturbances in our country at that time, terrible disasters, evil tidings, forced conversions, and strange deaths . . . and we had to spend our money like water [lit. stones] on public expenses, and whatever remained our enemies and besiegers the



Tatars and the Orthodox would steal from us. We even hired some of them [i.e., the Cossacks] as mercenaries to protect us. Day and night they would man the walls and guard the gates, until we had no money left to protect ourselves from our enemies.<sup>46</sup>

This suggests that Hanover's community of Zaslav had direct contact with Cossack forces from whom Hanover might have learned a great deal about events in the Ukrainian camp, either in direct conversation or in reports by other Jews who had spoken to them.<sup>47</sup>

Thus it would seem that Hanover's retelling of events in the non-Jewish world was based on the stories told on the non-Jewish street, which he heard directly or through intermediaries. This is an excellent indication of just how much interested Jewish observers could learn about non-Jewish society if they wanted (or needed) to. That being said, perhaps the most remarkable thing about Hanover was not that he was able to amass all the information about the Polish and Ukrainian aspects of the uprising but that he felt it important enough to write down and publish. This seems to have bespoken an almost unique sense on his part that the Jews' place in the world was dependent on non-Jewish society almost as much as it was on their covenant with God.<sup>48</sup>

Hanover's use of the non-Jewish accounts to explain the background to the uprising might also be the key to understanding why the figure of Khmelnytsky became so important for his narrative. Most Jewish observers correctly understood that it was the Ukrainian masses that were perpetrating the worst of the atrocities on them. Since they saw God as the ultimate author of their fate, they did not look beyond that immediate perception in search of other causes for what had happened. Hanover, on the other hand, seems to have been influenced by the views of both Poles and Ukrainians, who quite rightly attributed to the hetman a role of key importance in the outbreak of the uprising as a whole and the subsequent course of events.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, in *Yeven metsulah*, Khmelnytsky was portrayed not just as responsible for the uprising but also as bearing the ultimate responsibility for the attacks on the Jews. In fact, in the foreword to the book, Hanover neatly combined both views—the one attributing the massacres to Divine providence, the other ascribing to Khmelnytsky responsibility for the Jews' fate. As we have seen, he showed that the biblical prophecies of the massacres not only mentioned Khmelnytsky but even named him as the chief author of events.

In this chapter, I have tried to read Natan Hanover's chronicle, *Yeven metsulah*, as a work of literature. The author was not simply retelling stories that he had heard but reworking them to create his own historical narrative. Thus, I have not asked whether this or that story can be shown actually to have happened. In most cases, this is impossible to determine. Instead, I have tried to grasp the underlying reality that Hanover was trying to show to his readers through his use of literary artifice. In many cases, this rather broader picture can be backed up, to some extent at least, with other sources.

I have also moved the focus away from the atrocity stories, which are at the heart of this (and all the other Jewish) chronicles, to examine how Hanover portrayed the non-Jewish protagonists in the events. In doing so, I have moved to center-stage elements that he perceived as simply background to the Jews' suffering, and marginalized the descriptions of the massacres, which were clearly central to the book. I could do this because, unlike the other Jewish chroniclers, Hanover viewed this non-Jewish context as critical for understanding events and so described it in detail.

The questions I have asked have been concerned with Hanover's portrayal of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the Cossacks, and the Ukrainians. *Yeven metsulah's* description of the uprising's causes reveals some complex and ambivalent attitudes. Though the Jews of the Commonwealth had benefited from the Polish colonization of Ukraine and enjoyed good relations with the nobility, the text seems to suggest that there were some dissenting voices. These expressed concerns with consequences of the Jews' involvement in the exploitative regime and were even willing to identify with the peasants' suffering. In the period immediately preceding the outbreak of violence, Hanover hints that some Ukrainian Jews may even have felt some sympathy for Khmelnytsky himself in his struggles with the Konicpolskis.

Hanover's portrait of Khmelnytsky the man also exhibits some surprisingly ambivalent features. Though he is consistently described as duplicitous, his basic loyalty to king and Commonwealth are not put in question. Even in his initial dealings with the Polish nobility, Khmelnytsky is not shown as initiating trouble, just responding to aggression. It is only once the uprising and the Jewish massacres get under way that he is described in wholly negative and vituperative terms.

In ascribing the ultimate responsibility for the massacres of the Jews to Khmelnytsky, Hanover was taking a highly individual stance. The other Jewish chronicles did not give the hetman such a central role, nor devote

so much space to him. They most often mentioned him in his capacity as military leader rather than as oppressor of the Jews. Were it not for Hanover's scathing portrait, Khmelnytsky might not have been given the infamous place in Jewish communal memory that he now holds. This means, of course, that research into the massacres must move beyond the common perception of Khmelnytsky's demonic role to a more sober analysis of events.<sup>50</sup>

The sources for Hanover's descriptions of the hetman would seem to have come from oral reports he received from Poles and Cossacks, in direct conversation or through some intermediary. Unlike Jewish society, which saw God as the ultimate cause of their misfortunes, both Polish and Ukrainian society viewed Khmelnytsky as the immediate author of events. Hanover seems to have been deeply influenced by this view and so ascribed to the hetman the ultimate responsibility for all the events, including the attacks on the Jews. This led him to a highly negative view of Khmelnytsky, a stance that he shared with his Polish interlocutors.

Hanover was too good a writer to allow this hostile approach totally to overshadow his earlier ambivalence. Both are allowed to exist together in the text, creating a deep and multifaceted narrative. In the same way, Hanover seamlessly integrated some Polish and Ukrainian perspectives on events into the essentially Jewish tale he had to tell. This complex weaving together in his text of Jewish, Polish, and Ukrainian narratives (including the highly negative Polish view of Khmelnytsky) also shows that a simple reading of premodern historiography along national or ethnic lines—Jewish, Polish, and Ukrainian—is not really sufficient. These were not always separate categories, and the connections between them need to be examined.<sup>51</sup> It was, perhaps, only in the modern period that the historiographical boundaries between the groups may have solidified.<sup>52</sup> In this context, the enormous popularity of *Yeven metsulah* in modern Jewish culture—it enjoyed dozens of reprints and translations into Yiddish and many European languages—together with further waves of pogroms in Ukraine led to the general acceptance of its highly negative portrait of Khmelnytsky and the Ukrainians generally.

It would take some 250 years before another Jewish author, Sholem Asch, in his Yiddish novel *Kiddush ha-Shem*, would break out of the simplistic anti-Ukrainian reading of *Yeven metsulah*.<sup>53</sup> Asch was perhaps the first modern Jewish author to bring to the attention of the reading public the remarkable ambiguities and nuances to be found in a close reading

of Hanover's portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and his uprising. Sadly, though, *Kiddush ha-Shem* proved too late to effect any serious change in how Jews remembered the events of 1648, because the Holocaust of the 1940s irretrievably changed the shape of Jewish communal memory. Thus, Bohdan Khmelnytsky remains today, in the Jewish popular imagination at least, just a Jew-hating mass murderer. It is not at all clear that Natan Neta Hanover would have accepted such a simplistic view of him.

## 2

### “A Man Worthy of the Name Hetman”

#### The Fashioning of Khmelnytsky as a Hero in the Hrabianka Chronicle

*Frank E. Sysyn*

**IN COMPLETING HIS WORK** of more than two thousand pages on the Khmelnytsky period in the late 1920s, Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, the foremost historian of Ukraine and a noted scholar of Ukrainian literature, turned to the topic of Khmelnytsky as a/the hero of Ukrainian history.<sup>1</sup> He had wrestled with this topic for more than thirty years and had shifted in his evaluations of the hetman.<sup>2</sup> In his last and harshest characterization of Khmelnytsky, largely a response to Viacheslav Lypynsky's glorification of the hetman as a leader and statesman, he grudgingly admitted: “Notwithstanding, he remains not only a central figure, a representative of the most important epoch in the life of our nation [people] and the greatest revolution that it has experienced, but also a great leader and the principal actor in that revolution; truly great by virtue of his individual abilities and opportunities.”<sup>3</sup> But in concluding his largely negative assessment of the leader and the period, he explained that he dedicated his work to the creative suffering of the Ukrainian masses and not to “Bohdan the hero and his company.”<sup>4</sup>

When Hrushevs'kyi discussed the creation of the Ukrainian image of the hetman and the period, he saw its formative phase as occurring among the Cossack officer elite and chancelleries of the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Hetmanate. He viewed the eighteenth-century philosopher Hryhorii Skovoroda's characterization of “father of liberty, Bohdan the hero” as emblematic. Hrushevs'kyi summarized this traditional vision in this manner: “The struggle of the whole people, led by Bohdan, the finest son of the Ukrainian nation and the best representative of this national character of Cossackdom, a hero of the whole nation and liberator of Ukraine who

devoted his entire life to the task of liberation and accomplished it in one way or another, constitutes the traditional conception of the Cossack officer stratum, which was taken over by the Ukrainian intelligentsia."<sup>5</sup>

Hrushevs'kyi critiqued the "old Ukrainian tradition," found most explicitly in eighteenth-century history writings, and continued the work of nineteenth-century historians who questioned the reliability of the "Cossack chronicles" or histories as sources on the mid-seventeenth century. He also called for a reevaluation of these works as products of the culture of the Cossack chancellery of the Hetmanate and statements of their political and social vision and goals.<sup>6</sup> His call came in 1934 just as Ukrainian historical work in the Soviet Union was being destroyed under the Stalinist onslaught. Despite attempts to resume this work in the late 1960s, it could begin in earnest only in the late 1980s and has not been carried on extensively, in part because of the lack of adequate editions of eighteenth-century historical works. Over time, a devaluation of the Cossack chronicles as historical sources and their increasing use as statements of political culture have occurred. At the same time, greater attention has been paid to the form of the chronicles and to their role as texts and conveys of Ukrainian literature.

Ukrainian (Ruthenian) history writing revived in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries largely to deal with church affairs and the Christianization of Rus'.<sup>7</sup> It depended on Polish humanist and Renaissance historiography, and as the model of Latin and Jesuit schools triumphed approached history through the writings of Cicero and Livy and poetry through Virgil. Written by Orthodox clerics, it initially cleaved to the chronicle style found in the Old Rus' chronicles. At the same time local chronicles came to reflect dramatic events of the recent past. Even though Ukrainian or Slavonic-language writing was not needed by an elite that knew Polish and Latin, conservatism in defining a Ruthenian tradition explains the retention of native forms that were often only externally archaic. The one published history in the seventeenth century, the *Synopsis*, with its Greek title and dating from the creation of the world, may be seen as an example of ostensible archaism. It is, however, a work deeply influenced by Polish Renaissance historiography. The Khmelnytsky revolt and the formation of a new elite and educational models shifted this subject and form of Ukrainian historiography. The dramatic events of the midcentury and the political changes in midcentury Ukraine called out for recording. If the *Synopsis*, dedicated to the Russian tsar and published by the Caves monastery, provided little informa-

tion, the vernacular language work by Teodosii Sofonovych of St. Michael's monastery dealt more with Cossack Ukraine and the person of the hetman, albeit laconically. The late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century *Eyewitness Chronicle* was specifically written to describe the war, beginning in 1648 and incorporating contemporary accounts and the author's experience to produce the only Cossack chronicle that seems useful as a primary source for the data provided for the mid-seventeenth century. It is most usually attributed to Roman Rakushka, who began his life as a Cossack officer and ended it as an Orthodox priest. He symbolizes the emergence of a highly educated Cossack elite in the Hetmanate that both consumed and produced literary works. Yet it was only in the eighteenth century in the so-called Cossack chronicles and in the early nineteenth century *Istoriia rusov* (History of the Rus' People), stylized as a Cossack chronicle, that one finds a fully developed cult of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in historical works.<sup>8</sup>

The exceptional importance of the Cossack chronicles and the later *History of the Rus' People* in discussions of Ukrainian history, political thought, and literature can be only partially explained by the tremendous impact their publication in the nineteenth century had on Ukrainian intellectuals, as expressions of what was presumed to be an authentic contemporary Ukrainian voice.<sup>9</sup> It should also be noted that ostensible archaisms in the form of the manuscript chronicles merely increased the resonance of that voice. Their role was magnified by the destruction of most of the archives and manuscript culture of the second half of the seventeenth century in the Cossack Hetmanate and the limited and largely religious nature of Ukrainian publishing of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Already during his lifetime, Bohdan Khmelnytsky presented an enigma for his contemporaries, and rumors abounded about his actions and motives.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, Natan Hanover's *Abyss of Despair* presents one of the earliest rumor-legends of what drove Khmelnytsky to revolt and how he engineered his uprising in a way quite similar to that which later appeared in the *Eyewitness Chronicle*. Tales about the hetman soon passed into literature and accounts of the revolt by Polish and European eyewitnesses and authors in Latin, Polish, Italian, French, and other languages.<sup>11</sup> Lines between contemporary history and belles lettres were easily crossed in the seventeenth century. Wespazjan Kochowski, the Polish court historian who wrote about the uprising, was known for his poetry as well as for his subjective appraisal of events. Samuel Twardowski, who was called the Polish Virgil, wrote an epic poem on the uprising that served as a

historical source for historians and writers down to Henryk Sienkiewicz.<sup>12</sup> The Venetian litterateur Maiolino Bissaccioni wrote a collection on the revolts of the seventeenth century in which the second-longest chapter was devoted to the Khmelnytsky uprising. Within Ukraine, the long wars and strife of the late seventeenth century destroyed records and bearers of memory. The Cossack historians of the early eighteenth century, confronted by the lack of a written record by their ancestors, turned to the adage that they had been warriors, not writers.

The limited manuscript and archival inheritance of the late seventeenth-century Hetmanate presents particular problems for those who wish to study the Ukrainian cult of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and its representation in literary works. Although we have references to the cult in the reports of the acclamations by the Kyivan Academy professors and students, that Khmelnytsky was a Moses and well-named Bohdan (God-given) to liberate the Ruthenian people/nation from Polish servitude, we have only one possible contemporary panegyric from that Kyivan circle that dedicated so many other such works in Ukrainian, Polish, and Latin to other prominent figures of the early seventeenth century and that would do so again in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century Mazepan age. The “Vilnius” panegyric of 1649–1650, praising both Khmelnytsky and his chancellor Ivan Vyhovsky, compares Bohdan and his followers favorably to the ancient Kyivan prince Volodymyr and his sons: “The latter [Volodymyr] had twelve sons but they did not have/what the Khmelnytskys have proved./ Because of the sons of Volodymyr Rus’ fell./ Because of the Khmelnytskys, in Bohdan’s time it rose to its feet.”<sup>13</sup> Although we still need a thorough examination of the school manuscripts of the Kyivan Academy and other Ukrainian schools that may yield other panegyrics, at present we do not have another panegyric to Khmelnytsky until 1693.<sup>14</sup> Our only other major seventeenth-century Ukrainian representation of the hetman, the *Eyewitness Chronicle*, usually dated in its portrayal of Khmelnytsky to the 1670s and the pen of Roman Rakushka, is matter-of-fact in its depiction of the hetman and critical of the bloodshed of the revolt.

The Mazepan Age may hold the key to the formation of the Khmelnytsky cult.<sup>15</sup> Certainly the stability and flourishing of arts that produced the style often called Mazepan Baroque also made for attention to history and classics, and attention to literary forms at the Kyivan Academy. These circles praised Mazepa before the great disaster of the Battle of Poltava (1709). How much attention was paid to Khmelnytsky other than the panegyric of



1693 must be established. What is certain is that the decades after Mazepa's defeat were a time of a growing Khmelnytsky cult and increasing interest in recent history. By 1728 the academy had produced the play *God's Grace, Which Liberated Ukraine from the Poles' Unbearable Offenses through Bohdan Zynovii Khmelnytsky, the Most Glorious Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host*.<sup>16</sup> In the same decade, Samiilo Velychko compiled his massive history of Ukraine, which was based on the material of Samuel Twardowski's Polish epic poem *Wojna domowa* (Civil War), but which transformed Khmelnytsky from a villain into a hero.<sup>17</sup> The manuscript contained numerous literary works, poems, speeches, and the ostensible universals of Khmelnytsky that were political and historical treatises. The purported eulogy by Samuel Zorka to the hetman and the Bila Tserkva universal that outlines the reasons for the revolt were major literary works that exuded homage to Khmelnytsky. All this attention to Khmelnytsky came after the Poltava battle and the Petrine attack on the elite and institutions of the Hetmanate. The cult can be seen as demonstrating the legitimacy of the Cossack Hetmanate and extolling its founder, who could be portrayed as having rendered service to the tsar and secured rights and privileges for Little Russian Ukraine. The elite needed history and a founding myth to secure its precarious position.

Although one sees glimmers of contemporary history writing in seventeenth-century Ukrainian historical works and the *Eyewitness Chronicle* completed in the early eighteenth century, it is only in what is conventionally called the Hrabianka chronicle of the early eighteenth century that one finds a fully developed cult of Khmelnytsky and the clear influence of humanistic rhetoric and classical historians in the text. The preface to the text explaining its motives and method places it in the tradition of *ars historica*, and in reality the "Hrabianka Chronicle" was a history, not a chronicle. Although some of the six manuscripts that served as the source for the publication of 1854 contain information giving Hryhorii Hrabianka, the colonel of Hadiach, as the author and the date of composition of 1710, most manuscripts do not contain the name of an author and a composition date. They merely begin with the title "Events of the Most Bitter War." A number of scholars have posited that Hrabianka was merely the copyist or editor of a version. Opinions vary as to how much the manuscript is a close compilation of sources and accounts that already existed and how much it is a creation of an author. The majority of manuscripts of the "Events of the Most Bitter War" belong to a short version of the work that goes down only to 1654 and that does not contain the poems that

begin the longer version, the preface to the reader, or the attribution to Hrabianka. Opinions vary as to which version appeared first. Only when we have a proper academic edition of the more than sixty manuscript copies of the work will we be able to deal fully with its authorship, text, and sources. The present discussion takes into account the long version published in 1854 with the addition of the passages excised by the tsarist censor and published later, as well as the recently published short version.<sup>18</sup>

Much of the limited writing on the Hrabianka chronicle or "Events of the Most Bitter War" dealt with its utility as a historical source and its authorship.<sup>19</sup> As nineteenth-century historians came more and more to question the reliability of information in the "Events of the Most Bitter War," literary specialists came to view it as a major work of early modern prose. Ivan Franko and Mykola Zerov examined the text for its literary merits (regrettably, Zerov's master's thesis on the historical work has never been published in full).<sup>20</sup> In publishing the Harvard reprinting of earlier editions and a manuscript copy in 1990, the literary specialist Yuri Lutsenko has argued for its interpretation as Baroque historiography.<sup>21</sup> Paradoxically until the Harvard reprint, one of the most widely circulated manuscripts of the eighteenth century was a relative rarity in its 1854 print edition.

When the eighteenth-century secular and clerical elite of the Cossack Hetmanate wanted to know about Bohdan Khmelnytsky, they turned to the "Events of the Most Bitter War." In contrast to Velychko's massive work, which did not circulate and comes down to us incompletely in an original and a single copy, "Events of the Most Bitter War" was preserved in numerous copies, often in historical compendia that contained information on the Cossack past and the rights and privileges of the Little Russian nation/people.<sup>22</sup> These manuscripts were the historical memory of Ukraine of the eighteenth century, when the tsarist government banned secular printing and the St. Petersburg government questioned Ukrainian autonomy and the elite's position. Especially after the Battle of Poltava and the declaration of Mazepa as a "traitor," the Ukrainian elite needed proof of the noble lineage of the Cossacks and the Hetmanate and the rights and privileges that the exemplary hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky had obtained when voluntarily bringing Ukraine under the tsar's scepter.<sup>23</sup>

Certainly "Events of the Most Bitter War" placed Bohdan Khmelnytsky as the founder of the Hetmanate and the hero of Ukrainian society. The eighteenth-century reader could turn to it for material on the hetman's life and thought.<sup>24</sup> His patriotism and devotion to the Cossacks

emanates from the speeches, written in the style of the *ars historica*, that he is purported to have given.<sup>25</sup> For example, in winning over the registered Cossacks to his cause he instructs his emissary to declare: “Whose blood are they going to shed? Not that of their brothers? Is not one mother Ukraine their birthright? For whom should they stand up? For Catholic churches? Or for the Lord’s churches that gave them birth and spiritually raised them from the day of their christening? Do they want to help the Polish Kingdom, which paid them for their courage with slavery, or their mother Ukraine, which wishes to endow them with freedom?”<sup>26</sup> His elevated position was most pointedly expressed in the phrase presumably omitted by the tsarist censor in the 1854 edition for assigning the hetman too high a position. In an account discussing his receiving foreign emissaries and concluding treaties, prerogatives of a sovereign, the censor decided to strike out “Because it was only a crown and a scepter that were not afforded him.”<sup>27</sup>

Both the long and short versions of the work contain the account of Khmelnytsky’s decision in consultation with his officers to swear allegiance to the Muscovite tsar. The famed articles of Bohdan Khmelnytsky appear in the supplication to the tsar and the answer of Aleksei Mikhailovich. For the elite of the eighteenth-century Hetmanate, laboring under suspicions of treason after Poltava and fearing the abrogation of the Hetmanate’s autonomy, “Events of the Most Bitter War” provided proof of the voluntary submission of Ukraine and an example of a loyal hetman.

The longer version of the “Events of the Most Bitter War” contained a number of literary genres affirming Khmelnytsky’s role as the national hero. A dialogue with the Crimean khan is one of the longest passages in the work.<sup>28</sup> The “Word to the Reader about the Reason this History was written” afforded a rationale and list of sources for the history.<sup>29</sup> The poetic encomium “Praise in Verse to Khmelnytsky from the Little Rus’ People/Nation” was meant to accompany a portrait missing from the manuscripts from which the history was published.<sup>30</sup>

The dialogue with the Crimean khan allowed the hetman to defend his decision to go under the tsar’s high hand. Khmelnytsky emerges as the proponent of Ukraine’s link to Muscovy. Khmelnytsky also argues for the insignificance of the Tatars in his victories from 1648 on, and how the Tatars had benefited in many ways more than the Cossacks from their alliance. He even accused the Tatars of not honestly upholding their later agreement with the Poles. The eighteenth-century reader received

a full description of Tatar-Cossack relations with details deprecatory of the Tatars for all the mysterious turns of alliance and defections of the first years of the war. Obviously much could also be seen as applying to the contemporary eighteenth-century "infidels" whom the Cossacks fought. The hetman engages the khan in historical debates about the thirteenth-century conquests of Batii and the earlier Tatar destruction of the Rus' (otherwise called Little Rus') people's ancestors, the Khazars. The hetman proclaims his dignity when he says, "And now you feel not ashamed to speak to me, to a person whom such a numerous and brave people selected as a leader, to a person who is equal in all ways to you, as to your subordinate and in anger."<sup>31</sup> In the khan's speeches one could find trenchant criticism of Muscovy and even the assertion that the Rus', Polish, Hungarian, Moravian, German, and other princes who had once dominated Muscovite forces had been defeated by the Tatars. How convincing the reader might find the khan's arguments, however respectful he was of the hetman, remains an open question.

The "Word to the Reader about the Reason this History Was Written," found in the 1854 edition, outlines the purported sources for the work. Concentrating heavily on the Cossack role in fighting the Tatars and Muslims, it reflects more the realities of the eighteenth century than the events of the seventeenth. Recalling the mention of the Cossacks in the works of Kromer, Bielski, Strykowski, Guagnini, and Kochowski as well as Puffendorf and Hübner, the author presents the Cossacks, and above all Khmelnytsky, as having defended the Ukrainian lands, carefully outlining their borders as the Kyiv, Chernihiv, Bratslav, and Podilian palatinates. In order that this history might not be forgotten, he claims to have taken material from the diaries of "our warriors," from clerical and secular chronicles, and from eyewitnesses whenever possible, adding nothing that was not in the sources. He expostulates at length that the deeds of Moses, who led the Jewish tribe out of Egyptian slavery across the Red Sea during which the pharaoh and his warriors were drowned, would not be known if they had not been written down in Scripture. He then goes on to mention Nebuchadnezzar; Cyrus the Great; Alexander the Great; Cesar Augustus, who alone ruled the world; and Dmitrii, prince of Moscow, who destroyed the one million two hundred thousand troops of Mamai. He states:

While frequently reading about them and other conquerors of History with pleasure and while comprehending their benefit for the peoples/nations that brought them eternal glory, I felt great empathy because I saw that the deeds of our fatherland in no

way from others differ in military actions, yet it finds itself drowned in the abyss of oblivion. Therefore, I was thinking not for some vain glory, but felt motivated by the general good and do not leave to the ash of the buried the memorable deeds of our most faithful son of Rus' and wise leader Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who liberated Little Rus' from the most onerous Polish yoke through Cossack bravery and led her with the throne cities to their original state to the Russian monarch. With my accounts I decided to reveal to the world and to all peoples/nations that not only the Slavic-Rus' monarchs elicited fear of their braveness on all sides, but their servants, too, can stand up for the patrimony of their sovereigns and against the affronts to the Rus' (Russians) and resist in arms even against the mightiest foreign rulers.<sup>32</sup>

In light of the literature it cites, the preface was written after the 1710 date on the manuscript attributed to Hrabianka and reflects later eighteenth-century thought and terminology. It sought not only to cast Khmelnytsky as the agent of liberation but also to argue for the heroic acts and accomplishments of the ancestors of the tsar's eighteenth-century Little Russian subjects.

The panegyric "Praise in Verse to Khmelnytsky from the Little Rus' People/Nation" was meant to accompany a portrait for which a space had been left in a manuscript used for the 1854 edition.<sup>33</sup> It appeared alongside a second poem entitled "Verses on the Little Rus' Coat-of-arms," though the Zaporozhian Cossack seal or coat of arms meant to be drawn in was also missing.<sup>34</sup> The two poems served to identify Khmelnytsky as the founder of the polity and world of the eighteenth-century Cossack Hetmanate. The panegyric to Khmelnytsky, in part echoing the Vilnius panegyric of 1649–50, proclaimed: "Thanks to him Ukraine rose to its feet, / Because in the Polish bondage it had almost perished." He was praised for abolishing the Church Union and beating the Poles, Jews, and other enemies.

The most effusive praise of the hetman came at the time of his death.<sup>35</sup> Feeling the approach of his end, the hetman called for all the military leaders "on both banks [of the Dnipro] of Little Rus'" to congregate in his capital of Chyhyryn. He reminded his followers of all their struggles and the tortures to which "our fatherland" had been subjected. He placed primary emphasis on the suffering of "our mother the Orthodox church." He declared that God in his mercy had extended his hand in help, as he had to Israel in Egypt to return to her original pious faith. He reminded them of all they had borne for "the freeing of the Orthodox church and our fatherland from the yoke of slavery, the Poles." Approaching his end, he thanked them for their loyalty and for the hetmancy.

Since his son Yurii was young and many of his followers did not want him as hetman, he asked them whom they would choose. His followers answered that they could see only his son as a successor. “For your so famed services to the Zaporozhian Host, they said, and for your martial deeds, for that you have liberated us from the Polish yoke through your wisdom and bravery, and for that you made us glorious before the whole world and made us a free nation, it is fitting for us to remember your kin even after your death.”<sup>36</sup> They declared their choice to be Yurii. And Khmelnytsky is said to have advised his son in a paternal manner to be a good leader, to give each his due, not to side excessively with the rich and not to disrespect the poor so that all should have a place of honor. Above all he advised him to honor God and fulfill his commandments and to serve the tsar faithfully.

And then upon Khmelnytsky’s death, the reader finds a moving tribute to the hetman as a military leader. Subsequent authors have seen it as similar and possibly following the description of the warrior Prince Sviatoslav in the Primary Chronicle, which under 964 reads:

When Prince Sviatoslav had grown up and become a man, he began to collect numerous and brave warriors. For he himself was brave. And moving lightly, like a leopard, he waged many wars. When traveling he did not take any carts with him, nor a kettle, nor did he cook meat. But cutting off a thin slice of meat of a horse or a wild beast or a beef, he would roast it on the coals and heat it. Nor did he have a tent, but would spread out his saddle-blanket and set his saddle under his head. And the rest of his warriors were all like that. And [before going to war] he would send word to other lands: “I am setting forth against you!”<sup>37</sup>

The reader of the Hrabianka chronicle was treated to a somewhat reminiscent eulogy of Khmelnytsky as a warrior:

A man worthy of the name hetman: boldly he was ready to take on any misfortunes, even more diligent was he amidst these very misfortunes; whereby no toils tired his body, and his good spirit could not be subdued by adversaries. He endured cold and heat equally. He ate and drank what nature demanded and was not overcome by sleep at night or during the day. When he lacked time due to affairs and military matters, he rested only a little, and then not on expensive beds, but on such beddings as a military man ought. Even amid the military din, he slept calmly, in no way concerned. His dress did not stand out at all against the others, only the gear and his horses were somewhat better. He was often seen covered with a military cloak, as he rested among the guards. He went first into battle and was the last to leave it.

While modern historians took more than a hundred years to identify the passages,<sup>38</sup> the erudite eighteenth-century readers may have known that in the Hrabianka chronicle they were reading Livy's characterization of Hannibal:

There was no one Hasdrubal preferred to put in command, whenever courage and persistency were specially needed, no officer under whom the soldiers were more confident and more daring. Bold in the extreme in incurring peril, he was perfectly cool in its presence. No toil could weary his body or conquer his spirit. Heat and cold he bore with equal endurance; the cravings of nature, not the pleasure of the palate, determined the measure of his food and drink. His waking and sleeping hours were not regulated by day and night. Such time as business left him, he gave to repose; but it was not on a soft couch or in the stillness that he sought it. Many a man often saw him wrapped in his military cloak, lying on the ground amid the sentries and pickets. His dress was not one whit superior to that of his comrades, but his accoutrements and horses were conspicuously splendid. Among the cavalry of the infantry he was by far the first soldier; the first on battle, the last to leave it when once begun.<sup>39</sup>

They might have even pondered on the text that had been omitted.

These great virtues in the man were equaled by monstrous vices, inhuman cruelty a worse than Punic perfidy. Absolutely false and irreligious, he had no fear of God, no regard for an oath, no scruples. With this combination of virtues and vices, he served three years under the command of Hasdrubal, omitting nothing which a man who was to be a great general ought to do or see.

Instead they read in the Hrabianka chronicle:

Considering these and similar virtues, which is wonderful to report, he became the victor over and the object of fear of the Poles, who, while completely devoting themselves to the joys of civil life, clearly neglected military affairs and exercises. Therefore, had Khmelnytsky not secretly spared them (as was discussed earlier), then they would not only have lost their army, but all Poland forever.<sup>40</sup>

But whether they recognized the passage from Livy or not, the readers must have realized that Hrabianka or whoever they thought had written "Events of the Most Bitter War" had found the appropriate way of elevating Khmelnytsky as the exemplar of hetmans and the hero of Ukrainian history.

# 3

## A Reevaluation of the “Khmelnysky Factor”

### The Case of the Seventeenth-Century

### Sabbatean Movement

*Ada Rapoport-Albert*

**THE THEOLOGY THAT LINKS** messianic redemption with oppression, suffering, and violent upheavals originates in the Exodus narrative and the apocalyptic prophecies of the Hebrew Bible. These paradigmatic texts gave rise to a rich tradition of eschatological speculation on the catastrophic events, referred to in later Hebrew as the “birth pangs of the Messiah,”<sup>1</sup> that would immediately precede and thus pave the way for messianic redemption inaugurating a utopian future. Accordingly, Jewish historiography has tended to interpret all surges of messianic tension, and the messianic movements they generated from time to time in a variety of places and periods, as a preconditioned response to catastrophic events.<sup>2</sup>

This interpretation, as we shall see, has been offered to account for the remarkable messianic career of Shabetai Tsevi, a devout, ascetically inclined kabbalist, born in 1626 in the Ottoman port town of Smyrna (Izmir), who proclaimed himself Messiah, attracted a vast following, and gave rise to a movement that swept through the whole of the Jewish world for a while, persisting in one form or another until long after his conversion to Islam at the height of his celebrity in 1666, and his death in exile ten years later.

Shabetai Tsevi, and the mass movement he inspired, is the subject of a monumental study by Gershom Scholem, who explained the universal appeal of the redemptive vision that propelled the movement in terms of the profoundly messianic orientation inherent, as he argued, in the sixteenth-century Lurianic school of Kabbalah. This school originated as an esoteric doctrine in the Galilean town of Safed, but it became widely diffused and gained popularity throughout the Jewish diaspora during the first half of



the seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> Other historians have placed the unprecedentedly wide scope and persistence of the movement in a broader historical context. They highlighted, for example, the particular receptivity to the Sabbatean gospel of redemption that was displayed by the Jewish New Christians of Iberian origin who, since the sixteenth century, had been settling as refugees in large numbers and returning to Judaism throughout the Ottoman empire and in certain parts of Western Europe; or the keen interest the movement was arousing among contemporary Christian millenarians, especially in the Netherlands and England, who believed that the advent of the Jewish Messiah augured the imminent Conversion of the Jews and the Second Coming of Christ.<sup>4</sup>

The catastrophic event immediately preceding and thus allegedly inducing both the messianic self-awareness of Shabetai Tsevi and the rapid spread of his redemptive message was the Khmelnytsky uprising of 1648 and its prolonged violent aftermath, which devastated the Jewish communities of the Ukraine and other parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The first modern historian to present this catastrophe as a key factor in the rise of Sabbatean messianism was Simon Dubnow. In his ten-volume history of the Jewish people, he dealt with the two topics in one chapter under the title “The Calamities in Poland and the Jewish Messianic Movement.” He wrote:

The catastrophic events of 1648 shifted Shabetai Zevi’s focus from the mystical to the political brand of messianism. During the summer of that year, the dreadful news reached Turkey that in the neighbouring Ukraine the Jews had been slaughtered *en masse*, and hundreds of Jewish communities had been destroyed. Smyrna was well aware of the civil war in Poland, since the Crimean Khan, who was subject to Ottoman rule, had taken part in it. Even before the autumn of that year, Jewish refugees and those taken captive had arrived in Turkey, brought by the Tatars to the eastern port towns. Shabetai Tsevi’s father, who had dealings with European merchants, was well informed about the events and related them to his family. The enthusiastic visionary [Shabetai], who up until then had been listening only to heavenly voices, suddenly began to hear dreadful earthly sounds—the outcry of the martyrs [in Poland], and the wailing over the devastation of what had been the most important centre of Jewish life in the Diaspora. In his psyche, cravings for the soul’s salvation now mingled with yearnings for national liberation.<sup>5</sup>

Much of this is speculation or pure fiction. There is no record of what, if anything, Shabetai Tsevi’s father might have known and reported

to his family about the events in Poland in 1648; nor do we have any direct insight into the state of Shabetai Tsevi’s psyche at that time, although according to much of the available evidence it was indeed in 1648 that he first proclaimed himself Messiah and embarked on the series of “bizarre acts,” which eventually provoked the rabbinic authorities of Smyrna to expel him from the town. These acts included, for example, the enunciation in public of the ineffable four-letter name of God, to which he may have been driven by his newly acquired sense of messianic vocation, although neither this nor any of the other “bizarre acts” he performed in public at the time conformed to the depiction in the traditional sources of the Messiah’s conduct.<sup>6</sup>

Arguably, if the catastrophic events in Poland were indeed the trigger for the eruption of the mass messianic movement, one would expect the Messiah to have emerged on Polish soil, not Ottoman, which is presumably why Dubnow labored to highlight the proximity of the Ukrainian to the Ottoman territories, to draw attention to the military involvement in the uprising of the Muslim Tatars and the Crimean Khan, and to speculate on the means by which the fate of the Jews in Poland might have become known in Shabetai Tsevi’s household.

There is, however, plenty of indirect evidence to support Dubnow’s speculation. News about the Khmelnysky massacres and the devastation of the Jewish communities in the Ukraine did circulate rapidly and was readily available throughout Western Europe and the Ottoman Empire. The impression it created was reinforced by the tangible presence everywhere of thousands of Jewish captives and refugees who were being ransomed, integrated, or helped to migrate further by the local Jewish communities.<sup>7</sup>

Nor can one ignore the fact that 1648, the year that marks both the beginning of the Khmelnysky uprising in Poland and Shabetai Tsevi’s first proclamation of his messianic role, coincided also with a date traditionally believed by Jews to be pregnant with messianic significance, a coincidence that did not escape the attention of contemporaries.<sup>8</sup> According to a certain passage in the medieval kabbalistic compendium *Zohar* (i, 139b), the year 1648 signaled that stage of the messianic process at which the resurrection of the dead was due to occur, although most kabbalists took the date to be simply the year of the final redemption.<sup>9</sup> As on many occasions in the past, when catastrophe struck in place of the anticipated messianic redemption, it was understood as the birth pangs of the Messiah and served to further inflame rather than quash messianic hopes. It seems likely, there-

fore, that in 1648, Shabetai Tsevi—a keen student of the *Zohar*—was indeed interpreting the events in Poland as the birth pangs of the Messiah, and that this interpretation of the events may well have prompted him to proclaim himself the final redeemer.<sup>10</sup> The suggestion is supported by at least one explicit statement to this effect in a contemporary chronicle of the messianic movement describing the occasion on which, in the summer of 1666, Shabetai Tsevi was hosting a delegation of rabbis from Poland (on which more below):

Before departing from him, the envoys asked whether the birth pangs of the Messiah were yet to come, and he assured them that what they had already suffered was sufficient. They then asked when the redemption would come, and he refused to answer, as perhaps he, too, did not know, “for the day of vengeance is in mine [namely, only in God’s] heart” [Isa. 63:4]. *But he told them that since the year 1648, the crown has been placed upon his head*, “not by an angel, nor by a seraph, nor by a messenger but by the Holy one blessed be He Himself” [echoing the Passover Hagadah].<sup>11</sup>

Beyond supplying what may well have been the initial trigger for Sabbatean messianism, the events in Poland continue to feature in the Sabbatean sources from time to time, as follows.

(a) In a long letter by Nathan of Gaza, Shabetai Tsevi’s chief propagandist and prophet, to Raphael Yosef—a wealthy patron of the Sabbateans in Egypt, written in September 1665 and almost instantly disseminated widely abroad (copies were read out publicly in the synagogues of many European communities, in Smyrna and Constantinople, in the Yemen, and in the Holy Land)—Nathan discloses the course of the events that would unfold “a year and a few months from today.” They include a description of Shabetai Tsevi

taking dominion from the Turkish king without war, for by the [power of] the hymns and praises which he shall utter, all nations shall submit to his rule. He will take the Turkish king alone to the countries that he will conquer, and all the kings shall be tributary unto him, but only the Turkish king will be his servant. *There will be no slaughter among the uncircumcised* [that is, the Christians], *except in the lands of Ashkenaz*.<sup>12</sup>

The “lands of Ashkenaz” in this context are to be understood as a reference not only to the territories inhabited by Yiddish-speaking Jews in general but primarily to Poland,<sup>13</sup> and the provision whereby there alone “the uncircumcised” will be slaughtered is clearly an expression of the desire to avenge the blood of the Jewish victims who died in the massacres associ-

ated with the Khmelnysky uprising. In fact, in another version of the same letter, produced by Nathan himself only a few months later, the wording is altered slightly, to state explicitly that “*in Poland alone*” vengeance would be wreaked on the gentiles “to avenge the blood of our martyred brethren.”<sup>14</sup> Nathan reiterated the same view in a discussion with the rabbi of Ancona during his visit to that town in the summer of 1668. According to the rabbi’s account of the occasion, Nathan announced that “our Lord [Shabetai], accompanied by the Turkish king and a small number of Jews and Muslims, will travel by ship throughout the world, conquering it without war . . . and *he will wreak vengeance only on the towns of Poland, for the blood of our brethren which was shed in those provinces.*”<sup>15</sup>

(b) In December 1665, in Smyrna, Shabetai Tsevi desecrated the Sabbath by breaking down the door of the Portuguese synagogue—a bastion of local opposition to his messianic claims at that time. He interrupted the service and proceeded to conduct it himself in an outrageously unorthodox manner, which included reading the Torah portion out of a printed book rather than the traditional manuscript scroll; calling on many others, including women (!), to read from the Torah in the same fashion; delivering a kabbalistic sermon in which he explained why it was time to transgress the Law; and hurling insults at his opponents. Among other things, he addressed also what had clearly become a sensitive issue—the identity of Messiah son of Joseph (alternatively known as son of Ephraim)—the messianic precursor who, according to some rabbinic traditions, was destined to die in the apocalyptic wars that would precede the advent of the final redeemer, Messiah son of David. Since Shabetai Tsevi had presented himself from the outset as Messiah son of David, he was evidently challenged to identify his precursor, of whom no one had heard up until then. Shabetai came up with the name of a certain “Rabbi Abraham Zalman,” who, as he claimed, had performed the role of Messiah son of Joseph in complete anonymity, dying a martyr’s death during the massacres in Poland. He then proceeded to recite for him the prayer for the elevation of the souls of the dead.<sup>16</sup> Admittedly, the notion that this obscure and quite possibly fictitious Polish Jew was his precursor suggests an improvised response to an unexpected challenge rather than a genuine insight into Shabetai’s construction of his own messianic credentials. Nevertheless, it is significant that in searching for a plausible answer to the awkward question of his unknown precursor, he chose to locate him in Poland, where the violent upheavals could be presented as the apocalyptic wars destined to claim

the life of Messiah son of Joseph, and thus to pave the way for his own advent.<sup>17</sup> It is evident, however, that this response was not entirely satisfactory; Messiah son of Joseph was traditionally envisaged as a public figure, and yet no one had ever heard of the Polish Rabbi Abraham Zalman. Shabetai Tsevi's failure to be preceded by a credible messianic precursor continued to plague him, as is evident from his debate, less than a year later, with a certain Polish kabbalist and messianic prophet by the name of Nehemiah Cohen, who visited him in Gallipoli, where, suspected by the Ottoman authorities of sedition, he had been imprisoned—albeit in conditions of great comfort—since the spring of 1666. Nehemiah's visit was apparently sponsored by several Jewish communities in Poland, which had expressed their desire for news of the Messiah's progress as follows: "For we, the Jews in this bitter exile, are eager to hear good tidings of salvation and comfort, more especially in Poland, where wickedness and [the misery of] exile abound, and every day brings new disasters and persecutions."<sup>18</sup> According to several contemporary accounts of the visit, Nehemiah challenged Shabetai's interpretation of the apocalyptic traditions about Messiah son of Joseph, arguing that he had not yet appeared, and possibly even claiming the title of Messiah son of Joseph for himself, insisting that until he had fulfilled his own mission, Messiah son of David could not possibly appear, and therefore Shabetai's messianic claims were unfounded.<sup>19</sup> Nehemiah's brief visit came to an abrupt end with his sudden conversion to Islam, which he apparently repented as soon as he returned to Poland, but the incident may have led to Shabetai Tsevi's own conversion to Islam a few weeks later.

(c) A month earlier, in the summer of 1666, when Shabetai Tsevi was already incarcerated in Gallipoli, he was visited by two other important envoys from Poland, the son and stepson of the Rabbi of Lvov, David ha-Levi, better known by the title of his famous commentary on the *Shulhan Arukh*, the *Turey Zahav* (commonly abbreviated as the acronym TaZ). That these eminent Polish scholars were sent on a pilgrimage to the Messiah's court is a measure of the profound impact that the messianic movement had made on the Jews of Poland. But by the same token, all the contemporary accounts of their pilgrimage highlight also the profound impact of the massacres of the Jews in Poland on Shabetai Tsevi. He wrote a note to the illustrious TaZ, for the envoys to take back to their father, in which he offered the Polish Jews both comfort and revenge: "Soon I shall avenge you and comfort you as one whom his mother comforteth [Isa. 66:13] . . . the day of vengeance is

in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come [Isa. 63:4].”<sup>20</sup> During the same visit, we are told by another source that the envoys

wanted to tell him [Shabetai] of the tribulations and massacres suffered by the Polish Jews, but Shabetai said: “You need not tell me. Behold, the book *Tsuk ha-’itim* [“Troubled Times” by Meir of Shebreshin, the earliest and widely read chronicle of the 1648–49 Khmelnysky massacres, first published in Cracow in 1650] . . . is open here with me all day long.” He added, “Why do you think I am dressed in red and my Torah scroll is draped with red? Because the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come.” The envoys said: “Our Lord, for many years, and quite recently again, sacrifices and holocausts have been made because of our sins, and the sacrifice of Isaac has been repeated over and over again in Poland.” He replied: “I will make mine arrows drunk with blood [Deut. 32:42].”<sup>21</sup>

(d) Shabetai Tsevi’s third wife and messianic consort, Sarah, whom he married in Egypt in late 1663 or 1664, was a Polish Jewess. Her biography is difficult to reconstruct from the divergent, at times quite fantastical, accounts of her life in both the Jewish and the non-Jewish sources, but they all agree on a number of apparent facts: orphaned as a child during the 1648 Khmelnysky massacres, she was brought up in Poland as a Catholic, discovered her Jewish origins as a teenager, became convinced that she was destined to be the Messiah’s bride, and traveled through Holland, Italy, and the Levant, allegedly leading a licentious life while earning her living as a prophetess (or a witch, according to one of the more hostile reports).<sup>22</sup> Although there is no direct evidence to this effect, Shabetai Tsevi may well have been drawn to her at least in part on account of her Polish origins, which provided him with a personal connection to the calamitous experience of the Jews of Poland, an experience that, as we have seen, he considered to be the birth pangs of the Messiah and promised to avenge.

Notably, Sarah’s Polish background still featured as a significant factor in one of the last transmigrations of the Sabbatean movement, the late eighteenth-century syncretistic cult of the Polish adventurer and apostate messiah Jacob Frank. Frank promised to bring to successful conclusion the messianic project that Shabetai Tsevi (to whom he referred condescendingly as “The First One”), and his successor Barukhyah, late seventeenth- to early eighteenth-century head of the apostate Muslim Sabbatean community in Salonica (“The Second”), both failed to accomplish, as had all the previous potential redeemers of the Jewish tradition. According to Frank, the reason for their failure was none other than that they were all

men. The Messiah, he argued, must be a woman, since the messianic soul, which according to the kabbalah originates in the female aspect of the godhead, cannot be incarnated in a male but must be embodied in female form. As a convert to Islam and subsequently also to an idiosyncratic version of Catholicism, which the Polish ecclesiastical authorities rightly judged to be heretical, he was incarcerated in 1760 in the military fortress adjacent to the Pauline cloister of Jasna Góra in the town of Częstochowa, where the shrine housing the famous icon of the “Black Madonna” functioned as the most important Catholic pilgrim site in Poland. There, in close proximity to the icon, the shrine, and the cult of the Virgin Mary, Frank developed, from 1770 on, his doctrine of the redemptive “Maiden,” a powerful heavenly female figure who would manifest herself on earth in order to lead Frank with his followers, and ultimately the whole world, to a glorious state of perfection, envisaged in terms above all of supernatural physical strength and eternal life. In the figure of this mythical Maiden, Frank fused together the Virgin Mary and the human incarnation of the quintessentially female aspect of the kabbalistic godhead, the sefirah known as Malkhut or Shekhinah, and all three were eventually subsumed in his virgin daughter Eva, who became the focus of his cult and its messianic figurehead.<sup>23</sup>

Frank attributed Shabetai Tsevi’s failure not only to his being a man but also to his conversion to Islam—a religion that oppresses women and hides them away, thus lacking altogether the capacity for reaching out to the redemptive female, the Maiden. Judaism, according to him, is only slightly superior to Islam inasmuch as the kabbalists do acknowledge the divine female Malkhut—Shekhinah, but their knowledge of her is esoteric, and they can only whisper or allude to her name rather than worship and celebrate her in public. Christianity alone venerates the divine female—the Holy Virgin—openly. This is why it was necessary for Frank and his followers to “enter” her religion, even though this Holy Virgin was no more than an “outer shell,” which had to be penetrated in order to reach Frank’s holy Maiden, the truly divine female. Shabetai Tsevi’s “Ashkenazi” wife Sarah, who was known to have been brought up as a Catholic in Poland, features in Frank’s scheme as proof that Shabetai must have sensed the superiority of Christianity as the only religion that sets the divine female at its very core, but he did not pursue this insight, choosing instead to convert to a religion whose attitude to women was least conducive to the realization of his messianic goal: “[This applies] even to the First

One, who did a good thing by shattering the laws of Moses . . . but in the country where he was [Muslim Turkey] nothing could be accomplished, because there is no mention of the Maiden there. *He did take a Polish wife from that status* [that is, a Christian], but this was a mere gesture, and so he, too, fell there.”<sup>24</sup>

Gershom Scholem, the scholar to whom we owe much of what we know about the history of Sabbateanism, was well aware of the movement’s associations with the plight of the Jews of Poland, but he rejected the historiographical tradition that construed the rise of Sabbatean messianism as a response to the catastrophic events of 1648. In the opening paragraph of his *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah*, he stated:

Many factors were involved in producing the events described in the following pages. An analysis of their relative importance is all the more urgent as historians have reached no unanimity in answering the great initial question: What exactly were the decisive factors that brought about the messianic outbreak? The usual, somewhat simplistic explanation posits a direct historical connection between the Sabbatean movement and certain other events of the same period. According to this view, the messianic outbreak was a direct consequence of the terrible catastrophe that had overtaken Polish Jewry in 1648–49 and had shaken the very foundations of the great Jewish community in Poland . . . This explanation was plausible enough as long as it could be maintained . . . that Sabbateanism as a movement started as far back as 1648, when Shabetai Sevi came forward for the first time with messianic claims. It was supposed that Shabetai’s followers conducted a propaganda campaign converting more and more believers until the movement reached its climax in 1666 . . . It will be argued in what follows that there is no foundation whatever for this view.<sup>25</sup>

Scholem proceeded to base this verdict on the following arguments:

(a) Shabetai Tsevi was an unstable “manic-depressive,” incapable of articulating, sustaining, or disseminating any coherent vision. The success of his mission was due entirely to the theological ingenuity and public-relations genius of his prophet, Nathan of Gaza, whom he first encountered in the Holy Land in 1665, which is when the messianic movement as such actually began. Until then, Shabetai’s grandiose claims generally met with derision, and his following, such as it was, remained small and insignificant. While acknowledging that news of the fate of the Jews caught up in the Khmelnysky uprising must have played a part in Shabetai’s personal messianic awakening in 1648, Scholem denies that the events in Poland were a major factor in the outbreak of the mass movement in 1665.<sup>26</sup>



(b) The violent upheavals in Poland, beginning in 1648 and persisting for almost the whole of the next two decades, were bound to enhance the receptivity of Polish Jews to Shabetai Tsevi's redemptive message, but they could not account for the unprecedented universal appeal of the Sabbatean movement, which took hold not only in Jewish communities undergoing persecution and hardship, e.g., in Persia, Yemen, and Morocco, but also in centers of Jewish life that enjoyed peace and prosperity, such as Constantinople, Salonica, Livorno, Amsterdam, and Hamburg. The appeal of the Sabbatean message of liberation transcended social, political, and economic circumstances, and it cannot be attributed to the material conditions, however harsh, in any one region.<sup>27</sup>

(c) Sabbateanism was unique in two significant ways. It transcended the parochial nature that marked all other messianic outbreaks in the history of Judaism, none of which ever spread beyond its immediate region of provenance, and it survived the disappointment that invariably led to the collapse of earlier messianic movements once the predicted date of the redemption had elapsed without the redemption materializing. The persistence of belief in Shabetai Tsevi long after and despite his failure to deliver is particularly remarkable given the paradox of his conversion to Islam, which was totally unexpected and traditionally viewed as a disgraceful act of betrayal. By contrast, Shabetai's conversion was instantly integrated into the movement's kabbalistic theology, thus enabling many of his followers to maintain their faith in his messiahship. All this led Scholem to conclude as follows:

If there is one general factor underlying the patent unity of the Sabbatean movement everywhere, then this factor was essentially religious in character and as such obeyed its own autonomous laws . . . As it happens, we are in a position to identify and name this religious factor. It was none other than Lurianic kabbalism, that is, that form of kabbalah which had developed at Safed, in the Galilee, during the sixteenth century and which dominated Jewish religiosity in the seventeenth century.<sup>28</sup>

According to Scholem, the Lurianic kabbalah was essentially a messianic doctrine. It was based on the notion that as a result of a series of apparent mishaps at the time of the Creation, particles or "sparks" of divine energy or "light" had scattered and were now "exiled" from their supernal place of origin, trapped in the base material world that we inhabit. By performing righteous acts, every individual was charged with the task of liberating and restoring to their divine source as many

of these “sparks” as possible. Once they have all been liberated and restored, evil—which resides in the material world and draws its vitality from the divine energy of the “sparks” entrapped in it—will cease to exist, and the world will be purified, perfected, and redeemed. The Safed kabbalists believed that this task was nearing completion, which signaled the imminent dawning of the messianic age. Moreover, the messianic tension generated by the Lurianic doctrine marked a departure from the medieval kabbalah, which was generally unconcerned with the collective redemption at the end of days but focused primarily on the individual experience of the redemption as a state of mind, capable of being attained at any time by contemplative means. This turn in the development of kabbalistic eschatology was driven, according to Scholem, by the traumatic experience of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century. The Lurianic doctrine of the sixteenth century, although not necessarily a direct response to the trauma of the expulsion, nevertheless supplied a conceptual framework that made it possible to explain and justify it in theological terms. It depicted certain elements of the godhead itself as being scattered, exiled, and displaced as a result of a primordial cosmic catastrophe that mirrored the experience of the expulsion, whose rectification on both the divine and the earthly plane depended on human action. Scholem further argued that the Lurianic doctrine crossed the barrier of esotericism that had traditionally limited the dissemination of all kabbalistic lore. It became increasingly popular everywhere during the first half of the seventeenth century, preparing the ground for the rapid and near universal acceptance of the Sabbatean message, articulated as it was in Lurianic kabbalistic terms.<sup>29</sup>

All the elements of this compelling thesis have become subject to revision. Isaiah Tishby was the first to challenge Scholem’s evaluation of Shabetai Tsevi as an unstable personality who suffered from mental illness and played only a passive and intermittent part in the creation of the movement that bore his name but was, in fact, according to Scholem, largely the creation of his prophet, Nathan of Gaza. Tishby argued that there was sufficient evidence to credit Shabetai Tsevi with a more active, substantial, and distinctive contribution to the development of both the doctrine of the Messiah and the evolution of Sabbateanism as a movement from the outset.<sup>30</sup> This has implications for the significance of Shabetai’s first messianic proclamation in 1648, which was probably triggered, as we have seen, by the catastrophic consequences for the Jews of Poland of the

Khmelnysky uprising. If this was indeed the beginning of the movement, then the Khmelnysky uprising must be considered at least one of its formative factors.

Scholem's claim that social, political, and economic circumstances cannot account for the universal spread and persistence of Sabbateanism has been challenged by Jacob Barnai, who focuses specifically on what he calls "the social aspects" of the movement.<sup>31</sup> His study highlights the processes of transition and change marking early modern Jewish society, which contributed to the rise of the messianic movement and facilitated its worldwide diffusion. Without rejecting the significance of the religious factor singled out by Scholem (although pointing out that this was not necessarily the Lurianic brand of Kabbalah), he argues that a multiplicity of factors must have been at play, none of which can alone account for the overall development and spread of Sabbateanism. His conclusion as regards the Khmelnysky massacres, and the extended period of violent upheavals in Poland that followed, is that they must be counted as a significant factor not only in the Polish reception of Sabbateanism once it became a mass movement, from 1665 on, which Scholem had fully acknowledged and documented richly,<sup>32</sup> but also in the earlier European background of the movement, which can be traced back to the impact of the thirty-year war on the Jewish community of Poland, and to Shabetai Tsevi's messianic awakening in 1648, which coincided with the outbreak of the uprising.<sup>33</sup>

The most extensive revision of Scholem's argument concerns his thesis that the Lurianic kabbalah, which became fraught with messianic tension in the wake of the Spanish expulsion, was popularized during the first half of the seventeenth century, and thus provided the impetus for the rise of Sabbatean messianism in the following decades. The revision is associated above all with Moshe Idel,<sup>34</sup> who challenged two crucial elements of Scholem's thesis: (1) the Lurianic kabbalah was not any more messianic than some of the kabbalistic schools predating the Spanish expulsion—a view that has been reinforced to some extent by Yehuda Liebes, who highlighted the messianic elements of the medieval *Zohar*, and redefined the Sabbatean notion of the redemption in terms that distanced it from the apocalyptic messianism,<sup>35</sup> which according to Scholem became a hallmark of the post-expulsion Kabbalah. Idel's own studies of the relationship between messianisms and kabbalah further reinforced his challenge to Scholem's thesis.<sup>36</sup> (2) According to Idel, the evidence for the popularization of the Lurianic kabbalah in the early seventeenth century

is rather scarce. In fact, he argues, there is every indication that this highly complex and difficult-to-access doctrine remained impenetrable to all but a small minority of adepts. His view is supported by the independent findings of Ze'ev Gries, who has studied the issue from the point of view of the history of Hebrew book printing. In reference to the publication history of the Lurianic writings, he concludes:

It seems that the Lurianic kabbalists, who during the seventeenth century were concentrated mainly in Italy . . . hardly made any efforts to popularise their doctrine and their customs. On the other hand, with the spread of Sabbateanism, its disseminators, who adhered to the Lurianic kabbalah, helped raise the public interest in the literature of Lurianic liturgy, ritual and custom, and it was this that eventually gave rise, in the course of the eighteenth century, to a widely circulating popular Lurianic literature of this type . . . Unlike Gershom Scholem . . . I argue that . . . most of those who were drawn to Sabbateanism knew nothing of the Lurianic kabbalah.<sup>37</sup>

In other words, it was the Sabbateans who popularized the Lurianic kabbalah, not the other way round, as Scholem had claimed.

The dismantling of Scholem's “Lurianic thesis,” which dismissed the significance of the 1648–49 events in Poland as a factor in the rise of Sabbatean messianism, brings the Khmelnytsky uprising back into focus as a key factor, and it raises afresh the question of the relationship between catastrophic events and the emergence of messianic movements. This, after all, was the relationship that Scholem had labeled “a simplistic explanation” when he rejected the conventional presentation of Sabbateanism as a response to the Khmelnytsky massacres. Notably, however, he did not himself hesitate to rely on precisely such an explanation when he presented the expulsion of the Jews from Spain as the background for the rise and popularity of Lurianic Kabbalism, which he conceived as being charged with live messianic tension.



# **Part II**

## **Khmelnysky and Romanticism**



# 4

## Apotheosis, Rejection, and Transference Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Romantic Literature

*George G. Grabowicz*

THE FIGURE OF BOHDAN KHMELNYTSKY is arguably the major common topos in nineteenth-century Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish historical thought and historiography and reflects a natural, shared focus on the mid-seventeenth-century upheaval that permanently shaped the interconnected histories of all three nations. In Russian and Ukrainian literature of this period Khmelnytsky occupies a prominent place—although some qualifications are in order. For one, the separateness of the two literatures is neither fixed nor clear in the first decades of the nineteenth century—as the case of Gogol/Hohol exemplifies<sup>1</sup>; differentiation into two separate national canons will occupy much of the nineteenth century. The very fact that a work may be written in Russian, for example, Hrebinka's *Bogdan* (1839–1843), but conform to the emerging canon of Ukrainian literature gives both a tentative and a dynamic character to the texts in question.

In the course of that differentiation, and the implicit Ukrainian nation formation that underlies it, the figure of Khmelnytsky will play a significant role in the formulation of the national past (particularly in the reading given to him by Shevchenko, but in those of Kostomarov and Kulish as well). Apart from the “ideological” side, the drawn-out articulation of a contested Ukrainian “national idea” contributes also to a complex literary development or “timetable”: the systems of neo-Classicism, pre-Romanticism, and Romanticism have different trajectories and centers of gravity in each literature and thus the very presence of “Romanticism” as a field and a poetics is less firm than has often been assumed. Ukrainian Romanticism is not necessarily coterminous in its poetics and timeframe with the Russian—or with



the Polish. Ukrainian works written or published in the 1840s may well exhibit sentimental/neoclassicist features or aspects of the burlesque and essentially neoclassicist mode of *kotliarevshchyna*.<sup>2</sup> In all three literatures (and particularly the Ukrainian) “pre-Romanticism” and its conventions constitute a fluid category. In the first half of the nineteenth century the Russian and Ukrainian discourses are both shaped by the imperial center, and for decades Ukrainian literature is seen by the public and by its practitioners as a provincial adjunct, if not an addendum, to the imperial literature. This will obviously nuance the treatments in question, but what it also introduces is the incipient awareness in Ukrainian literature—particularly pronounced in Shevchenko—that the topic of Khmelnytsky and his iconicity is intrinsically canonic, loyalist, and “Russian,” that is, an imperial priority or “property.” Finally, a major sea change is occurring in the very treatment of Ukrainian themes and topics: although at the beginning of the century it was entirely normal for Russian literature to write on Ukrainian topics as part of its treatment of “its own” history, by the middle of the century these Ukrainian themes and topics had become almost entirely the domain of Ukrainian literature<sup>3</sup>; the “nationalization” of the past was part and parcel of identity formation. A similar process is occurring on the Polish-Ukrainian interface, although the falling off of interest in things Ukrainian is not at all as precipitous in Polish literature as it is in Russian literature in the course of the nineteenth century.

The situation in Polish literature has its own drama. The neoclassical and pre-Romantic mode contributes at the start of the century two dramatic works, both devoted to Khmelnytsky and entitled “Bohdan Chmielnicki”—one by the prominent writer, historian, and political figure Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz (1758–1841), and the other by Tymon Zaborowski (1799–1828), a promising poet who died by suicide at the age of twenty-nine and who remains a decidedly minor figure. Both works remained unpublished, and in the case of Niemcewicz’s unfinished. Despite that, they have much to say about the intellectual and artistic climate of pre-Romanticism and its perception of Khmelnytsky. At the same time, his absence from the larger picture of Polish Romanticism is striking and deserves special attention.

In the Russian-Ukrainian literary sphere in the first half of the nineteenth century, the situation is not all that different. As summarized in Sipovskii’s study (which still remains the basic overview), in the category of works dealing with the seventeenth century Khmelnytsky has eight

works devoted to him.<sup>4</sup> At the same time there are eleven works dealing with Mazepa, and fifteen with the Haidamak uprisings, especially the *koliivshchyna*, the peasant revolt of 1768.<sup>5</sup> This decreased attention and the fact that in at least half of the works the poetics is basically pre-Romantic suggests both a common pattern with the Polish case of somehow “down-playing” Khmelnytsky and that other mechanisms of thematization and cathexis may be in play. It is this phenomenon that I propose to treat under the notion of “transference.” For some authors (particularly Kostomarov and Kulish, and in some measure Niemcewicz as well), a belletristic perspective on Khmelnytsky coexists with a specifically historicist focus. A juxtaposition of the two modes for addressing the figure of Khmelnytsky can prove highly productive and is essential for addressing the work of Kulish and Kostomarov.

### Khmelnytsky in Polish Literature

Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz’s drama *Bohdan Chmielnicki* was written in 1817 (just a year after his groundbreaking *Śpiewy historyczne* [Historical Songs]) and was designed to project an alternative vision of history—and, as in the latter, a program of engaged literature and of patriotic service to the nation.<sup>6</sup> Although a professional historian,<sup>7</sup> in this drama he is content to freely remold history (for example, by telescoping the events between 1647 and 1657, i.e., the causes of the uprising, the battles of 1648, the death of Khmelnytsky’s son Tymofii in 1652, and the death of Khmelnytsky in 1657) to provide a greater impact and indeed to maintain the classicist unity of action.

A central ideological feature of the historicism of *Bohdan Chmielnicki*—and a dominant intellectual issue of the day—is the Slavophile idea, which also serves as the matrix of the tragedy. In effect, the *historical* tragedy in question is the deadly enmity that has arisen between two brotherly people, Poles and Cossacks.<sup>8</sup> This is stated at the very beginning, in scene 6, Act I, by the character Niczaja (i.e., the Cossack colonel Nechai who died in 1650): “O, why do two nations? / Who should share common benefits and labor / So tear at each other?” [Ach: czemuż dwa ludy, / Co wspólne mieć powinny korzyści i trudy, / Szarpią swe wnętrza?] It is echoed in the next scene by Bohun (already here, long before Sienkiewicz’s *Ogniem i mieczem* [With Fire and Sword], a paragon of knighthood and valor, and later in the drama fated to play Banquo to Chmielnicki’s Macbeth) who laments

the conflict within the Slavic genus. The most explicit invocation of Slavophile ideals is made by Sieniawski, a captured Polish nobleman who engages Chmielnicki in long arguments on the causes and morality of the conflict and, in answer to the Cossack hetman's call for eternal vengeance, exclaims: "Remember—Slavic blood also flows in your veins? The time of reconciliation has come." [Wspomnij,—i w tobie samym płynie krew słowiańska! . . . Przyszedł czas pojednania . . .] (II, 9).<sup>9</sup> The central topos in the drama is the presentation of Bohdan Chmielnicki, his cause, and his tragedy. It is articulated through various *port paroles* (Sieniawski, Kisiel, and ultimately Bohun, who becomes a martyr for his ideals) and intertwines the pedagogy of civic lesson, *krzepienie serc* (strengthening of hearts; also long before Sienkiewicz), the virtues of loyalty and patriotism, reconciliation between the two nations, and love of peace. The latter two especially project an ideal of a community of nations and focus the work's underlying Slavophilism.

The didactic and patriotic is intermingled with the sentimental. This is both a function of plot (e.g., in the motif of parted lovers and of an unwilling bride: Rozanda the Moldavian hospodar's daughter forcefully married to Timofei [Tymofii] Chmielnicki); or in the reunion of the two lovers, Helena, Wiśniowiecki's daughter, and Sieniawski, whom Chmielnicki blesses and to whom, on his deathbed, he entrusts his three-year-old son) and of stereotyped casting, as when Chmielnicki poses as a Rousseauian simple man: "Being both a farmer and soldier, sequestered in wilderness / I saw for the first time the tempting lights of the capital" [Rolnik i żołnierz razem, schowany w tej dziczy / Po pierwszy raz ujrzałem blask dworu zwodniczy] (II, 9) or as the difference between Poles and Cossacks is cast as that between the civilization and courtly manner of the Poles and the "dzikie ustronie" (wilderness), the Dnipro rapids and the steppe of the Cossacks. Essentially, however, this is contained in the values, or "philosophy," that underlies the action and thought of the world of *Bohdan Chmielnicki*, that is, in the prevailing and unchallenged belief in God's justice (as stated by Bohun's shadow [V, 2]), in the validity of remorse (V, 1), in the basic goodness of man and the power of friendship to overcome national enmity—as when Chmielnicki entrusts his son to Sieniawski.

This also provides the essential foil for the character of Chmielnicki, which despite the historical setting, revolution, and war is cast primarily in terms of injured personal and national dignity. Yet even though he speaks both of his injuries and the scorn he received instead of justice, and of the great suffering of his people, as in his eloquent tirade to Kisiel (III, 2), the

focus of the drama turns ever more insistently to the personal wrong as the cause of the war. Chmielnicki's most effective arguments for the necessity and justice of the revolution, and the quite unexpected idea of Ukraine's political independence ("niepodległe państwo Ukrainy," IV, 4), remain unanswered and quickly recede into the background. In effect, Niemcewicz's drama and his general concept of history shrinks from this confrontation.<sup>10</sup> Instead, Chmielnicki becomes a driven man, and hate and revenge become the expression of his spirit (cf. IV, 4). Thus too, he wishes his cause to be the incarnation of destruction (cf. IV, 7; and here Niemcewicz is drawing on a rich literary and historical tradition, extending from such seventeenth-century works as Samuel Twardowski's *Wojna domowa* and Wespazjan Kochowski's *Annales*, in which Chmielnicki is portrayed as a virtual Antichrist of destruction).

As an initiator of historical evil, Chmielnicki thus assumes the character of an eastern despot: he has Śmierowski, a Polish emissary, shot with arrows (IV, 2; echoing not only the martyrdom of St. Sebastian but also a folk version of the sultan executing Baida Vyshnevets'kyi); he paranoically suspects Helena and Sieniawski of plotting against him and kills Bohun, his chief lieutenant, in a fit of rage as the latter warns him of God's retribution; finally, like so many literary tyrants, from Macbeth to Boris Godunov, he is persecuted by visions of his victims. Accompanying all this are references to "wild Asiatic hordes" with which he has allied himself and with which he is now identified.

Bohdan Chmielnicki's contradictory and greater-than-life personality dominates the drama even though, as in a Shakespearean play, the full dimension of his tragedy goes beyond the personal and is a function of his role as national leader. Yet his Romantic features, the powerful irrational forces of his will, are essential for creating the counterpoint to the drama's hierarchy of order and values. Niemcewicz's Chmielnicki also prefigures future treatment not only of him but of the Cossacks as such. He is, on the one hand, a man of wild passions, violence, and cruelty, and at the same time a free spirit in full communion with nature, the very incarnation of primitive freedom. As a leader he can be a tyrant or a Messiah. His cause may be perceived as vicious and demonic (as it is in the seventeenth-century tradition of a *Wojna domowa*) or it may be hailed as a just revolution. These antipodes, based on the essential duality of the archetype, indeed of all archetypes, become the twin pillars of the treatment of the Ukrainian historical theme in Polish literature.

Tymon Zaborowski's *Bohdan Chmielnicki*, a tragedy in five acts, was written in 1823, the year of the appearance of Adam Mickiewicz's *Poezje*, the work most often taken as signaling the beginning of Polish Romanticism; it was not published until the twentieth century and as such had no immediate impact on the period in question.<sup>11</sup> It is eminently classicist in its structure, considerably more so than Niemcewicz's drama: not only does it strictly adhere to the three unities, its *dramatis personae*, in contrast to Niemcewicz's more populated stage, are confined to four; again in contrast to Niemcewicz's *Chmielnicki*, where Bohun is killed, and Chmielnicki dies on stage, the violence here is merely reported, or at the very end anticipated. There are no shadows from beyond the grave, and no choral interludes. It is written in polished thirteen-syllabic meter as effective and sonorous as Feliński's *Barbara Radziwiłłówna*, and as in Feliński's drama it presents the play of noble passions. Not content, however, with reproducing his predecessor's somewhat narrow vision of tragedy as pathos and the intrigues of a foreign vamp (Bona Sforza), *Bohdan Chmielnicki* aspires to portray the more basic and universal conflict of freedom versus tyranny, and the tragedy of civil war. In the process Khmelnytsky's historical background is blurred: he is hardly identifiable as a seventeenth-century Cossack, and the play abounds with fictitious (or wildly telescoped) events. Historical verisimilitude is clearly not a priority here.

More than Niemcewicz, Zaborowski is intent on showing history as an extension of political philosophy—and as a repository of exempla both for concrete political action and for an understanding of the present. The political sphere is hardly circumscribed by national or chronological boundaries, its dimensions are supranational and supratemporal, in effect, the broad contours of ideas. Thus, the Poland that is projected here is an idealized Polish Commonwealth, a version of Jagiellonian Poland where national (i.e., ethnic) distinctions are not stressed and where the author can repeatedly present the two peoples (Poles and Cossacks/Ukrainians) as one “*naród*,” and indeed have Chmielnicki call himself a Pole (cf. V, 5).<sup>12</sup>

Slavophile ideas are also stressed. In an impassioned speech (II, 2) in which he defines his cause as just retribution for a long history of gentry greed, anarchy, and exploitation, Chmielnicki invokes the idea of a Slavic community at several strategic moments.<sup>13</sup> He specifically invokes Slavdom when he speaks of the depredations of Jesuit education—perhaps the central charge of the Enlightenment against Sarmatian Poland, but a clear

anachronism (of fact as well as attitude) for the seventeenth century.<sup>14</sup> This Slavdom, however, is consistently confined to the Jagiellonian concept: the other Slavs are not mentioned.

Elaborating on the Enlightenment notion that history provides inevitable victory over error, darkness, and injustice, Chmielnicki's revolution is portrayed not simply as the working of justice but as apocalypse. The cause of freedom becomes sacred and synonymous with divine retribution, as we see when he addresses his knights (!) before battle.<sup>15</sup> In this holy war Khmelnytsky's figure is expanded to the dimensions of the prototypical liberator—a Moses who leads his people to salvation (III, 1), and with typical hyperbole when the cause of freedom is concerned they are no longer merely Cossacks, or even Slavs, but potentially all the world's oppressed (cf. III, 1).<sup>16</sup> But even though he rejects these heady prospects, the very mode of the enumeration, the images of booty and arms project the dark shadow of an Asiatic conqueror—an Attila, a Genghis Khan, a Tamerlane. (There is, moreover, the continuity of tradition in this, for in numerous contemporary works, from anonymous laments to chronicles and epics, Chmielnicki is depicted as the scourge of God.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, there is the parallel tradition of Khmelnytsky as savior, as a Moses—with the play on his name, Bohdan—A Deo datus. Understandably, this conception was to be found primarily in Ukrainian [high as well as folk] literature, but it was known and commented in Polish literature from the beginning, as for example, in Kochowski's *Annales*.) Thus, although his cause is portrayed as righteous, the bloody reality of civil war as well as the motivation of personal revenge, and the tormenting doubts they create, show Chmielnicki as a tragically torn figure, to be known in history as both a “mad avenger” and a “defender of peoples.”

Zaborowski's attitude to Khmelnytsky is not ambiguous, however. He is presented, in his own final words (“I taught . . . how to love one's freedom and to further the freedom of others” [Uczyłem . . . Jak wolność kochać swoją, dźwigać wolność ludów]); V, 5) as the very principle of freedom. In this he becomes a link between Enlightenment conceptions of the Cossack hetman, from Staszic and Koźmian to Lelewel,<sup>18</sup> and the myth of the radical Romantic Cossacophiles, most notably Jan Czyński and Michał Czajkowski.

. . .

As noted, in Polish Romanticism proper the attention paid Khmelnytsky is significantly smaller. He is not, of course, totally ignored or sub-

jected to some implicit taboo. He appears, for example, in the poetry of Bohdan Józef Zaleski, where he is presented with that poet's characteristic radical ahistoricism (in one poem Khmelnytsky is a singer and a poet; the siege of Zbarazh takes place in the sixteenth and not the seventeenth century, with the Poles and Cossacks fighting the Tartars and not the latter two against the Poles). But Zaleski's vision of the Ukrainian Cossack past is naïve, sentimental, and fundamentally infantile, and in its reconstruction of an ideal Polish-Cossack amity there is no room for Khmelnytsky, that is, for any substantive examination of the broader issues involved.

A special, bolder variant of this is the Cossacophilism of Michał Czajkowski. Khmelnytsky is often mentioned in the context of the split that Czajkowski sees in the body of Cossackdom: between those who seek and maintain their natural and holy alliance with their brother Poles, and those who still harbor the rancorous legacy of Khmelnytsky. In his novel *Hetman Ukrainy* (1841), dealing with the time of Khmelnytsky's successor, Vyhovskiyi, the subject also comes up, as does his favorite thesis that religious fanaticism is a fatal source of discord. In terms of his own self-projection as a Cossack *otaman*, Czajkowski frequently mentions Khmelnytsky as a kind of precursor or avatar—which, of course, sheds more light on Czajkowski than on Khmelnytsky. Since his apotheosis of Cossackdom as an ideal order of knights transcends history, geography, and reason, it presumably also could contain Khmelnytsky—but teasing out the inherent contradictions was not something Czajkowski was disposed to do.

Khmelnytsky is virtually absent in the writings of the major Romantics. As central as Ukraine and Cossackdom is to Juliusz Słowacki, he does not figure there either, not even in the play *Jan Kazimierz* (which exists only in a fragment). The same can be said of Henryk Rzewuski (although there is a—highly negative—reference in *Pamiętki Soplicy*). The reasons for this structured absence are postulated below.

### Khmelnytsky in Russian pre-Romanticism

Concurrently with the Polish, Russian pre-Romantic interest in Khmelnytsky is relatively prominent, particularly in the Decembrist context, although, as noted by Sipovskii, in sheer bulk it falls behind the attention paid to Mazepa and the 1768 Haidamak uprising. Of the eight works Sipovskii lists, two—Fedor N. Glinka's novel *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 1816 and 1819, and Kondratii Ryleev's *duma* "Bogdan Khmel'nitskii" (1822)—clearly

express the Decembrist perspective. (For their part, the poems respectively attributed to Maksymovych and Hrebinka fall largely into the Ukrainian canon; the other four works, by Gonorskii, Liubich-Romanovich, Holota, and Kuz'mich, fall somewhere in between—and all of them are now largely forgotten.)

Although the overall Ukrainian theme looms large in Russian literature of the early nineteenth century, the historical subset is considerably smaller than in the Polish case. Moreover, it is almost entirely a product of Decembrist poetics—and was soon to be replaced by Gogol's crypto-historicism, or, more generously, his mythical vision of Ukraine, and then, by the mid-1830s (as signaled by the poem *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 1833), with a Ukrainian literary-historical interest proper.

Within this frame, Decembrist attitudes provide a coherent perspective. The major components of this poetics-cum-ideology are a belief in the role of the poet as national tribune, as leader and teacher, and in his calling as a high civic duty (cf. Ryleev's famous "I am not a Poet, I am a Citizen" [Ia ne Poet, a Grazhdanin]); the requirement of a literature that is uniquely national, and hence also patriotic; the value they place on historicism and a general sense of history as a *magistra vitae*.<sup>19</sup> Incipient Romantic tendencies are strongly tempered by rationalist eighteenth-century premises. Thus, as Galster argues, the poet is not concerned so much with "the Romantic cult of genius, or, as with Gogol, with a struggle to 'rule man's soul', but with Enlightenment didacticism."<sup>20</sup> It was in their understanding of historicism, however, that we see the full sway of eighteenth-century rationalism over Decembrist thinking. As Gukovskii puts it, "Neither Kniaznin, nor Ryleev, nor even Kuechelbecker in the *Argivjane* distinguished between the past and the present. In the past they saw the same thing as in the present, ignoring both the changeability of the human psyche and the changing bases of social existence, and thinking that people are always the same."<sup>21</sup>

. . .

The first Decembrist, and, indeed, the first nineteenth-century Russian literary work on the Ukrainian past, is F. N. Glinka's *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii, ili osvobozhdennaia Malorossia* (Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnytsky, or Little Russia Liberated). Parts of this novel first appeared in 1817 in vol. III of his *Pis'ma k drugu* (Letters to a Friend); in 1819 Glinka published it separately in an expanded form, but it was never completed. The poetics of this novel is not pre-Romantic, let alone Romantic, but



Classicist and sentimental (thus reminding us of this pole in Decembrist writing). Its literary value is marginal. Nevertheless, it is the first work to focus on Khmelnytsky and the larger themes in which he will be perceived.

The very title of the work, that is, its second part, shows clear literary echoes—especially Glinka’s own earlier poem *Vel’zen, ili osvobozhdennaia Gollandia* (Velzen, or Holland Liberated; 1810) and beyond that Schiller’s *Geschichte des Abfalls der vereinigten Niederlande* (History of the Revolt of the United Netherlands Against Spanish Rule; 1788). The subject of the Dutch War of Independence against Spain repeatedly drew the attention of the Decembrists as a prime example of the cause of freedom in successful battle against tyranny. In the words of N. Bestuzhev in his *Zapiski o Gollandii 1815 goda* (Notes on Holland in 1815, published in 1821), the Dutch “showed the world what mankind can do and to what heights the spirit of free men can rise.”<sup>22</sup> Glinka’s *Khmel’nitskii* finds this same inspirational theme closer to home, as he notes in his extensive, self-consciously “historiosophic” introduction: “What the deathless Tell was for Switzerland, Gustav Vasa for Sweden, William of Nassau for Holland and Pozharskij for our Fatherland, the excellent Khmelnitsky was for the Ukraine which he freed.”<sup>23</sup> History functions here not only as a *magistra vitae* but also as divine retribution. As we see in the high pathos of the speeches of Khmelnytsky and his father, the pride of the Poles will be brought low by the Ukrainians just as the pride of the Lithuanians was brought low by the Russian tsars.<sup>24</sup>

The novel is unabashedly *à thèse*, and its task is to apotheosize Khmelnytsky and the cause of freedom, and to demonstrate the justice and reason in Ukraine’s incorporation into Russia. The rather trivial plot (Khmelnytsky’s dream of liberation, his journey to Crimea for aid, the kidnapping by the Poles of his friend Osmund (!) and the killing of his father by Czaplinski [Czaplicki], his challenge of Czaplinski to a duel and his capture by the latter’s ruse) is subordinated to frequent and long pathetic monologues, tirades, and dithyrambs, on freedom, against tyranny, or in praise of friendship. In contrast to Niemcewicz’s and Zaborowski’s dramas, which are also couched in pathos and sentiment but which do represent artistic achievement, Glinka’s unfinished novel is flat and unconvincing. Much of Glinka’s work is moralizing, but here it is egregiously so.<sup>25</sup> Thus, even freedom, the ultimate value, is described in the words of the fiery (!) Khmelnytsky not with real passion but with the politic qualifications of a Polonius: “freedom, that is, under law, enlightened, is one of the main components of popular happiness” [svoboda, rozumetsia,

zakonnaia, blagorazumnaia, est' odna iz glavneishikh sostavnikov chastei shchast'ia narodnago].<sup>26</sup> In general, Khmel'nitsky's causes—freedom, and history itself—never rise above pathos and melodrama.

. . .

Kondratii Ryleev, the leader of the Northern Society, a major organizer of the uprising of December 14, and one of the first martyrs of the Russian revolutionary movement, was also the representative Decembrist poet and the one who epitomized the Decembrist interest in Ukraine and its past. His development of the Ukrainian historical theme, moreover, resonated well beyond the circle of Decembrist writers and friends. It elicited a lively interest and a distinct ideological answer from Pushkin (i.e., in *Poltava*), and it had considerable political impact on Russian and Ukrainian writers and intellectuals.<sup>27</sup>

Ryleev first turns to the Ukrainian past in his *Dumy* (1824), which are modeled, as he himself notes, on Niemcewicz's *Śpiewy historyczne*.<sup>28</sup> He cites the Polish poet in his introduction and stresses the same "sanctified goal" of producing "khrabrykh dlia boiu ratnikov, muzei dobreitnykh dlia soveta."<sup>29</sup> Like Niemcewicz's *Songs* for Polish history, the *Dumy* span the range of Russian history, from Oleg to Derzhavin; they are, in short, a primer of basic historical knowledge, a gallery of national heroes, and a few villains, each of them epitomizing a virtue or a vice; in some there is a striking parallel to Karamzin's *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago* (History of the Russian State).<sup>30</sup> In all their basic structures—civic and pedagogical goals, rationalist and abstract thought, narrative voice, prosody and versification—the *Dumy* reflect a classicist poetics.<sup>31</sup> Generally, however, the poetry is not of the highest caliber, and it is not surprising that Pushkin was quite skeptical; as he directly tells Ryleev in a letter and later quips to Viazemskii, "the *Dumy* are trash and the name comes from the German *dumm* and not from the Polish, as one would think at first glance."<sup>32</sup>

In the *Dumy* the Ukrainian historical theme as such appears in only two poems, one on Khmel'nytsky, "Bogdan Khmel'nitskii" (no. 16),<sup>33</sup> and one dealing with Peter I and Mazepa, "Petr velikii v Ostrogozhsk" (Peter the Great in Ostrogozhsk) (no. 18). (In the four longer poems—of which only *Voinarovskii* [1825] is finished—the historical focus is entirely Ukrainian, i.e., *Nalyvaiko*, *Gaidamak* and *Palei*.) The conception and execution of "Bogdan Khmel'nitskii" reveals the obvious and not very beneficial traces of Glinka's unfinished novel.<sup>34</sup> It is cut entirely out of the cloth of

pathos and never rises above melodrama; its literary devices and motifs are mostly clichés.<sup>35</sup> It begins with Khmelnytsky in prison (by then a topical setting; Byron's "The Prisoner of Chillon" (1816) had just been translated by Zhukovskii<sup>36</sup>):

In a dungeon dark and raw  
 In chains, morose and grim  
 Khmelnytsky was lying.  
 Dark thoughts were roiling him  
 And playing over his face.

[Sred mrachnoi i syroi temnitsy . . .  
 V tsepiakh, i groznyi i ugriumyi,  
 Lezhal Khmel'nitskii na zemle  
 V nem mrachnye kipeli dumy  
 I vyrazhalis' na chele.]<sup>37</sup>

Khmelnytsky's vow of revenge and of battle against tyranny is composed entirely of the *loci topici* that Pushkin had found so obtrusive.<sup>38</sup> As he succumbs to grief ("And onto the rusted shackles/Tears fell from his eyes" [I na zarzhavye okovy/Upali slezy iz ochei]) there suddenly appears the wife of Czaplínski, his captor, to confess her love for him and to free him (ll. 69–74). He rides off to triumph over the Poles, and the happy ending has a quintessentially Decembrist cast:

And from that time freedom was established  
 In the Ukrainian steppe,  
 And a people's happiness bloomed in villages and cities.  
 And instead of medals and honors  
 The collective voice of the people  
 Named him the long-awaited emissary of heaven  
 A Hero and Leader, sent by God.

[I votsarilasiasvoboda  
 S tekh por v ukrainskikh stepiakh,  
 I stala s schastiem naroda  
 Tsvest' radost' v selakh i gradakh.  
 I chtia poslom nebes zhelannym,  
 V zamenu vsekh nagrad i khval,  
 Vozhdia-geroia—Bogom dannym  
 Naroda obshchii glas nazval.] (105–112)

In terms of his own poetic achievement, and the Ukrainian historical theme that was so central to it, Ryleev's slightly later work, the poem *Voinarovskii*, is far superior and in many ways remains a lasting testament to his poetry and idealism. But it is focused on and animated by a very different set of concerns, not so much, or not only, Mazepa and the lost cause of Ukrainian independence in the early eighteenth century as the larger contemporary issues of honor, treason, radical commitment to one's cause, and the question of existential choice—which in Ryleev's case led him to the gallows and to his posthumous status of martyr for the revolution. It does, however, highlight some essential features. For one, there is the reliance on topoi (or stereotypes) that are already well established in a given theme and genre and that in light of the propaedeutic goal may readily be drawn on for the expected, pragmatic—and implicitly popular—effect; the prime goal, after all, is not just to give a primer on Russian history and heroism (precisely as the passage from Niemcewicz indicates) but to identify this primer with Decembrist values, here, primarily the struggle for freedom. At the same time the locus of this freedom may be placed in the most rudimentary or stereotypical setting: here, in the Ukrainian steppe (which is subsequently adumbrated by “villages and towns,” but which was also noted earlier; cf. line 22). In effect, although inculcating the value (*svobodoliubie*) the message implicitly also relies on established (collective) perceptions and premises (the wild, “primal” Ukraine, etc.). The subsequent articulation of the Ukrainian/Cossack myth in Russian literature, in Pushkin and especially in Gogol, will provide many examples of this.

Even more striking perhaps is the selectivity of Ryleev's perspective on Khmelnytsky. The brief introduction to this *duma* (indeed all of them have one) shows that the general outlines of Khmelnytsky's life and historical actions are familiar to the author and, clearly, there is much to choose from. But he specifically chooses this moment, presumably because it furthers the confluence of several key factors here: the melodramatic and the love plot, the existential (the moral decision to fight on), the promise of the support of God or destiny (God Himself fights on the side of the oppressed! / Our leaders are decisiveness and I! [Sam bog pobornik ugnetenym! / Vozhdireshitel'nost' i ia!; lines 89–90]) and not least of all the final apotheosis (Khmelnytsky—as *a Deo datus*, Bogom danny[i]). As such it is quite revealing of both the genre and its larger ideological framework.

A final nuance in Ryleev's brief but intense elaboration of Ukrainian history is his unfinished drama “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii,” of which

only the Prologue survives (it was written, as later police interrogations of his friends and acquaintances established, in the last months of 1825 just before the fateful Decembrist uprising in which he played a leading role and for which he was executed).<sup>39</sup> The figure of Khmelnytsky has not yet been written in. All that Ryleev managed to write is part of the introductory setting of the Khmelnytsky uprising, which, tellingly, depicts several Ukrainian peasants asking a Jew, Yankel, for the key to the church so they can celebrate a wedding, indeed promising to pay the fee later, when the crops come in; Yankel refuses and asks for the money, or for security and indeed suggests they turn to robbery to get the money. A quarrel ensues and a Polish *sotnyk* with reluctant Cossacks in tow arrives to arrest the most vociferous of the peasants. The Prologue breaks off there, but not before the welling anger of the masses is made plain—along with their desperate expectations for a leader to head it and give it purpose.<sup>40</sup> What is also clear is that as a synecdoche for the oppression that led to the revolution Ryleev draws on one of the most potent and widespread topoi in the anti-Polish and anti-Jewish interpretations of the Khmelnytsky revolution, the “keys to the church” topos, which was given great currency by the *Istoriia rusov* and which served to define the iniquity of Polish rule by also adding to it this popularly (or demagogically) framed religious outrage.<sup>41</sup> (Its appearance in Ryleev’s unfinished work suggests yet again that the *Istoriia rusov* was probably circulating in manuscript form already in the early 1820s—long before its publication in 1846.) The keys-to-the-church topos also confirms Ryleev’s readiness to draw on available popular material—and on stereotype. And yet despite his negative casting—Yankel also echoes the Shylock archetype<sup>42</sup>—the Jews he represents are not depicted without sympathy: his wife Rakhil’ has strong premonitions of an impending catastrophe and in discussing it she, and Yankel too, suddenly become human—and not just stock and stereotypical characters. In bringing this to our attention Ryleev is touching on a major dimension of the Khmelnytsky uprising.

### Khmelnytsky in Nineteenth-Century Ukrainian Literature

The role of Khmelnytsky and the *khmelnychchyna* in Ukrainian literature, even within the confines of the slow-starting nineteenth century,<sup>43</sup> is understandably more complex than in Polish and Russian literature: it is a question here not only of literary and historical tradition, and more

broadly of collective memory, but also of the overarching processes of identity formation and ultimately of nation formation. Khmelnytsky clearly does not play that role in Polish and Russian literature (although in the latter he is indeed inducted into the imperial canon). Though sharing a number of features with the neighboring and much more established literary processes, his presentation in the Ukrainian case also posits and has an impact on a discourse that, in the second half of the nineteenth century, develops into harsh polemics around the figure of the hetman. It also reminds us that periodization and literary convention, as important as they are, may be trumped by broader cultural and political developments or values.

Their articulation may often take a literary form, however. Such is the case with a long-dormant literary work, the school drama *Mylost' Bozhiiia Ukrainu . . . svobodyvshaia* (God's Grace Which Has Freed Ukraine . . . ) of 1728, which, as I have argued elsewhere, serves as a link between the seventeenth century and the modern nation-building idiom of Shevchenko and the Cyrilo-Methodian Brotherhood of 1846–47.<sup>44</sup> The work is an unqualified, that is, formal and canonic, apotheosis of the Hetman, as the full title of the drama articulates: “Mylost' Bozhiiia Ukrainu ot neudob nosymykh obydliaids'kykh chrez Bohdana Zynoviia Khmel'nyts'koho preslavnoho voisk zaporozhkykh hetmana, svobodyvshaia, i darovannymy emu nad liakhamy pobedamy vozvelychyvshaia, na nezabvenniu tolykykh ego shchedrot pamiat' reprezentovannaia v shkolakh kievskykh 1728 leta” (God's Grace which has freed Ukraine from Polish Bondage through Bohdan Zynovii Khmel'nyts'kyi, the most glorious Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, and which has elevated him through the victories over the Poles that were vouchsafed to him is hereby represented in living memory of His beneficence in the Kyivan schools in the year 1728). Discovered and published by Mykhailo Maksymovych in 1857, the two-hundredth anniversary of Khmelnytsky's death,<sup>45</sup> the work has a duality or ambiguity that resonates with its reemergence after an absence of some 130 years. In effect, it is not a traditional triumphalist encomium on the order of, say, Teofan Prokopovych's *Epinikion* (1709) celebrating Peter I's victory over Charles XII and Mazepa at the battle of Poltava that year or any such similar work. What distinguishes *Mylost' Bozhiiia* is that it is a laudation not so much of Khmelnytsky—who indeed is presented as a liberator, a divinely sanctioned Moses for his people, but is clearly not the main object of the work's cathexis—as it is a work praising the nation and the people, Ukraine herself, which has survived its greatest ordeal, precisely by God's Grace. That ordeal, however,

was not the Polish yoke but the despotic and vengeful rule of Peter I in the aftermath of Mazepa's failed insurgency, his "treason"; and after Peter's death in 1726, the accession of Peter II and the appointment of a new hetman, Danylo Apostol, rekindles the feelings of hope and expectation that some eighty years earlier were associated with Khmelnytsky. What this shift in frame of reference points to, however, is a broader pattern of substitution and indeed transference associated with the figure of Khmelnytsky.

Throughout the late seventeenth and the eighteenth century, in the genre of the Cossack Chronicles, from *Hrabianka*, *Velychko*, and the *Eye-witness Chronicle* to the *Istoriia rusov*, which itself is not a chronicle but in a real sense culminates the form, Khmelnytsky was understandably at center stage; he was, after all, the founding father of the hetman state and both the corporate, that is, *starshyna* loyalty and the emerging national self-identification that in large measure was rooted in it could not but identify with him and his achievement. The important dialogue *Razhovor Velikorossii s Malorossiieiu* (A Dialogue Between Great Russia and Little Russia), written by Semen Divovych in 1762, which summarizes the case of the Cossack *starshyna* and Little Russia herself and their claim to parity with Great Russia under a common Romanov crown, is based primarily on the legacy, the renown, and the achievements of Khmelnytsky.

. . .

In the nineteenth century, in the rapidly developing Ukrainian literature in the vernacular, with its fluid new social institutions and ongoing search for identity, the iconic stature of Khmelnytsky is both continued and discontinued: new forms and accents emerge, and along with them an unprecedented polarization of views.

In 1833 there appeared anonymously in St. Petersburg the long poem *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii: poema v shesti pesniakh* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky: A Poem in Six Cantos). The work has been variously attributed to Mykhailo Maksymovych, who was then a professor of botany in Moscow (the following year he was to leave for Kyiv to take up the position of rector and professor of Russian philology at the newly opened university there) and who had recently earned acclaim for his edition of Ukrainian folk songs *Malorossiiskie narodnye pesni* (1827). In the absence of any clear bio-bibliographical evidence, the text itself would argue otherwise—although the work's presence in the emerging Ukrainian canon is also clear. The poem is characterized by a broad range of sources, draw-

ing on the one hand on the *Istoriia rusov* and Bantysh-Kamenskii's *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, and on the other, as Zhirmunskii argues, a range of Pushkinian influences.<sup>46</sup> Even more so, it is marked by an eclecticism of form and mode, and by the high pathos of national suffering under Polish oppression (and it comprises the usual topoi of Polish, Uniate, and Jewish outrages).

The melodramatic plot centers on Khmelnytsky's love affair with Maria, the daughter of his sworn enemy Czaplicki (a clear echo of "Poltava"); his imprisonment in a dungeon and release by Maria; their flight, during which he is shot by the pursuers and left for dead while she is recaptured by the Poles; his recovery and flight to the Sich; and then his raising of the national uprising. Only now does Khmelnytsky devote himself to the "rodina": "O, Fatherland, now Zinovii belongs to you alone / He will not begrudge you / His final drop of blood! / I will forget everything, from this moment on / The soul will be numb to gentleness / Until the fatherland is freed / From its sorrows and travails." [O rodina! Teper' Zinovii Tebe odnoi prinadlezhit; / Svoei poslednei kapli krovi, / On dlia tebia ne poshchadit! / Zabudu vse! Ot sei minuty / Dusha dlia nezhnosti zamret, / Dokole rodina ot smuty / Ot tiazhkikh bed ne otdokhnet!] (52).

The Sich interlude is interesting not only for its local color (anticipating by two years Gogol's "Taras Bul'ba") and evident sympathy for the Zaporozhians but, what is more telling, the author's shift to a markedly Kotliarevskian diction and meter, for example:

All the Cossacks, arrayed by regiment  
 Were standing in the square  
 Awaiting the start of the council  
 And lo, the church door opens  
 And the esaul brings out the banner.  
 And seeing now their battle companion  
 An eager gleam of vengeance  
 Shines in the Zaporozhians' eyes.  
 The *dovbysh* beats the heavy drum  
 The gathered throng grows still  
 As the Commander, and the Judge,  
 And Army Secretary all appear.

[Uzhe na ploshchadi stoiali  
 Vse kozaki, po *kureniam*,



I vse nachala *rady* zhdali,  
 Vot otvorilsia Bozhii khram,  
 I *esaul* vynosit znamia.  
 Pri vide sputnika v boiakh,  
 U zaporozhtsev mesti plamia  
 Sverknulo v radostnykh ochakh.  
 V litavry *dovbyzh* udariaet,  
 Nadrod, shumevshii, umolkaet,  
 I poiavilis': koshevoi,  
 Sud'ia i pisar' voiskovoi.] (52–53)

Similarly, the response of Barabash to Khmelnytsky (the key moment when Khmelnytsky is persuading the “registered” Cossacks to join his uprising):

My friends, don't trust these vagabonds  
 Don't fall into the brigands' clutches.  
 To arms! Your foe is right before you! . . .

[Druzia ne verte sim burlakam  
 Ne daites' v kogti gaidamakam  
 Za sabli! Vot gubitel' vash! . . . ] (90)

In the final scenes the apotheosis is realized—but in the poem's peculiarly hybrid way: Khmelnytsky is greeted as hero and savior by the *narod* at St. Sophia square in Kyiv and by the metropolitan . . . and by a “neznamka” who turns out to be Maria. And thus while the nation celebrates the hero

. . . suddenly the bells rang out  
 And the Kievans shouted:  
 Khmelnytsky! The tyrant's overthrown!  
 You've saved us from our infamy  
 You've brought glory to your fatherland,  
 From now on you're our Bohdan  
 A man of excellence!

[Vdrug zalilis' kolokola,  
 I kievliane vozopili:  
 Khmel'nitskii! Nizlozhen tiran!  
 Ty ot pozora nas izbavil,

Ty rodinu svoiu proslavil,  
 Otsel', da budesh' ty: Bogdan  
 Muzh znamenityi!]

he is also reunited with his lover (“The hetman clutched to his breast/His friend returned to him by the Heavens/and overcome by his feelings/Could hardly catch his breath . . .” [ . . . getman pal na grud'/K podruge, nebom vozvrashchennoi/I dolgo on ne mog vsdokhnut'/Vostorgom chistym upoennyi . . . ] ) to which the author/narrator adds for his coda: “Gentle Reader, complete for yourself/ This picture of heavenly joy!” [Chuvstvitel'nyi! Dokonchi sam/Nebesnuiu kartinu shchast'ia!]

As pronounced and cloying as it is, the sentimental mode is not the defining feature here. As we see at various key moments there are references to the “russkii tsar” (Russian tsar; e.g., “I russkii tsar' za nas poidet,” p. 80, cf. also p. II, p. 90, etc.), his powerful presence and anticipated beneficent aid. Their culmination comes in the Epilogue, which articulates the underlying loyalism and teleology of the work by putting the whole Khmelnytsky story into the political context of the historical inevitability and *reason* (or *zakonomernost'*) of the unification of Ukraine with Russia—which is then sealed at the very end with a dedication of the poem to Tsar Nicholas I. In effect, rhetorically and ideologically the poem marks out the outlines of the “little Russian” (or “molorussian”) discourse that was to compete with the emerging Ukrainian national discourse throughout the rest of the century.

. . .

Ievhen Hrebinka's drama *Bogdan*, subtitled *Stseny iz zhizni maloros-siikogo getmana Zinoviia Khmel'nitskogo* (Scenes from the Life of Little Russian Hetman Zinovii Khmel'nitskii), which explicitly and indeed programmatically positions itself in the Ukrainian literary canon (even while still being written in Russian), was published in parts between 1839 and 1841 and then in its entirety in 1843; in each case the venue was a St. Petersburg journal.<sup>47</sup> Like the preceding anonymous poem about Bohdan Khmelnytsky, *Bogdan* is also an eclectic work, but even more baggy and remarkably prolix. It begins with a long Prologue, the first part of which is an interminable (almost six pages) rumination—along with a chorus of *rusalki*—on the charms of the Ukrainian night (i.e., the by-then-famous Gogolian topos, “Do you know the Ukrainian night? O, you do not know the Ukrainian night!” [Znaete li vy ukrainskuiu noch'? O, vy ne znaete

ukrainskoi nochi!]), which, however, is populated by various spirits of the night. The night then turns Shakespearean, or specifically Macbethian, as various dark shadows from the past appear, that is, shadows of the various leaders of Cossack uprisings against the Poles, Pavliuk, Ostrianytsia, Nalyvaiko, who speak of their martyrdom at the hands of the Poles (and Hrebinka specifically footnotes his sources for the various gory details, that is, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* of Bantysh-Kamenskii and the *Istoriia rusov*.<sup>48</sup> (The first of these shadows, Pavliuk, begins his speech, “I, Pavliuk, Hetman of the Christian-Cossacks, / Have raised my arms against the evil Jews . . .” [Ia Pavliuk, ia getman khristiiian-kazakov; / Ia oruzh’e podniai na poganykh zhidov . . . ], and then moves directly to the keys-to-the-church topos we had just seen in Ryleev’s fragment. That unpublished manuscript could hardly have been known by Hrebinka, but it does attest to the viability of the topos and its role in justifying the uprisings—and archetypically linking the violence to religion.)

From the quasi-folkloric and Gothic Prologue, the drama moves to a verse description of Khmelnytsky (shifting, as it were, to dramatic poem) and then, in Scene 2, presents him in dialogue with a priest with whom he discusses the moral choices he faces in rising up against lawful authority, that is, the king. The crypto-dialogue (the priest has little to say) is in fact an opportunity to recount the early history of Khmelnytsky, the story of his neighbor Czaplicki and his lawlessness, Khmelnytsky’s trip to Warsaw to see the king (who urges him—another key topos in the story—to defend himself with force of arms (“So what prevents you, Khmelnytsky, / To defend your rights by your own means, / And as long as your swords have not grown dull?” [Da chto, skazhi Khmel’nitskii, vam meshaet / Samim svoi otstaivat’ prava, / Poka u vas ne pritupilis’ sabli?]<sup>49</sup>). Scene 3 is an imagined dialogue with the pro-Polish Cossack colonel Barabash, who advises loyalty to the crown and urges conformism and the usual sybaritic life of the nobles. Scenes 4 to 7 present versified accounts of the intervening events of the first year (1647–48) of the uprising (again with several footnotes to the historical sources) and culminate with Khmelnytsky’s apotheosis (“Cossack freedom was again resurrected / Khmelnytsky, the Hetman, the defender of the people / Hurries in state to Kiev . . . / And in Kiev the army, the people and all the worthies / Bestow on Khmelnytsky the name ‘Bohdan’” [Voskresnula snova kozach’ia svoboda / Khmel’nitskii getman, izbavitel’ naroda / Torzhestvenno v Kiev speshit . . . / A v Kieve voisko, narod i sinklit / Daruet

Khmel'nitskomu imia Bogdana]); the last line is again footnoted with a reference to Bantysh-Kamenskii). Scene 8 is another dialogue with the priest, which now serves as an opportunity for Khmelnytsky to discuss his political plans now that he has been victorious, that is, to whom is he to submit? Go back to vassalage to Poland? To the Ottoman Porte? The option of an independent Ukraine is simply not considered, after all, who is he, Khmelnytsky, to aspire to the status of a sovereign ruler: "I'm a simple Cossack, can I aspire / To raise myself to that position! / I have no wish to spill more blood / And a sea of troubles on our poor Ukraine. / We have enough example in Godunov, / Who ruled so miserably in Rus'" [ . . . ia prostoi kozak, mogu li dumat' / Vozvysitsia i stat' na stepen' etu! . . . / Ia ne khochu naklikat' snova krov' / I bedstviia na bedniu Ukrainu. / Dovol'no nam primera Godunova, / Chto tsarstvoval tak gor'ko na Rusi] (227)? The notion that the issue is not his person but the nation he purports to represent simply never enters the equation. Indeed after some thought his decision is made; it is, after all, self-evident.

Yes, I want, I need to and I will achieve  
The destiny that God has placed on me!

. . .

And thus I see: a tsardom without measure  
Reaching many seas;  
The West and East, The South as well as North  
Have all become as one;  
Throughout a Slavic tongue  
And everywhere a holy and righteous faith  
And all is ruled by one great Tsar . . .  
And the name of that miraculous realm is Russia!

[Da, ia khochu, zhelaiu i ispolniu  
Mne bogom dannoe prednaznachen'e! . . .

. . .

I vizhu ia: tam tsarstvo bez granitsy  
Nadvynulos' na mnogie moria;  
I zapad, i vostok, i iug i sever  
V odno slilis'; vezde iazyk slavianskii,  
Vezde sviataia, pravednaia vera,  
I pravil im odin velikii tsar' . . .  
I tsarstvo to chudesnoe—Rossiia!] (229)

The penultimate scene (9) shows equally perfunctory images of the Ukrainian countryside, of Cossacks and peasants (in a kind of Potemkin village *avant la lettre*) awaiting a history-changing event. The event itself, the final scene, is now highlighted with a separate subtitle, “Os’moe ianvaria 1654 goda” (January 8, 1654), and depicts the Pereiaslav treaty. It appears as a set piece—the “official ratification,” so to say. The *narod* gathers: Cossacks, the Cossack starshyna, a folk bandurist utterly moved by the occasion. We even hear parts of his song: (“Two brothers have embraced / And they are strong again / Like Great Russia and Mother Ukraine” [Brat’ia obnialis’ rodnye / I sil’ny opiat’, / Kak velikaia Rossiia / Da Ukraina-mat”]; 246). Khmelnytsky puts the matter to a vote: “Do you Cossacks wish to swear with us / An oath of loyalty to the tsar of Muscovy, of fealty to Russia?” [Khotite li vy, kazaki, s nami / Prisiagu dat’ moskovskomu tsariu / Na poddanstvo Rossii?] There is no discussion. The vote carries: “The people (throwing their caps in the air): We swear! We swear!” [Narod (brosaiia kverkhu shapki): Volim! Volim!] (248). The reader, however, may be left wondering: Was this work written in 1843 or 1954? Even a quick synopsis reveals some basic problems, both in this work and in the genre of the Khmelnytsky story. Hrebinka’s particular weaknesses—his lack of dramatic control, his eclecticism, echoes of *kotliarevshchyna*,<sup>50</sup> turgid verse, and general reliance on clichés and stereotype—should not conceal the larger systemic fact that the Khmelnytsky story, even though not that frequently attempted, seems to be encountering a paralyzing contextual inertia.

. . .

The case of Mykola Kostomarov, the eminent Ukrainian and Russian historian, a major figure, along with Shevchenko and Kulish, in the Ukrainian national revival of the nineteenth century and a prominent Ukrainian writer of the period, is most instructive here. In 1841 he published in the Ukrainian almanac *Snip* (The Sheaf) a tragedy entitled “Pereiaslavs’ka nich,” which deals with the first year of the Khmelnytsky uprising and also draws on a stereotypical cast of characters, including the Jew Ovrām and the key-to-the-church motif. But Khmelnytsky himself is not depicted. That depiction was to appear later in the decade, when he wrote his “Ukrainskie sceny iz 1649 goda.” First published posthumously in his *Literaturnoe nasledie*,<sup>51</sup> these scenes were found in his papers and are assumed to have been written in the late 1840s, primarily in Saratov, where Kostomarov was exiled after his arrest in the Cyrylo-Methodian case. As “scenes” they are much

more coherent and focused than the just-discussed *Bogdan*: they focus on a rather short interval in 1649 when, after his various victories over the Poles, Khmelnytsky was negotiating with high commissioners of the Polish Commonwealth on the future course of Polish-Cossack relations. The scenes have a rather broad cast of characters, both Polish and Cossack (Kysil' and Vyhovskii, Lentovskii and Nemyrych, and others as well), each with a distinct and often colorful voice; but what is most telling is that the tone and content of their discourse implicitly assumes a mostly adult audience, one standing in sharp contrast to the unabashedly infantile level of Hrebinka's drama as well as the anonymous poem discussed earlier.

What is even more striking, however, is that these dramatic scenes, basically speeches, but also responses, comments, and so on, in Ukrainian, with only Russian stage directions, were subsequently fully incorporated into Kostomarov's major history of Khmelnytsky, his multivolume *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (1857, 1859).<sup>52</sup> A remarkable substitution seems to be occurring here: the mode of belletristic presentation that has so evidently been losing intellectual authority and creative originality and authenticity, as witnessed by the works of Hrebinka and the anonymous poem attributed to Maksymovych, is now being bodily transposed into another mode with different standards and criteria. Later historiography, to be sure, would also charge Kostomarov's history with being belletristic (a separate, if fraught, issue)—but in the context of the mid-nineteenth century and the evolution of the Khmelnytsky reception the difference here is fundamental: one need only compare the pages upon pages of bibliographic and archival sources with which Kostomarov prefaces his study with the evanescent intellectual, conceptual, and source apparatus that characterized the earlier works.

. . .

A discussion of Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian literature of the Romantic period would obviously not be complete without Shevchenko. Merely to bring him into the picture, however, is to change the frame and dynamic of the discussion. Shevchenko's discourse, specifically in the poetry, changes the rules of the game much more fundamentally than even Kostomarov with his turn to history proper. For Shevchenko basically dismisses the empire-centered, "malorosian" discourse on Khmelnytsky in its entirety—while also directly challenging the iconic status of the hetman as the "father of the nation." In various of his "political poems," most of all in "Velykyi l'okh" (The Great Crypt), he directly or implicitly casts Khmelnytsky as

a failed and foolish leader who contributed to the present enslavement of Ukraine by Russia, precisely through his naïve treaty with Muscovy in 1654. No other estimation for Khmelnytsky but this exists for Shevchenko; his rejection is categorical. In order for its full dimension to be apprehended, however, it needs to be part of a general reading of Shevchenko's poetry and his self-perception as poet, and that is a separate task.

. . .

The rejection of Khmelnytsky by Kulish, the other major articulator of the Ukrainian cause in the nineteenth century, is in some ways more nuanced than Shevchenko's, while at the same time it transcends the Romantic period and speaks to a modern understanding of nationhood and national legacy. Characteristically, it is also couched in the historical or historical-polemical mode, particularly his *Istoriia vossoedineniia Rusi* (History of the Reunification of Rus'; in three volumes, 1874–1877) and the *Otpadenie Malorossii ot Pol'shi* (The Revolt of Little Russia Against Poland; also in three volumes, 1888). The picture of Khmelnytsky that emerges from these works is devastatingly negative, but it's a very different kind of critique from the ethnocentric and fundamentally orientalist if not outright racist versions of a Franciszek Rawita-Gawroński or a Henryk Sienkiewicz (although in some surface features they seem to be parallel). For Kulish the issue is paradoxically cast in both Enlightenment and positivist (or sociological) terms: not only did the hetman unleash the period of Ruin and devastation, but his concern was not with structures, institutions, and society, and instead with “asiatic” self-aggrandizement and with inherent Machiavellianism. This, too, must be contextualized, especially within modern Ukrainian historiographic traditions—and as such it anticipates a separate task.

### Preliminary Conclusions: The Problem of Transference

For the pre-Romantics (both Polish and Russian) the Khmelnytsky theme has intellectual and ideological, that is, Enlightenment, currency. With time, in both Russian and Ukrainian literature, its cultural, historical, and iconic weight tends to “distort” the efforts of weaker writers (Hrebinka, the pseudo-Maksymovych, et al.), and their efforts at coping (self-conscious footnotes and intertexts, etc.) appear as ineffectual and all-

too-obvious. The strong writers, Shevchenko, Kulish, Kostomarov, each in his own way, change the rules of engagement to avoid the stultifying effect of a hypercanonicity imposed by literary (conventional), but even more so extraliterary (political and cultural) factors. No such strictures obtained in the Polish case (other than issues of censorship within the Russian empire), but here too there is an implicit saturation or simply avoidance effect. Even if the major Polish Romantics do not engage the Khmelnytsky theme, they can hardly avoid or ignore—insofar as it is something beyond pure cognition and intellection—that larger Ukrainian Cossack theme in which it is imbedded. The reason for this—and it applies to all three literatures—is the profound cathectic function of the topic: the Khmelnytsky story, like the broader Ukrainian Cossack theme in which it inheres, dealt with collective memory and trauma and the collective shadow and (for the Poles and Ukrainians, and even in part for the Russians) with identity as well, and hence it could not but draw the attention of various writers. A basic mechanism that emerges both in Polish and in Ukrainian literature for circumventing the “dead hand” of convention and canonicity was the substitution of the objective correlative (to harken back to that idiom), or, to evoke the cathectic and the psychologically charged, the workings of transference. (In Russian literature this is not the case by reason of a break in the seemingly common Ukrainian-Russian canon and the past it dealt with: after the 1830s, and especially after Shevchenko, that content was now ever more clearly the purview of Ukrainian literature. For Russian literature it was no longer cathectic—as witnessed by the loss of interest in the Ukrainian theme by midcentury.) In both Ukrainian and Polish literature, on the other hand, the transference in question involves a shift of cathectic focus, basically from Khmelnytsky to the *koliivshchyna* of 1768, the last and bloodiest of the peasant rebellions of the eighteenth century—and to their leaders, Zalizniak and Gonta, especially the latter. To paraphrase a saying current in the early Soviet period: “Gonta is today’s Khmelnytsky.” As can be imagined, the estimations were polar: the great majority of Polish Romantic writers, especially the conservatives, Grabowski, Rzewuski and others, but also such Cossacophiles as Michał Czajkowski, were totally critical. And yet, even here there were nuances—as in Goszczyński’s *Zamek kaniowski* (The Castle of Kaniv), and Słowacki’s *Sen srebrny Salomei* (The Silver Dream of Salomeia), not to speak of the radical socialist and emigre “Gromada Humań,” which took for itself the very name of the locus of atrocity—the Uman’ massacre—to call attention to the unresolved conflicts within Polish



society. In Ukrainian literature the issue is centered on Shevchenko and his poem *Haidamaky* (1841), which opens a new dimension in national mythmaking, martyrology, and the examination and co-creation of collective memory and identity. It is presented, moreover, with a degree of subtlety and ambiguity that counters the very martyrology and mythmaking that animate the poem. Khmelnytsky is nowhere mentioned in *Haidamaky*, but his spirit and legacy are not that far from it; they have been transferred, not exorcised. The charged reception of *Haidamaky* is ongoing to this day—as a not-so-distant echo of our subject.<sup>53</sup>

# 5

## Heroes and Villains in the Historical Imagination The Elusive Khmelnytsky

*Taras Koznarsky*

IN APRIL 1847, Russian imperial police arrested a group of young Ukrainian intellectuals and literati who included Mykola Kostomarov, Taras Shevchenko, Mykola Hulak, and Panteleimon Kulish—members of a purportedly dangerous, secret organization known as the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius. A corpus of incriminating documents was confiscated and subjected to close scrutiny, including letters and literary and polemical works. In addition to Shevchenko’s poetry (for which the outraged tsar meted out a harsh punishment to the poet), several other texts were deemed particularly harmful. A manuscript, “Zakon bozhyi” (God’s Law) or “Knyha buttia ukraïns’koho narodu” (The Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian Nation), modeled on Adam Mickiewicz’s “Księgi narodu polskiego i pielgrzymstwa polskiego” (Books of the Polish Nation and Polish Pilgrimage), depicted Ukraine as a victim at the hands of despotic neighbors, the Polish Commonwealth, and Muscovite tsardom and foresaw its rise as a free polity in the family of Slavic nations. Pressed by investigators, Mykola Kostomarov testified that he had copied this work as a curiosity from an officer named Khmelnytsky, claiming that they had been guests at the same house for a short time in Kharkiv in 1836 or 1837.<sup>1</sup> The distraught Kostomarov advanced a few more details: this Khmelnytsky had served in the Special Caucasus Corps at the rank of ensign, took part in the campaign against the Turks, and after his stopover in Kharkiv left for Petersburg. Kostomarov said that Ensign Khmelnytsky was a young gentleman of medium height and dark complexion with a brown mustache and a hyphenated last name (the second part of which Kostomarov said he couldn’t remember). For months,

the imperial police spun their wheels, searching through lists of Petersburg residents—all in vain. Aside from a petty clerk (not unlike the Gogolian Akaki Akakievich) and a widow of a civil servant, the authorities were unable to track down any Khmelnytskys, hyphenated or otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

Unlike Hulak or Shevchenko, Kostomarov was no stoic, let alone a fighter. Confronted red-handed with the incriminating “God’s Law,” a stylized messianic manifesto he most likely wrote himself (the two copies that were found were in his handwriting), he blurted out the first idea that came into his head—Khmelnytsky. And what an idea! After all, Khmelnytsky was “Bohdan,” God-given, a Ukrainian Moses, and the subject of historiographic narratives, literary works, and ideological constructs. In the eighteenth-century drama *Mylost’ Bozhia* (God’s Grace), Khmelnytsky had been cast as an agent of divine Grace who brought about Ukraine’s liberation; so who better than Khmelnytsky to deliver God’s law or the book of genesis of the Ukrainian people? By the time of Kostomarov’s arrest, he had written a dramatic piece depicting Khmelnytsky’s victorious entry into Kyiv that included a charged conversation between the hetman and Polish envoy-dignitaries at a banquet table (*Ukrainskie stseny iz 1649 goda* [Ukrainian Scenes from 1649]). Moreover, he was also in the process of writing a monograph on Khmelnytsky, which police seized among his other papers.<sup>3</sup> While Kostomarov sent the literal-minded police on a chase all over the empire for the specter of a young dark-complexioned fellow with a mustache, the culprit could easily have been found elsewhere: in the realm of Ukrainian history, in the virtual gallery of mustached Cossack leaders. The police needed not have looked further than the lavishly published first edition of the history of Little Russia by Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, which sported a number of engraved portraits, including one of Khmelnytsky that fits Kostomarov’s description quite nicely (Fig. 5.1).<sup>4</sup>

This episode points to the peculiar position Khmelnytsky occupied in the imagination of Ukrainian elites in the first decades of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, as the chief Cossack hero, he epitomized the vindication of Ukraine in the face of its oppressors. He also embodied national historical agency at the highest, divinely sanctioned, “triumphal” level. Yet he submitted this agency into the hands of Muscovite monarchs, sealing the destiny of Ukraine within the Russian empire. However one assesses these two poles of a single axis, it is beyond question that Khmelnytsky became central to Ukrainian historical memory and imagination, acquiring a breadth of roles and incarnations that I shall chart in



FIGURE 5.1. Front matter and portrait of Khmelnytsky from Bantysh-Kamenskii’s *History of Little Russia* (Moscow, 1822)

this chapter. The functions of Khmelnytsky—as hero, adventurer, warrior, statesman, politician, vehicle of divine grace, focus of collective identification, point of political reference were used, actualized, and promoted in various combinations by historians and literati, depending on the discourse, genre, and purpose of a text. The corpus of these manifestations of the hetman is fairly sizable and varied, encompassing historiography, folkloric corpuses, novels, poems, and drama. Some of these works tackle the hetman directly, as a protagonist or central character, and in a few he is present in the memory or imagination of the narrator. Regardless of the agenda, all of these manifestations are interconnected by virtue of the syncretic nature of the Romantic discourse, its dynamic, protean quality, omnivorous and improvisatory approach to sources, and porous boundaries.

This chapter examines the structuring and functioning of the cult of Khmelnytsky in the Ukrainian discourse of the first decades of the nineteenth century, focusing on historiographical, polemical, and journalistic endeavors. The first section, “Vessels of History,” examines articulations of the cult of Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian historic narratives of several genres, focusing on their stock repertoires of heroic qualities. The second section,

“Shadows of the Past,” explores the significance of this cult for facilitating the Ukrainian historical narrative itself and interprets the cult as a therapeutic response to the curse of Mazepa, cast on Ukrainians in the Russian popular imagination. By examining how the characters of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa are structured, I show how these figures mirror one another as vessels of charisma, emphatically confirmed in historical narratives in Khmelnytsky’s case and just as effortfully denied in Mazepa’s. Finally, in the third section “A Hero in Action,” I explore how the personal qualities of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa are mirrored, especially as clustered around the variously shaped concepts of “secrecy.”

### Vessels of History

The most influential source in Ukrainian history was a spirited polemical tract masquerading as a chronicle, *Istoriia rusov* (History of the Rus’ People), probably written in the late 1810s.<sup>5</sup> The work held sway on the historical and cultural imagination of Ukrainian and some Russian intellectuals and writers of the Romantic age. Building on its eighteenth-century predecessors (the Cossack chronicles, such as Hrabianka’s, and Western sources, such as Schérer), *History of the Rus’ People* puts forward a narrative of Little Russia-Ukraine as descending from the medieval polity Rus’ and thus steeped in liberty and ancient privileges and confident in its glory. The destiny of Cossack Ukraine unfolds along the nodal points of collective memory: ancient glory (Rus’ princes), betrayal (Polish mistreatment of Ukraine), suffering (the sadistic executions of rebellious Cossack leaders, with Nalyvaiko as the most exemplary martyr), triumph (Khmelnytsky’s war leading to the liberation of Ukraine and his pact with the Muscovite tsar), deviation (Ukraine’s fragmentation in the Period of Ruin) and treason (Mazepa’s betrayal, for which all Ukraine suffered), new sufferings (Hetman Polubotok, a martyred advocate for Ukraine’s liberties), and limbo (dissolution of the Hetmanate under the last hetman, Rozumovsky). In this chain of events and states, Khmelnytsky occupies the lion’s share of attention.<sup>6</sup> Amplifying the earlier tradition (eighteenth-century chronicles and literary works),<sup>7</sup> *History of the Rus’ People* exhibits the full-fledged cult of Khmelnytsky as charismatic leader, with the added sheen of enlightenment and preromantic ideas.

In *History of the Rus’ People*, Władysław IV, “a known Ukrainian patriot,” nearly sanctions Khmelnytsky’s revolt so that his actions in no

way undercut the personal bonds of loyalty. On the contrary, Khmelnytsky's war is presented as fully justified, waged against magnates who unlawfully enslaved and tortured Ukraine.<sup>8</sup> Quoted in this work are Khmelnytsky's rousing speech to the Cossacks and eloquent and often aphoristic pronouncements, along with decrees, letters, and pacts—whether documented or purported. On his victorious arrival in Kyiv in 1648, he is declared “the father of the fatherland and the liberator of the fatherland and the people.”<sup>9</sup> The *Khmelnytsky of History of the Rus' People* acts as a magnanimous commander, allowing those Polish nobles and Jews who were recognized by his people as well behaved to leave the towns incorporated into the Cossack administration in peace and with honor.<sup>10</sup> Here, the hetman's pact with the Muscovite tsar appears to be the Cossacks' choice, made freely after heated deliberations about the four rulers eager to ally with Ukraine. In this account, the Cossacks choose to place their trust in the Orthodox monarch regardless of threats issued by the spurned rulers. This union of the valorous Cossack Ukraine with Russia is depicted as the act that elevated, indeed transformed, Russia into a powerhouse on the political map of Europe.<sup>11</sup> Yet the narrative also casts the union as a “bitter pill” that not only caused the hetman headaches but led to his untimely death, brought on by pressures and the treachery of external powers and internal enemies.<sup>12</sup>

The author lavishes remarkable attention on Khmelnytsky's death, describing it as a catalyst for national consolidation through grief and commemoration: “Sobs and cries tore the air, and indescribable lament went on everywhere. All mourned him as one's own father, all bewailed: ‘Who will now disperse our enemies and protect us from them? Our sun has grown dark . . .’”<sup>13</sup> The collective outpouring gives way to rational consolidation of Khmelnytsky as a national hero and “an ardent patriot of his nation”:

With his superior intellect, he was very good-hearted and just. In national matters, he was the consummate politician, and at war—a fearless and enterprising leader. His bravery was equal to indifference [to danger/death]. In victory, he never grew arrogant, in his misfortunes, did not despair. His patience through the most difficult labors and deeds never flagged. Hunger and thirst, cold and heat, he endured with the greatest composure. He so loved his fatherland and his people that he always and without complaint sacrificed for them his peace, health, and life itself. In a word, he was a superior leader amidst his people, and an incomparable commander of the army.<sup>14</sup>

Khmelnytsky's qualities catalogued above exemplify the national hero, to be emulated by every patriot of Ukraine. As indicated by an inscription on his funerary portrait included in the text, his qualities and valorous deeds place the hetman in the European (universal) pantheon:

Thus is drawn the image of the Cossack hero,  
Who resembles the Greeks at whose hands Troy collapsed!  
What Pompei and Caesar were in Rome—  
This is what Khmelnytsky meant for the Russes by his deeds.<sup>15</sup>

Thus “a son of his fatherland became its father.” Khmelnytsky's burial site may have been destroyed by the Polish army in 1664, but *History of the Rus' People* provides a textual, virtual site for his commemoration. This section, which articulates and seals the legacy of Khmelnytsky, is monumental to the point of cliché, buttressing the legacy and destiny of Ukraine and anchoring Ukrainian identity in the sturdiest Cossack hero. *History of the Rus' People* was written during a surge of patriotic zeal among Ukrainian elites of the Napoleonic era, which rose hand in hand with their social and cultural aspirations. After their victorious march through Europe, the briefly reinstated Cossack regiments were disbanded by the imperial authorities, and the tug-of-war process of nobilitation resumed, with the rights of Cossack families to hereditary noble status questioned.<sup>16</sup> *History of the Rus' People* advanced the agenda of Ukrainian elites through the carefully crafted form of the historical manuscript (chronicle). Ukraine's historical narratives were also produced in contemporary genres (essays, letters, etc.), with Bohdan Khmelnytsky invariably occupying a dominant role.

The first Ukrainian periodical, the journal *Ukrainskii vestnik* (Ukrainian Herald), published by the circle of literati associated with Kharkiv University, opened with the piece “Getman Khmel'nitskii” (Hetman Khmelnytsky), attributed to Rozumnyk Honorsky.<sup>17</sup> Most of the essay consists of an unreferenced translation, compiled from Jean-Benoit Schérer's *Annales de la Petite-Russie* (1788), where the Cossacks are characterized as a virtuous and noble estate, comparable to the ancient Spartans and Romans—to refute attempts to label them traitors.<sup>18</sup> Bolstered by the objective opinion of a foreigner, Honorsky amplifies the civility and honor of the Cossacks by casting them, as a nation, in the mold of a universal Hero-Patriot whose deeds and sacrifices evoke feelings of gratitude in any unbiased man.<sup>19</sup> This honor is passed to the present generations of the Cossacks by virtue of descent, service, and tradition, now ameliorated by civilization: “Don't you

see in every Cossack a veritable Hercules? He is a son of luxurious Asia, fortified by all the adversities of the North.”<sup>20</sup> Sealing his characterization of the Cossacks and their contemporary descendants, Honorsky turns to Ukrainian history in the form of an encomium to Khmelnytsky: “Let us call forth from the darkness of the past a man who dedicated himself to the benefit of the fatherland: let him be the eternal reproach to the careless, and a firm lesson to the alert! What Little Russian could remain indifferent to the name Khmelnytsky?”<sup>21</sup> Hence the universal category of “Hero” is filled in with Ukrainian content, as epitomized by Khmelnytsky. This great man “of truly Cossack countenance” was enriched by learning and fortified by the injustices and vicissitudes that befell him. He didn’t chase glory, but glory followed him.<sup>22</sup> This carefully assembled preamble to the historical account of Khmelnytsky creates a self-endorsing, self-referencing system of values. The universal charisma of the Hero-Patriot is revealed in a Cossack-Hercules as a virtuous collective image and transferred to Khmelnytsky as the most exemplary representative of this group, and vice versa—Khmelnytsky’s personal charisma is redirected to the collective body of the Cossack estate—personal and national charismas reinforcing one another.<sup>23</sup> The essay “Getman Khmel’nitskii” is nothing short of an ideological and cultural program of the Ukrainian gentry in post-Napoleonic times. The centrality of the hetman to Ukrainian agendas (the Ukrainian discourse) of the period is in evidence in the first volumes of *Ukrainian Herald*, the journal serving as a forum for concurrent articulations of Ukrainian historical narratives. One M. Hrybovsky begins his historical notes on Ukraine from the 1650s to the fateful 1709 Battle of Poltava with an assessment of how the death of “our unforgettable” Khmelnytsky caused new pains to Little Russia, which had just begun to renew her strength after a long struggle with a foreign enemy and internal strife.<sup>24</sup> Ilia Kvitka, in his short survey “Kratkoe istoricheskoe opisaniie Maloi Rossii” (A Short Historical Description of Little Russia), thus commemorates the hetman: “Few of the great men accomplished as much for the well-being of one’s motherland as he did. Monuments are erected to all such men, and all of them are extolled in histories and poems. But for him—only his deeds and his name endure as a monument, and not a sign marks the place where his remains are concealed!”<sup>25</sup>

Nourished by the Ukrainian elites, absorbed from the Cossack historical tradition, the cult of Khmelnytsky made its way into Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii’s *Istoriia Maloi Rossii: so vremen prisoedineniia onoi k rossiiskomu*



*gosudarstvu pri Tsare Aleksee Mikhailoviche, s kratkim obozreniem pervobytnago sostoianiia sego kraia* (History of Little Russia from the Times of Her Joining the Russian State During the Reign of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, Together with a Survey of the Prior State of This Country).<sup>26</sup> A descendant of a Moldovan noble family with strong Ukrainian ties and born and educated in Moscow, Bantysh was charged with writing a Little Russian history at the start of his service in the office of the governor of Little Russia, Prince Nikolai Repnin, in 1816. With sound archeographic experience and the full support of Repnin (who even contributed a chapter), Bantysh succeeded in producing a solidly researched work that, even though reflecting the Ukrainophile sentiments of his milieu, nonetheless firmly placed the Ukrainian historical narrative within the imperial frame of reference. Making the point that history proper begins for the Little Russian polity with its union with the Muscovite tsardom, the historian charts prior events in a fifty-page introduction (with separate Roman pagination).<sup>27</sup> Hence, Khmelnytsky appears in the introduction to Little Russian history in the depiction of the Battle of Cecora (Battle of Țuțora) between the Polish and Ottoman forces as a remarkable warrior of the Commonwealth “who will afterward occupy the chief place in the history of Little Russia.”<sup>28</sup> Most of Khmelnytsky’s career as a hetman is found in the introduction: his victories at Zhovti Vody and Korsun, his entry into Kyiv as “a liberator of all Ukraine,” announced by the clergy as “the true Bohdan, God-given,”<sup>29</sup> and the Treaty of Zboriv. Only after Khmelnytsky exhibits the clear intention of bringing Little Russia into the fold of Russia does history proper begin. Despite the destruction of the Cossack army at Berestechko (for which *History* makes the hetman responsible),<sup>30</sup> Khmelnytsky remains a charismatic leader whose brow is “decorated with everlasting laurels”<sup>31</sup>—and his return home without an army does not prevent the people from placing their faith in him. The hetman’s alliance with the tsar reverses Ukraine’s misfortunes in repelling the Polish attacks. Khmelnytsky’s address to the Cossack leaders on his deathbed serves (as in *History of the Rus’ People*) as a ritual of national consolidation through grief and elicits a collective pledge of commitment to his political legacy, where Cossack loyalty to the tsar takes priority. Bantysh concludes his treatment of Khmelnytsky with a stock summary of heroic qualities from Cossack chronicles, “balanced” by the Polish opinion (Kochowski) of him as an ignoble, inconstant, disloyal man, a “new Tamerlane,” “whose sheer luck far exceeded his worth.”<sup>32</sup> The historian recognizes the validity of both views as dependent on perspective

(Ukrainian or Polish), making the figure of Khmelnytsky ambivalent in the field of universal history. Lavishly published in Moscow in 1822, the work brought its author a higher rank and a reputation as a historian, if not unanimous approval among Ukrainian readers, some of whom complained that Bantysh's narrative was cursory in presenting the Cossack military and economic history of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.<sup>33</sup>

### Shadows of the Past

The cult of Khmelnytsky, invariably present in the Ukrainian historical discourse, in fact serves as its most strategic symbolic capital, providing a culminating moment for Ukraine's historical narrative and a focus for the positive collective identification of the descendants of Cossacks. Whatever the subtexts, directions, and agendas of the variously shaped Ukrainian historical narratives (and different they are!), Khmelnytsky provided impetus and legitimacy to the very enterprise of Ukrainian history as a field at odds with the Russian historical narrative that was avidly explored and shaped in the same period by Russian intellectuals and literati, steeped in national pride, Romantic ideas, and imperial civilizational zest. Khmelnytsky (and Cossack Ukraine) would not have fit very well in Karamzin's magisterial survey, which absorbed the legacy of Rus' into the dynastic framework of the Russian empire.<sup>34</sup> Polevoi's national framework (in his history of the Russian people) would have also been a poor fit, had Polevoi continued his work beyond Godunov.<sup>35</sup> In the Russian historical narrative, Cossack Ukraine is but a brief episode in the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich.<sup>36</sup> In Nikolai Ustrialov's standard survey of Russian history, the union of Little and Great Russia is characterized as a lofty plan of the Muscovite monarch, the only legitimate vessel of historical agency, who followed the traditions of the gathering of the Russian lands carried out by his predecessors.<sup>37</sup>

With Khmelnytsky's help, Ukrainian intellectuals carved a politically legitimate space in which historical agency could be assigned to Ukrainian heroes and the Ukrainian people, who directly shaped their destiny and contributed to universal history. This is why we do not encounter any significant attempt by Ukrainians to challenge the cult of Khmelnytsky until Taras Shevchenko's prophetic and polemical poems of the second half of the 1840s. Even for those Ukrainian historical enterprises that veered toward the subversive, Khmelnytsky remained indispensable as a hero.<sup>38</sup> Yet even in those Ukrainian historical narratives that embraced the open

public script of loyalty to the empire, the figure of the hetman presented a number of problems. These problems only began with the paucity of sources able to reliably document his biography, family background, and even political career.

In the stock language of the cult, the hero Khmelnytsky (carrier of charisma), given by God to Ukraine, acts to vindicate her sufferings, defeat her enemies, and steer her to safe haven, thus epitomizing Ukrainian national agency at its highest. A vessel of political genius and providential grace, Khmelnytsky, chosen by Ukraine (not born a ruler), performs extraordinary deeds worthy of a sovereign, breaking down the existing order and establishing a new realm (Cossack Ukraine), thus performing political transcendence.<sup>39</sup> Yet what happens to this exceptional agency once Khmelnytsky submits to the tsar of Muscovy, whose powers are granted by natural law?<sup>40</sup> Does Khmelnytsky's charisma "expire," or does it transfer to the Russian monarch? Do the national sources of this charisma become redirected to Ukraine's new legitimate ruler, the Orthodox sovereign? Should Ukraine's history begin or end there? These questions do not have easy answers and are tackled differently within various Ukrainian projects, depending on the medium and aim. In the first edition of Bantysh's *History of Little Russia*, after the Pereiaslav Treaty Khmelnytsky partakes in joint Cossack-Muscovite campaigns and remains steadfast in his loyalty. His strength diminishes (as if through rapid aging), but Ukraine's well-being is secure in the union. In *History of the Rus' People*, Khmelnytsky, although a subject of the tsar, continues as an independent ruler of Ukraine through his direct dealings with European and Ottoman sovereigns.

The death of Khmelnytsky is mourned deeply by all Ukraine, signaling the beginning of wars and divisive internal strife, known as the Period of Ruin. The agency of numerous Cossack leaders, pulling in different directions, is now shorn of providential sanction as they struggle to realign Ukraine's orientation and loyalty. Mazepa's election in 1687 could have ended this state of pain and tumult; he successfully ruled for more than twenty years (longer than any other hetman). However, his act of treason profoundly affected the course of Ukraine's history, and Ukrainian historians were careful in handling the two stable decades of his leadership, separating the treason of Mazepa as an individual from the loyalty and service of the Ukrainian Cossacks to the tsar.

Thus in Ukrainian historical narratives, the Ruin became a tragic interlude between two opposing periods of import, the hetmancies of Khmel-

nytsky and Mazepa, as captured in the Ukrainian popular saying, “From Bohdan to Ivan, we have had no hetman [in our land].”<sup>41</sup> These two periods marking Ukraine’s zenith and nadir, triumph and treason, form the main axis of the Ukrainian historical narrative that sought to explain the current state of Ukrainian elites and support their aspirations within the Russian empire. The demonized image of Mazepa, the symbol and cause of Cossack Ukraine’s downfall, was assembled in direct contrast to that of Khmelnytsky, creating a cliché that denounced him as a villain. In *History of the Rus’ People*, Mazepa figures as a “natural Pole,” a tyrant disliked and feared by his people, who in order to maintain his rule had to rely on hired soldiers, and whose fateful betrayal was caused by his personal vengefulness and malice—“not at all in the national interest.”<sup>42</sup> Since the fateful year 1709, the anathematization of Mazepa was a fixture of the Russian political and historical discourse. However, this demonization also shaped its opposite, the cult of Khmelnytsky—which after the defeat of Charles XII and his ally Mazepa at Poltava, when the very existence of the Cossacks became compromised and openly questioned by the Russian imperial administration, became all the more vital for the self-presentation and preservation of Ukrainian elites. I would argue that the cult of Khmelnytsky developed to compensate for the curse of Mazepa, which stigmatized the Ukrainian Cossack elites in the Russian historical and popular imagination as traitors (*Mazepas*, Mazepa’s spirit, Mazepists), and to provide a powerful focal point for the Ukrainian elites’ identification and mobilization.<sup>43</sup>

The denunciation (anathema) of Mazepa that propagated collective guilt and trauma was thus therapeutically circumvented by the celebration of triumph, dignity, and loyalty, cultivating a much more positive self-image of the Cossacks. Yet both acts (performances) were necessary for the configuration and maintenance of Ukrainian collective identity within the Russian empire. Should we then be surprised that after Khmelnytsky the next most important topic of the Ukrainian historical narrative is Mazepa, occupying, for example, the next largest segment of *History of the Rus’ People*?<sup>44</sup> Much more surprising, however, is the distribution of text in the first edition of Bantysh-Kamenskii’s *History of Little Russia* (1822). Partly due to the historian’s position that history proper begins for Little Russia only with her unification with Great Russia, partly due to the then-available corpus of sources in Cossack history, the narrative dedicated to Khmelnytsky occupies a section of the introduction and the first chapter of the first volume, roughly seventy pages in length,<sup>45</sup> while the account of

Mazepa occupies the entire third volume and a part of the fourth—more than twice the size of the Khmelnytsky section!<sup>46</sup> In a peculiar way, the first public history of Little Russia, despite its inclusion of the cult of Khmelnytsky and sympathies to the Ukrainian people, in effect becomes a history of Mazepa's hetmancy and of the separatist tendencies and autonomist aspirations of the Cossack elites. This presentation could lead to a logical verdict that Cossack Ukraine is a thing of the past, beyond all current aspirations. I suspect that this textual "imbalance" was the main impulse behind some Ukrainian readers' dissatisfaction with Bantysh, behind the criticism of the inadequate coverage of Ukrainian Cossacks as a group of a distinct origin and culture.<sup>47</sup> In the second edition of his *History of Little Russia* (3 vols., Moscow, 1830), Bantysh-Kamenskii expanded on Ukraine's history before its alliance with Russia, with chapters on Ukrainian culture and various ethnographic materials. More importantly, he reversed the balance between the accounts of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa, giving Khmelnytsky the clear textual advantage.<sup>48</sup>

If the ideological and personal treatments of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa are posited as saturated opposite colors, if the gravity and impact of their actions stand in stark contrast, the narrative and even thematic structures of their biographies reveal striking similarities, to the point of mirroring. Three key biographical elements connect the hero and the villain: their socially and culturally determined distinctions, the sources of their agency, and their deaths as occasions of collective mourning.

Both hetmans have special connections to Polish kings. Khmelnytsky was educated in Warsaw, and recognized for his talents by superiors. Sigismund pays ransom to free the young hero (who bravely fought in the Polish-Ottoman battle of Tułora and fell captive) and employs him at his court. Mazepa was also educated by the Jesuits and served at the court of Casimir. These similar circumstances, however, lead to differing interpretations. In the case of Khmelnytsky, his rapport with Polish royalty provides legitimacy to the Cossack uprising of 1648 as a justified war against the magnates who oppress the Ukrainian people and ignore their king's wishes (this war is framed in *The History of the Rus' People* as nearly sanctioned by King Władysław IV himself). In contrast, Mazepa's ties to the Polish court and the "communication skills" and education he gained in the Polish environment support classification of the hetman as a foreigner, a "natural Pole"—thus divorcing the traitor from the national body of Ukraine. In other words, the same set of conditions is treated in Khmelnytsky's and

Mazepa's cases. For Khmelnytsky they are a mark of distinction, elevating him above other Cossacks and Cossack leaders. For Mazepa, they constitute a negative mark of difference, alienating him from the Ukrainian population and relieving Ukraine as a collective body from the role of accomplice in Mazepa's personal crime.

Intriguingly similar are Khmelnytsky's and Mazepa's pretexts and even reasons for starting wars against the existing order. Each is propelled to action for personal reasons, responding to an insult. When the Polish official Czapliński robbed Khmelnytsky of his family estate and his female consort, he resorted to an appeal to higher justice, without much success, fought with Polish officials, suffered imprisonment, and was forced to look for refuge in Zaporozhia. For Bantysh-Kamenskii, Khmelnytsky's actions, which sparked a Cossack uprising, were motivated by "unbearable offenses" (of a personal nature).<sup>49</sup> In contrast, the author of *History of the Rus' People* goes to significant effort to reshape the origins of the Cossack war: Khmelnytsky's confrontational remark on the impregnability of the Kodak fortress (built to subdue the Zaporozhian Cossacks) serves as a pretext for his imprisonment by Czapliński. In *History of The Rus' People*, the king himself repairs this insult. A royal envoy punishes Czapliński through dishonor, cutting off his mustache. In this context, the honor of the God-chosen charismatic hero remains undiminished, and Khmelnytsky undertakes a war against the Polish overlords, with a nod from the king, in response to their brutal oppression of the Cossacks as an estate.<sup>50</sup>

In contrast to this constellation of events, auspicious for Ukraine, Mazepa's decision to break away from Peter I and side with Charles XII is explained in Ukrainian historical narratives as motivated purely by the desire for personal revenge. Deeply harbored in the hetman's "black soul" (by a nature disposed to malice),<sup>51</sup> his vengefulness is linked to a particular insult he suffered from Peter I, who once pulled his mustache at a banquet table.<sup>52</sup> Both Bantysh-Kamenskii and the author of *History of the Rus' People* explicitly deny Mazepa any patriotic motives. Both authors refute national interests or violation of the rights of the Cossacks by Peter I as possible reasons for Mazepa's transfer of loyalty, proposing instead the hetman's ingratitude, ambition, malice, and vengeance.<sup>53</sup> Yet both works complicate the matter by including materials that run contrary to the narrative surface: Mazepa's apocryphal speech cited in *History of the Rus' People* and the "Song of Hetman Mazepa" appended in Bantysh-Kamenskii display

Mazepa's preoccupation with the fate of Ukraine and his concern over her dire circumstances he sets to counter. If in Bantysh-Kamenskii this can be explained as an attempt to lend a degree of objectivity to the narrative by presenting various historical sources (if not a degree of fascination with Mazepa), in *History of the Rus' People* this discrepancy is part of the narrative design. Although the historian carefully navigates the narrative surface of his accounts (after all, it is aimed at proving the nobility, honor, and loyalty of the Ukrainian Cossack nation under the benevolent Russian tsars), he includes facts and quotes sources that run contrary to the ideologically correct statements with which he aligns himself and his people.

In our examination of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa, one more mirroring detail deserves closer scrutiny. The curious "mustache theme" appears only in accounts of these two hetmans, further linking the hero and the villain. Mustaches, as we know, generally do not belong to accounts of historical events (unlike limbs or other parts of the body, deserving of description when affected by wounds or submitted to tortures). In Ukrainian historical narratives, there is no evident need for drawing attention to the facial hair of any Cossack: they were all customarily mustached (with shaven beards and forelocks). Yet the mustache in Ukrainian culture also served as a sign of virtuous and dignified manliness.<sup>54</sup> The importance of the mustache to the narratives of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa is linked precisely to the treatments of these two characters from the vantage point of honor, dignity, and virility. The notions of face and defacing make the mustache symbolically pregnant. Khmelnytsky's dignity and manliness, which suffered under unjust imprisonment, are restored by virtue of his injurer's defacement: the cutting, on the king's orders, of Czapliński's mustache. Through this legendary episode, Khmelnytsky literally saves face. In contrast, by pulling Mazepa's mustache, Peter performs not only a physical act but a symbolic one: he undermines the honor and dignity of the old hetman, emasculating him. This treatment perfectly fits into the overall narrative and thematic design of the Ukrainian historical account: not only does it support the purely personal and vengeful motives of Mazepa in siding with Charles XII, but it also undermines his very agency (by emasculation).<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, this mustache episode foreshadows the later treatment of the traitor Mazepa by the infuriated Peter: the anathema by the church and the ritualistic and sensational public display of the hetman's effigy, defaced (insignia torn off), dragged through the streets and hung.<sup>56</sup> *Habent sua fata mystaces!*

The funerals of these two Cossacks become events in the Ukrainian historical narrative. There are Cossack leaders who died a relatively peaceful death and were buried and mourned by the people (such as Sahaidachny), and others who suffered execution, deposition, or exile. Yet their funerals were private affairs. Not so for Khmelnytsky and Mazepa. The death of Khmelnytsky, as mentioned earlier, became a virtual site of collective mourning and commemoration, not surprising given the role he played in the legitimization of the ethos and status of Cossack Ukraine. What is particularly striking, however, is the description of Mazepa's funeral in Bantysh-Kamenskii's *History of Little Russia*. The fallen hetman dies of deep sorrow turned into despair, and he is buried near Bendery:

Musicians, playing a funerary march, walked at the head of the procession. One staff officer carried the hetman's mace, decorated with precious stones and pearls. Several Cossacks with bared sabres surrounded the cart [with Mazepa's body], pulled by six white horses. The coffin was followed by the numerous Cossack wives, who drowned out the music with their sobbing, and Cossack officers. Rank-and-file Cossacks walked at the end of the procession, with lowered banners and rifles.<sup>57</sup>

Bantysh-Kamenskii claimed to have found these details in his father's notes through sheer serendipity. Whatever the source, their inclusion in *History of Little Russia* is not incidental. The specificity of these details conveys the perspective of an eyewitness observing an exilic funerary rite: last honors being paid to the dishonored and cursed hetman. As with Khmelnytsky, the episode establishes a community of mourning, ever so poignantly because it mourns one who had been permanently deprived of power and removed from his land. These emotions are experienced powerfully, but wordlessly: the women are wailing, even overpowering the music, but the reader is not told what they are saying.<sup>58</sup> It is as if the words of the lament are banned along with their subject, since the emotions would suggest a bond between the hetman and his community (nation) that the official narrative of the *History of Little Russia* tries to sever. Thus burying Mazepa, the mourners—musicians, officers, women, and regular Cossacks, standing in for the collective, even national, Cossack body—grieve through Mazepa *for* the power, honor, and agency irreversibly lost due to a twist of the Northern War. If Khmelnytsky's death created a community bonded in the mourning of its physical separation from the hero and in the pledge to honor his legacy, Mazepa's death created a mourning community of "bondage"—the trauma of a palpably felt disempowerment, dishonor,



and displacement. These two episodes of mourning, pivotal in the Ukrainian historical narrative, encapsulate the cycle of triumph and trauma that shapes Ukraine's collective past and destiny in the historical imagination.

Having included the poignant episode of Mazepa's burial, Bantysh rushes to refute the opinions of some foreign writers who praised the hetman's magnanimity and patriotism. Yet, even when performing the required denunciation of Mazepa, the historian raises the issue of charisma as he includes mention of his special qualities and gifts. Bantysh admits the validity (even deservedness) of the Little Russian and Polish opposing opinions on Khmelnytsky (a charismatic leader and ignoble brute), but he expends noticeable effort in the denial of Mazepa's charisma, importance, honor, and glory. It seems to take significant effort to extricate the narrative of *History of Little Russia* from dangerous sympathies. After all, the descendants of the Cossack elites knew that Mazepa's decision to ally with Charles was an attempt not only to restore the Hetmanate's autonomy but also to regain their political agency. After his fateful and now cursed attempt, they had no choice but to unambiguously dissociate themselves.

In the second edition of *History of Little Russia* (where the portions dedicated to Khmelnytsky and Mazepa are closer in length), Bantysh has made several changes in his depictions of the two hetmans. In his discussion of the last period of Khmelnytsky's life, the historian assigns to him actions and attributes that can be qualified as "Mazepist": he overstepped the lawful limits of his authority, "both wishing to maintain an oath given to the tsar and yet acting secretly, contrary to the Pereiaslav treaty" by engaging in diplomatic relationships that contradicted Muscovite diplomacy.<sup>59</sup> The last days of the hetman are not only represented as a consolidating national ritual of mourning, but also dramatized by a charged exchange between the dying Khmelnytsky and Muscovite envoys sent to convey the tsar's displeasure at his recent wrongdoings (his dealings with Rákóczi and support of the Swedish king Charles X Gustav). The offended Khmelnytsky exclaims:

Never shall I relinquish my bond to the Swedish king, with whom I have been friendly for more than six years, prior to submitting to the sovereignty of his Tsar's Majesty. Swedes are trustworthy people: they know how to maintain both friendship and promise. His Majesty acted unmercifully against me, the Hetman, and the entire Zaporozhian Host, by making peace with Poland and wishing to return our motherland to them.<sup>60</sup>

Khmelnysky is forced to confront his inner conflict by the Muscovite envoys' insistence on the bonds of Orthodoxy and his sworn oath of allegiance. The emotional turmoil aggravates his illness and hastens his death. Although the rest of the Khmelnytsky chapter remains the same as in the first edition, with his charisma in place, in these added pages, the hetman curiously absorbs themes and features that mirror those found in Mazepa (Swedish connections, issues of loyalty and trust between sovereign and subject, suffering and illness compounded by political and diplomatic difficulties). In this second edition, Bantysh also introduced a small change in his assessment of Mazepa that denies the hetman the possibility of charisma or significance. He writes that although Mazepa had been guided by egotistical motivations alone and "left the world's theater in infamy," one act gives credit to this traitor: the destruction of documents that could have indicted and brought suffering to others.<sup>61</sup>

These details reveal Bantysh's careful navigation of the minefield of the Ukrainian historical past, rife with sentiments and ideological gestures, versed in rhetoric and mimicry.<sup>62</sup> In balancing his narrative, the historian, operating firmly within the official parameters of the imperial cultural discourse, tackled a most delicate issue: that of the legitimacy and charisma of Ukrainian historical and political agency. In this process, the hetmans Khmelnytsky and Mazepa shift colors and exchange attributes, and the bond between these two key characters—cornerstones of Ukrainian identity—is palpable.

### A Hero in Action

However we approach the characters of Khmelnytsky and Mazepa, there is no denying the centrality of the periods they embody to Ukrainian historical memory. When Khmelnytsky breaks the bonds of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (interpreted as "Egyptian" slavery) and commits to Great Russia (interpreted as liberation), it is understood as a triumph of Cossack Ukraine. Yet Mazepa's long hetmancy, which marked the end of the Ruin, constituted another pivotal historical period, which came to an abrupt end in 1709. This period had to be thoroughly reshaped, not only physically but also "virtually." The Petrine punitive machine not only hunted down the Mazepists and their families but also sought to erase the era of Mazepa from Ukrainian culture and memory, replacing it with a stock repertory of negative clichés.<sup>63</sup> The previous glory of the

old hetman may have been gone, but the reflections of his era remained imbedded in Ukrainian historical narratives, lurking as a shadow and mirror to Khmelnytsky and a lesson to the descendants of the Cossack elites. This is the meaning of the popular saying, binding the two hetmans into a cycle (loop) of Ukrainian history: “From Bohdan until Ivan, there was no hetman in our land.”<sup>64</sup> Thus the shadow of Mazepa (the essentialized Ukrainian perfidy in the Russian popular imagination: Ukrainians as *the spirit of Mazepa* [mazepin dukh]) continued to follow Khmelnytsky along his heroic march through the Ukrainian historical narrative, now joined with the Russian imperial destiny.

Charisma: this is the ultimate thread that links Khmelnytsky and Mazepa in Ukrainian historical narratives, despite the marked treatment of the hetmans as antipodes. Both were powerful leaders and politicians, experienced commanders and diplomats, and eloquent orators. Two qualities of their characters (aspects of their behavior), variously developed in Ukrainian historical narratives, underscore the connection between the hetmans: secrecy and eloquence. Both qualities can be configured either positively or negatively, depending on the possessor’s place/function in history. When part of Khmelnytsky’s actions and strategies, secrecy is an aspect of wisdom and political prudence. Secrecy in this context is a special, providentially bestowed design that the leader grasps or intuits but that remains inaccessible to his followers and adversaries. Once the charismatic leader reveals the plan, it becomes the inevitable path for collective action. The leader’s followers feel the design to be something they had been striving for yet had been unable to grasp, articulate, and enact before the arrival of the chosen hero. In the Ukrainian historical narratives, Khmelnytsky’s actions are characterized by secrecy, cunning, and occasionally even treachery; yet these do not detract from his glory.<sup>65</sup> Through the narrative of Bantysh-Kamenskii, the hetman emerges as a majestic man, a fearless commander, a forthright leader, and at the same time a far-sighted and careful politician.<sup>66</sup> Hence, even paradoxical actions are resolved by their charismatic origins: when Khmelnytsky missed the opportunity to crush Polish power definitively, he behaved according to “deep politics,” striving to win not only by combat but also by “prudent patience and caution.”<sup>67</sup> Whether intrepid, careful, or imprudent—even after the grave defeat at Berestechko (due, in some significant part, to his mistakes), Khmelnytsky remains unquestionably the bearer of divinely bestowed charisma, recognized as his country’s “liberator,” whose “brow is decorated with everlasting laurels.”<sup>68</sup>

Khmelnysky, in *The History of the Rus' People*, recognizes himself as a vessel of national destiny, pointing out that the great victories that garnered the Cossacks “fame almost all over the world” were the “workings of national enthusiasm triggered by extreme Polish cruelty.”<sup>69</sup> In sum, secrecy, with its corollary qualities, emerges in the case of Khmelnysky as an inherent element of his charisma (connected to the mysterious, divine source of his authority and action), adding to his political wisdom or even genius. These qualities are further reinforced through numerous “quotations” from Khmelnysky’s arguments, speeches, and decrees that justify the causes and glorify the effects of his war as a national liberation.

In marked and mirroring contrast to Khmelnysky, Mazepa’s secrecy is inherent to his role as an alien (“natural Pole”) within the collective Cossack body, in keeping with his egotistical ambition and cunning, jealousy and vengefulness, ingratitude and greed, duplicity and treason.<sup>70</sup> Even in those instances when positive qualities are attributed to Mazepa, they are modified and tempered by negatives. *The History of the Rus' People* depicts the hetman’s career as accompanied by and accomplished through “excessive bravery and extreme embitterment,” which inevitably lead to “an immeasurable abyss.”<sup>71</sup> Bantysh denies Mazepa bravery and decisiveness and qualifies him as “a poor warrior, but crafty minister.”<sup>72</sup> When he reports on how Mazepa interceded with Peter I to forgive his slanderer Kochubei, the historian tempers any possible positive perception of this action, calling it “forced magnanimity” and “false justice” (following with examples of his cruelty and injustice).<sup>73</sup>

The Ukrainian historical narratives go to great lengths to deny the collective bonds, let alone divine sources, of Mazepa’s authority. Bantysh-Kamenskii emphasizes that Ukrainians did not like the hetman, that he was hated by the people and the Cossack army and was supported only by the officers of the top echelon.<sup>74</sup> The historian, however, admits that Mazepa had all the makings of an exceptional leader: “By the power of his courage, by aligning his enlightened mind with a gift to enchant, to steal into the deep corners of the human heart—this ruler could have become the soul of those under his command, but he wasn’t interested in this.”<sup>75</sup> In *The History of the Rus' People*, Mazepa is castigated as a traitor and villain whose authority was usurped due to his cruelty and treachery (and hence was incompatible with true, i.e., divine, sources of charismatic power). Yet the hetman is also depicted as a benefactor of the Church and a pious Christian who at all costs refrained from spilling the blood of his compatriots and coreligionists.<sup>76</sup> In sum, the Ukrainian historical narratives

admit Mazepa's charismatic qualities while forcefully denying the possibility of his charisma in order to dissociate his rule and his legacy (his treason and the curse it generated) from the collective body of Cossack Ukraine. Within the framework of Ukrainian historical narratives, Mazepa, like Khmelnytsky, is given a voice by means of "quotations" (his speech before the Cossacks on the eve of the fateful decision to ally with Charles XII, his words when burning documents that might have implicated "other patriots" still within Peter's reach).

Thus the connection between Khmelnytsky and Mazepa as figures of the Ukrainian historical imagination exists not only in functional terms (the cult of Khmelnytsky as compensation for the curse of Mazepa) but also in terms of their biographical "structures" (that is, the structuring of the hero and antihero, where components and attributes mirror one another and even morph together). In transforming the Cossack past into cultural capital, Ukrainian intellectuals and literati focused on nodal historical periods that could provide attractive characters and plots, positive moments of collective identification, and "proof" of the loyalty and dignity of the Cossacks, in order to present themselves as a people with a distinct physiognomy yet at the same time as privileged partakers of the Russian empire and Russianness itself.<sup>77</sup> The political and historical aspirations of the Cossack elites were transformed by their descendants (middle- and lower-level intelligentsia and nobility) into folkloric, antiquarian, and literary pursuits, shaped for both the metropolitan and local milieus (frequently striking different tunes depending on the addressee), the examination of which falls outside the limits of this chapter.

To conclude, I have argued that representations of Khmelnytsky, as strange as it may seem, recall Mazepa in spirit and form. In narrative and discursive terms, this shadow connection, this Castor and Pollux relationship, is based on a relatively stable repertory of qualities that define and activate the charisma of a national leader. Both hetmans were vessels of national charisma, and the nature of this charisma is a gift (in providential terms, a divine gift; in secular terms, genius) that elicits and guides their special agency and legitimizes this agency in the minds of their community. Either by means of opposition (when the qualifications of the hetmans conform to the rules of open transcript, casting them as hero and villain) or through subtler comparison, or even by a blurring of the lines between them (through a hybridization of their features), Mazepa follows Khmelnytsky as a function of the Ukrainian historical narrative. At times this

happens through thematic contingency, and at times, metonymically or literally, as in the historical novel by Petr Golota, *Khmel'nitskie ili prisoedinenie Malorossii* (The Khmelnytskys or the Reunion of Little Russia), which is furnished with an epigraph taken from the song of Mazepa: "Let there be glory eternal that we have obtained our liberties through our sabre!"<sup>78</sup>

What comes to mind at this point is the phrase from Vladimir Mayakovsky's dross that my generation had to memorize some decades ago: "We utter 'Lenin' and understand—The Party; we say 'Party' and imply—Lenin." For generations of Ukrainian literati and intellectuals, regardless of their stripes, something similar can be said, albeit without the Mayakovskian hubris: they said "Khmelnytsky" and implied "Mazepa" (and when they said Mazepa, they implied Khmelnytsky). The relationship, of course, was not symmetrical; not everything that could be said could be written, and not everything written would necessarily be said. The functioning and shaping of Ukrainian identity was closely linked with the articulations of Ukrainian-Russian power relationships and scenarios of the verbal (and more broadly, cultural) performance of Ukraine.

We now return to the Kostomarov episode that opened this chapter. What was Kostomarov doing when he fingered Khmelnytsky as the source for "The Book of Genesis of the Ukrainian Nation"? I submit that he was blaming his own Mazepist deed, the subversion of the autocratic and imperial tenets of Ukraine's existence in "Zakon bozhii," on a "Khmelnytsky!" This quirky slip of the tongue may or may not be in keeping with Kostomarov's personal psychology, but it is certainly consistent with the collective psychological pattern. Khmelnytsky and Mazepa, therefore, are two sides of the same coin; they are the one-in-the-same Romantic mustached fellow, the ubiquitous agent-provocateur, the idiomatic and stereotypical "Ukrainian." In other words, while grilled by investigators, Kostomarov hysterically imagined a character, an instant situational pseudonym. Under pressure, he "forgot" the second half of the hyphenated name of the dark-complexioned officer from the South, who was none other than Khmelnytsky-Mazepa.

## 6

### The Image of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Polish Romanticism and Its Post-Romantic Reflex

*Roman Koropeczyj*

THE LAST OF THE FEW EXTANT SCENES of Juliusz Słowacki's 1841 drama *Jan Kazimierz* is set in 1649 in Zbaraż as the fortified town is being besieged by a combined force of Tatars and Cossacks. Its Polish defenders, Jeremi Wiśniowiecki, Mikołaj Koniecpolski, and Jędrzej Firlej, admit an envoy from Bohdan Khmelnytsky, who informs them that if they surrender the town, the hetman is willing to spare everyone with the exception of Wiśniowiecki, who, he insists, must pay with his head for "spilling Cossack blood, for rapes, torture, and persecution."<sup>1</sup> The Poles reject Khmelnytsky's offer . . . but the scene ends here abruptly, and the remainder of the drama is missing, "destroyed," apparently, "together with other private papers through carelessness."<sup>2</sup>

However this may be, what remains of *Jan Kazimierz* may nonetheless be viewed as somehow emblematic of the peculiar status of the image of the Ukrainian hetman—and, by extension, of the Polish-Cossack wars of 1648–1657—in the discourse of Polish romanticism. If Henryk Sienkiewicz's *Ogniem i mieczem* (With Fire and Sword) delivers what is, *ceteris paribus*, the most expansive, and most resonant, treatment of Khmelnytsky in Polish literature, in the Polish romantic imagination his figure is, as in Słowacki's fragment of a drama, all but absent, occupying an isolated and vaguely defined space outside its frame. This absence is particularly striking in view of the proliferation therein of Cossack types, historical and otherwise, that served as carriers of many of romanticism's most cherished concerns, from national history and orientaloid exotica to social upheaval and acts of individual transgression.<sup>3</sup> And in this respect, besides

Mazepa, Konasiewicz-Konaszewicz, Żołotareńko, besides the various Żmijas, Teteras, Pysankas, and Czorbias as well as a host of anonymous atamans, *watażkas*, and Zaporogues (more often than not speeding across the steppe on spirited steeds), it was first and foremost the names and places associated with the Haidamak uprising of 1768—Gonta, Żeleźniak, Wernyhora, the Matronyn Monastery, Uman’—that preoccupied the Polish romantics.<sup>4</sup> Thus when Count Henry Krasinski produced a history of “the Cossacks of the Ukraine” for English-speaking readers “comprising biographical notices of the most celebrated Cossack Chiefs and Atamans,” he devoted a separate chapter each to “Mazepa, Sava, Zelezniak, Gonta,” and even (egregiously) to “Stenko Razin” and “Pugachef”<sup>5</sup>; only “Chmielnicki/Khmelnytsky,” it seems, did not rate, incorporated as his portrait is into the introductory chapter about the origins and early history of the “Polish Cossacks” (28–54)<sup>6</sup>—and this in 1848, the bicentennial of the Khmelnytsky uprising.

Yet surely, both the hetman’s biography and the peripeties of the Polish-Cossack wars are as rich in atmospheric requisites and narrative possibilities, to say nothing of their ideological implications, as the *Koliivshchyna* (*Koliszczyzna*) or the careers of a Mazepa or Sawa-Caliński; rich enough, one would think, to beguile the romantic imagination. “How many novels,” exclaimed Zenon Fisz reflecting on his visit to Subotiv and Chyhyryn in his 1856 account of his travels in Ukraine, “what poetic tales could one concoct out of [the Khmelnytsky era]!” “Will any of our Ukrainian poets venture to depict this period?”<sup>7</sup> Very few, as it turns out.

Prior to *Ogniem i mieczem* (1884), there appeared only a handful of literary treatments of it or the figure at its center, with quality commensurate with quantity to boot.<sup>8</sup> In fact, two such efforts are the products, strictly speaking, of a transitional sensibility: the first, a tragedy entitled *Bohdan Chmielnicki*, by Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz, was written in 1817; the second, Tymon Zaborowski’s tragedy *Bohdan Chmielnicki*, dates from 1823. (As if to underscore the subject of this essay, neither was published during its author’s lifetime.<sup>9</sup>) The remaining texts (besides diegetically retrospective assessments such as those expressed in, for instance, Michał Czajkowski’s *Wernyhora* [1838]) constitute a hodgepodge of conventional romantic genres—a few short poems,<sup>10</sup> a *gawęda* in verse,<sup>11</sup> a ballad,<sup>12</sup> a historical drama,<sup>13</sup> and a novel (in French, no less).<sup>14</sup>

What is noteworthy about this small corpus is not only—or, rather, not so much even—the generic diversity, but its clichéd, epigonic nature.



To be sure, with the exception, arguably, of Niemcewicz and Zaborowski (whose tragedies, in any case, are by neoclassicist definition bound by convention), none of the authors represented here belongs to Polish romanticism's A-list. Their recourse to genres already tried and true may thus be a function simply of talent, of their authors' inability to deal imaginatively or even effectively with the subject matter.<sup>15</sup> Hence the facile appeal to emotions through melodrama (the dastardly Czaplinski, his conniving Jesuit sidekick, star-crossed lovers [Bogdanko and Maria], a mysterious helper [Ursule], and a no less mysterious anchorite in Jan Czyński's *Le Kosak*; the fearless, valiant, and wise Jeremi Wiśniowiecki of Karol Drzewiecki's eponymous drama; Niemcewicz's relentlessly evil Khmelnytsky); the supernatural (the witch Sołocha in *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*; the demonic Khmelnytsky in the ballad "Wesele czehryńskie" [The Chyhyryn Wedding]; Bohun's ghost in Niemcewicz's *Chmielnicki*); pornographic violence (Aleksander Groza's "Mogiły" [Graves]); the orally inflected tale of a petty gentryman ("Mogiły").

This is not to say that melodrama per se cannot function as a vehicle for articulating certain deeper truths (and, of course, ideological positions). In fact, it is precisely an analogous palette of inherently melodramatic elements—a semiexotic frontier; cruel villains with semiexotic names (Szwaczka, Szyło, Neżyvyj, Żurba); scheming (Orthodox) monks; mysterious nocturnal ceremonies (the consecration of knives); a treasonous Cossack retainer who (purportedly) murders his own children (Gonta); a dark-eyed maiden; graphic violence; the tales of survivors—that made the *Koliszczyzna* so appealing to a generation of writers brought up on Shakespeare, Schiller, Scott, Byron, the Gothic novel, and *le roman frénétique*. To paraphrase Henry Krasinski, but this time as the author of the "historical drama" *Gonta*, there was in all this "a curious mixture of eastern, southern, and northern imagery; [ . . . ] an angel with the demon, [ . . . ] a noisy joy with black sorrow and despair [ . . . ] a Cossack and his steed, a White Eagle and an Ossian's child."<sup>16</sup> Something other than melodrama must account, then, for the incoherence of the Khmelnytsky corpus, something that is again emblemized (albeit inadvertently) by Słowacki's fragment *qua* fragment. And in this respect too, a comparison with the *Koliszczyzna* is instructive.

The actual events of 1768 traced a distinct narrative arc, consisting of a relatively well-defined inception (Zaluzniak's emergence from the Matronyn Monastery), complication (Gonta's decision to join the Haidamaks),

climax (the siege of Uman' and the ensuing slaughter), and resolution (the capture and punishment of Gonta and Zalizniak), all occurring within the space of little over one month, with the subsequent first partition of Poland providing a salient epilogue. In other words, the historical *Koliivshchyna* already constituted a narrative *bien composée*, one that, together with the suggestive setting and the no-less-suggestive cast of characters, contained within itself the elements of the "phantasmatic scenario" that was subsequently reenacted as the Polish romantic myth of Cossack Ukraine (wherever and however one chooses to read this myth).<sup>17</sup> The Khmelnytsky saga, by contrast, was just that, a saga. Not only did it take place over a period of some eleven years (if measured solely by the biography of its central protagonist), but it was marked by repeated advances and retreats, buildups and climaxes, crises, ostensible resolutions, and reversions to crisis, with, in addition, a large, and changing, cast of characters and forces that appear to resist binarization. And far from providing a sense of closure, the death of Khmelnytsky in effect guaranteed the perpetuation of the saga.

Generic multiformity is thus rearticulated as thematic diffusion: "We-sele czehryńskie" and Czyński's *Le Kosak* both reimagine Khmelnytsky's feud with Czaplinski; A. P.'s "Duma ludu ukraińskiego" (*Duma* of the Ukrainian Folk) deals with the Moldavian campaign, as does Zaborowski's *Chmielnicki*, which in fact focuses as much on Tymotej (Tymofii, Tymosh) and his relationship with Helena (aka Rozanda) as it does on the figure of his father; in "Mogily" Aleksander Groza depicts the slaughter of Polish POWs after the Battle of Batoh, while in the poem "Bohdan" he depicts the hetman riding off into the steppe. That the latter is subtitled "a fragment" (*ułomek*) only underscores the absence of a distinct narrative vector, something that Drzewiecki, for his part, lays bare in his *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*. Advertised as a series of "dramatic scenes," the two-part historical drama consists of seven acts that are connected solely by a recurring cast of characters, with each act constituting a self-enclosed whole based, in chronological order, on discrete episodes from the first three years of the Khmelnytsky uprising (Hlyniany, Piliavtsy, Zbarazh [Zbarazh], Zboriv). Moreover, by ending the drama with the death of its title hero (historically, in 1651), Drzewiecki effectively finesses closure. Which, in his own way, both Niemcewicz and Czyński also end up doing, but conversely, as it were. The former, constrained still by the conventions of neoclassicist poetics, conflates an entire constellation of historical events (among them, Khmelnytsky's son Tymosh's marriage to Rozanda, Czaplinski's kidnap-

ping of Khmelnytsky's wife, Cossack raids on Istanbul [in that order!]) as well as imagined ones (he has the hetman murder Bohun) into the requisite twenty-four hours of a five-act classicist tragedy that ends with Khmelnytsky's suicide. For its part, *Le Kosak*, a melodramatic potboiler *à thèse*, alludes to the course of events of 1646–1648 in its first thirty-four and a half chapters and then suddenly condenses the last nine years of the Khmelnytsky uprising into a final, sensational chapter and a half. The novel ends with a fantastic face-off between “Prince Jérémie” and “Bogdanko” that results in the death of both, but not before it is given to Khmelnytsky to gaze into the future and predict the fate of Poland and Ukraine. Curiously, Drzewiecki too resorts to this device, only in his case it is the dying Wiśniowiecki who is afforded (or, rather, suffers) a vision of the future of the Commonwealth. In both instances, the Khmelnytsky saga avoids closure. Indeed, it is precisely its open-ended nature that is figured in Zaborowski's *Chmielnicki*, whose hero is depicted in the last scene of the tragedy *awaiting* what may or may not be a final showdown with the treasonous Wyhowski (*sic*)<sup>18</sup> (see Fig. 6.1); and in “Wesele czehryńskie” as well, which, like Groza's “Bohdan,” has Khmelnytsky riding off into the steppe, vowing revenge against the Poles for the death of his Cossacks. In this regard, and all classicist conventions aside, Niemcewicz's decision to kill off his hetman would appear to be a matter of wish fulfillment, a form of retribution both *ex post* and *ex machina*.

The generic diversity of the texts, their thematic diffusion, and above all their conventional nature must, however, all ultimately be viewed as reflexes of what can best be described as ambivalence on the part of their authors toward the figure of Khmelnytsky, ambivalence that is as much a function of romantic sensibility as it is of the complex nature of the man depicted in postpartition Polish historiography.<sup>19</sup> As such, the image of the Cossack hetman projected in these texts differs markedly from the one inscribed in pre-partition accounts of the uprising. The one exception in this respect (and proverbially proving the rule) is Drzewiecki's *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*, which is, for the most part, a dramatization of the relevant material in Edward Raczyński's Polish paraphrase of Wespazjan Kochowski's *Climacteres*.<sup>20</sup> In placing an idealized prince, “a righteous knight and knighthood's patron” (45) at its center, it simultaneously denigrates Khmelnytsky as a drunken, unpredictable, bloodthirsty, ambitious upstart, intent on extirpating all Polish “dukes and princes” from Ukrainian lands even if it means, cynically, mobilizing the unwashed



FIGURE 6.1. Jan Matejko, *Bohdan Khmelnytsky Pledging Allegiance at Zboriv* (watercolor; 1859). Courtesy of the L'vivs'ka national'na halereia mystetstv im. B. Gl Voznyts'koho.

Orthodox masses (*czerni*) (98–100).<sup>21</sup> At the same time, Drzewiecki has his characters suggest that, although absolutely inexcusable, the uprising was nonetheless “all the fault of Czaplicki” (2), whose behavior toward Khmelnytsky had earned this Polish gentryman the Cossack’s “unrelenting” hatred, which he subsequently directs against the entire Polish gentry and then Poland itself (131). In doing so, Drzewiecki incorporates into his drama the one episode in the Khmelnytsky saga that comes closest to constituting a coherent narrative unit and, at the same time, its allegorical core, but only *in posse*.

In their search for the causes of the Commonwealth's collapse, post-partition Polish historians (most prominently, Jerzy Samuel Bandtkie, Joachim Lelewel, Jan Nepomucen Czarnowski, and Karol Szajnocha) could not ignore the Khmelnytsky uprising, and they viewed this as both symptom and proximate cause. And in speculating on what may have impelled the man whose actions conditioned the further course of Polish history, they focused on a story (adduced already in earlier chronicles and histories of the uprising<sup>22</sup>) of the Cossack's feud with a haughty Polish gentryman named Daniel Czapliński (*vel* Czaplicki).

Depending on the account, sometime around 1646, Czapliński for whatever reason (envy, resentment, spite) expropriates Khmelnytsky's estate, humiliates his son in public (and/or kills him), steals his woman, and marries her (or first rapes, then kills her, together with the son). To add further insult to injury, Czapliński at one point has Khmelnytsky—a gentryman, after all—arrested and locked up for suspicion of treason; and, again, depending on the version, it is this very same woman who frees him, and whom he eventually marries. This woman, who is never named, is identified as either Khmelnytsky's wife or his concubine and is even said to have been Czapliński's own daughter.<sup>23</sup> In any case, Khmelnytsky's failure to obtain legal satisfaction for the multiple outrages committed against his person from a sympathetic but helpless King Władysław IV as well as a mockingly unsympathetic diet in Warsaw finally compels him to seek redress by other means, to which end he flees to Zaporozhia (Zaporizhzhia). There he mobilizes his fellow Cossacks, who have their own grievances against the Poles, and, together with his new allies the Crimean Tatars as well as masses of disgruntled Orthodox peasants and townfolk, wages war against the "commonwealth of the (Polish) gentry."<sup>24</sup>

Although the romantic historians' focus on the Czapliński episode effectively displaces the etiology of the uprising by reducing complex and, more trenchantly, uncomfortable social, historical, and cultural truths to a sensationalistic narrative about a personal vendetta, the story by this very same token articulates, allegorically, a set of structures that in fact inscribe these truths. Indeed, it is precisely this combination of sensationalism and allegorical saturation that the romantics may have found appealing. Practically all of the literary texts in question treat the episode in one way or another, either in passing, or more substantively, by placing it, as in "Wesele" and *Le Kosak*, at the very center of the narrative.

And here, the lines between romantic fiction and romantic historiography blur. Szajnocha's comment(ary), that it was "by a decree of Providence" that Khmelnytsky should "become god's scourge [ . . . ] bringing punishment to the more culpable segment of the [Polish] nation [i.e., the magnates]" (1), is emblematic enough in this respect, as it conflates allegorically the personal and the collective: Khmelnytsky's humiliation at the hands of Czapliński and his no-less-humiliating treatment by the grandees in Warsaw is nothing less than the story of years of systematic oppression of the Commonwealth's Orthodox population by a ruthlessly selfish Polish Catholic aristocracy. As Niemcewicz's Khmelnytsky explains to one of his Polish prisoners, it was the gentry that

[ . . . ] were the cause of destitution and in Ukraine too  
 Fed us with a contempt that people remember well.  
 When the vile Czapliński tore my humble homestead  
 From me, full of grief at the unbearable wrongdoing,  
 I took my pitiful complaints before the Sejm.  
 A farmer and a soldier both, raised in this wilderness,  
 For the first time I saw the court's deceptive splendor  
 And that throng of flatterers that surrounded the throne,  
 And that impudent assembly of delegates that threatens the throne.  
 I enter; what kind of reception did my dolor elicit?  
 Cold indifference from the wizened gentlemen of the council,  
 Conceited youth, proud of its refinement,  
 Sneered at my aspect, my clothing; [ . . . ]  
 I demand justness: they point to wan laws [ . . . ]  
 It was then that quiet vengeance filled my soul [ . . . ].

[Byli przyczyną nędzy i też Ukrainy  
 Karmili nas pogardą, dobrze ludziom pomną.  
 Gdy niegodny Czapliński słobodę mą skromną  
 Wydarł mi, zdjęty żalem na gwałty nieznośne,  
 Niosłem z pokorą przed sejm skargi me żalose.  
 Rolnik i żołnierz razem, schwany w tej dziczy,  
 Po pierwszy raz ujrzalem blask dworu zwodniczy  
 I te pochlebców tłumi, co tron otaczały,  
 I ten grożący królom zbiór posłów zuchwały.  
 Wchodzę; jakież przyjęcie wzbudziła ma smętność?  
 W sędziwych rady panach zimna obojętność,

Zarozumiała młodzież, dumna swym wytworem,  
 Natrząsała się nad mą postacią, ubiorem; [ . . . ]  
 Żądam słuszności: oni mdle wskazują prawa [ . . . ]  
 Wtenczas to cicha zemsta zajęła mą duszę [ . . . ] (446)

This same basic set of what are essentially sociopolitical oppositions informs the entire plot of *Le Kosak*, which, being the work of one of the more radical Polish émigré publicists, is in fact little more than a screed aimed at the Polish gentry and their clerical enablers.<sup>25</sup> Since “le peuple n’est pas assez éclairé [ . . . ] pour briser le double joug de la tiare et de la noblesse,” Bogdanko and his Cossacks are now called “de vaincre les castes, qui oppressaient les masses” (2:209). The villainous Czapliński and his conniving Jesuit sidekick thus serve as at once the personifications and embodiments of a Commonwealth eviscerated by magnates and priests; Khmelnytsky, in turn, depicted racing back and forth across the Ukrainian steppe on his faithful steed, as at once the personification and embodiment of a free people whose mission, ultimately, much as in Zaborowski’s tragedy, is to save Poland from itself.<sup>26</sup> As the latter’s Bohdan puts it:

Poland’s my country, my environment is freedom,  
 The destruction of unlawful powers that rule the world,  
 Was Bohdan’s first and his last desire [ . . . ]  
 The scourge of rapacity and crime has become my motto.

[Polska moim jest krajem, a wolność żywiołem,  
 Zniszczenie władz nieprawych, które światem rządzą,  
 Pierwszą była, ostatnia jest Bohdana żądzą [ . . . ]  
 Bicz na gwałty i zbrodnie mojem stał się godłem [ . . . ] (332–333)

In this respect, both Zaborowski’s and Czyński’s Khmelnytsky are ambiguous figures, double-natured insofar as he is at one and the same time a Polish patriot (and even, as Czyński would have it, a Polish gentryman by birth) and a Cossack.<sup>27</sup> As the former, he is a noble figure, intelligent, educated, courteous, gallant, and above all proud. Betrayed and humiliated by the magnates, he thus becomes a reluctant rebel, or, if you will, quite literally (as far as Niemcewicz and Zaborowski are concerned) a tragic figure whom fate has chosen to exact punishment on Poland for its various sins. As a Cossack, though, he is not only a carrier of the ideals of liberty, a free-spirited horseman of the Ukrainian steppe who in Groza’s

“Bohdan” like “a bird in flight / Closed his heart and closed his eyes, / And with thoughts spinning in a mist of musings/Rushes from highway to byway” (15), but by this very same token, a simple, spontaneous child of nature, “raised in the wilderness,” who in “Wesele” offers his unfaithful wife a choice between the Starosta’s “gold,” “lamé,” and “Persian carpets” and his own “Cossack homestead,” where

You’d have bread with water,  
A bedspread of lowland reeds and ivy,  
The wind or foul weather as guests [ . . . ]

[Chleb byś miała przy wodzie,  
Z trzciny, bluszczu, niżowych posłanie,  
Wicher gościem czy słońca ( . . . )] (131)

And it is precisely as such, suspended uncertainly between the (civilized) Polish world and the (semicivilized) world of the “Wild Plains” that Khmelnytsky is invariably associated with the supernatural,<sup>28</sup> either himself the quasi-demonic figure with “a terrifying moustache” who in “Wesele” appears out of nowhere to disrupt the Starosta’s wedding and then just as uncannily escapes death; or someone who enlists (ostensibly) supernatural forces on his own behalf: the “sorceress” Sołocha in Drzewiecki’s *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*; “la sorcière” Ursule in *Le Kosak*.

However, at the heart of the Czapliński episode is the woman (be it as Khmelnytsky’s wife or concubine, and mother of his son), whom Franciszek Rawita Gawroński aptly calls “a veritable Helena of the borderlands”<sup>29</sup>—aptly, since her fate, like that of her mythological counterpart, figures the mythical cause of the conflict between Cossack and Pole. The details vary: Niemcewicz has her kidnapped by Czapliński just as Khmelnytsky appears to have finally sated his desire for vengeance against the Poles for allowing the expropriation of his “humble homestead” to go unpunished; in “Wesele,” at the Cossack’s unexpected appearance to reclaim her (he promises to avenge both his homestead and his son in hell), she “runs trembling and falls—/Into the arms not of her husband but the *starosta*” (130), who, rather than meet his fate at the hands of Khmelnytsky and his men, takes her and everyone else at the wedding with him by detonating barrels of gunpowder (only Khmelnytsky escapes); it is her “shame” (*shańbienie*) (321) that in Zaborowski’s tragedy obsesses her son Tymotej, driving him to seek vengeance on behalf of his father and, consequently, to his own grave; in *Le Kosak*, Katherine, as she is



called there, “was unable to survive her dishonor” and dies “in the arms of her executioner” Czapliński, who then kills her son (1:70). Whatever the configuration, the allegorical thrust of the story as well as its underlying structure is clear enough. The violent fate of the woman, like that of Ukraine, suggests not so much the impossibility of coexistence of Cossack and Pole, but rather, on a more fundamental level, the impossibility of Ukraine as such, an impossibility underscored by the no-less-violent fate of Khmelnytsky’s offspring, and, of course, the destructive, indeed, total violence of the uprising itself:

It was no longer a war now, but a dreadful carnage, a duel to the death between two people, it was a massacre. Woe to him who fell into the hands of his opponent! Be it woman, child, or old man, no prisoners, they were slaughtered mercilessly. [. . .] Prince Jeremiah exterminated the Cossacks, and the Cossacks did the same to the nobles. (*Les Kosaks* 2:356–357)

As I noted earlier, the Czapliński episode, with all of its structural possibilities and symbolic potential, remained largely unrealized in the work of the Polish romantics, victim, if you will, as much of a dearth of talent and thus of the demands of generic convention as of the unresolved nature of the course of the Khmelnytsky saga itself. Only Niemcewicz, in what is yet another gesture of wishful thinking, seeks to resolve the saga by having his dying Khmelnytsky entrust “thankless Ukraine,” together with the hetman’s little boy, to the paternalistic care of the noble Sieniawski (457–458), the only Pole for whom the Cossack exhibits any respect in the tragedy. Otherwise, it remains either open-ended or, as in *Le Kosak* and *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*, outwith the chronotope, as prophecy.

The Czapliński narrative does, however, resurface in what I indicated at the outset is the most extensive treatment of Khmelnytsky in Polish literature, Henryk Sienkiewicz’s *Ogniem i mieczem*.<sup>30</sup> As Izabela Kalinowska and Marta Kondratyuk argue in their contribution to the present volume, Sienkiewicz contains and neutralizes the threat Khmelnytsky poses by introducing the Cossack Bohun, who, “in spite of his masculine power and charisma, suffers a defeat in his rivalry with Skrzetuski over Helena. The real-life Czapliński-Helena-Khmelnytsky triangle is transformed into the fictitious one of Bohun-Helena-Skrzetuski.”<sup>31</sup> It is in this, its transposed form, that the relationship in fact structures the entire novel—and offers the resolution absent in the romantic depictions of the Cossack chieftain.

Of course the figure of Khmelnytsky himself is very much at the center of Sienkiewicz's tale, or at least its historical component, where, as in Drzewiecki's play and, in part (and most certainly *mutatis mutandis*), Czyński's leftist potboiler, he shares the stage with Wiśniowiecki, the two mutual antagonists embodying the forces tearing Ukraine apart. In this respect, in fact, Sienkiewicz's depiction of the hetman—cunning, egomaniacal, in whose soul “the notion of good and evil, virtue and crime, lawlessness and justice [ . . . ] had fused into one with notions of personal injury or personal benefit,” and a drunkard to boot who, “foaming at the mouth, gave bloody orders that he later regretted” (1:241–242)—differs little from Drzewiecki's.<sup>32</sup> Czapliński, however, makes only a brief appearance in *Ogniem i mieczem*, when early on in the novel the blustering nobleman is rudely shown the door by Skrzetuski after having failed (thanks to the unwitting Skrzetuski) to prevent Khmelnytsky's flight to the Sich; subsequently, only his name resurfaces throughout the novel as the person who at least in part was responsible for the wronged Cossack's decision to take up arms against the Commonwealth. As the old warrior Zaćwilichowski recounts, Khmelnytsky

quarreled with Czapliński like cat and dog, but that's no big deal! You know, the usual, one gentryman making life hell for another out of enmity. Not the first time, not the last. On top of that, people say that he was flirting with the *starosta's* wife: the *starosta* stole his mistress and married her, and he in turn kept hitting on her later, which wouldn't be surprising since . . . she was something of a loose woman.<sup>33</sup>

(In addition, Khmelnytsky himself tells Skrzetuski earlier that Czapliński beat up his son [1:15].) Yet, even though most of the elements constituting the episode in Sienkiewicz's version largely correspond to their configuration in the romantic texts, including the historiography, not only are its etiological implications deemphasized, much as they are in Drzewiecki's play, in favor of what Zaćwilichowski calls “some deeper machinations” (5:24) but, by the same token, its symbolic function is effectively foreclosed. That function, however, is precisely what structures the story of Bohun, Skrzetuski, and Helena.

As in the Czapliński episode, at its core is a woman who serves as an object of exchange between the two elementally antagonistic forces, Pole and Cossack, that inscribe the symbolic structure of the Khmelnytsky saga.<sup>34</sup> The former is represented by Skrzetuski, an officer in Wiśniowiecki's army (and the hero of *Ogniem i mieczem*), who in effect defends and en-

forces the imperatives of his virtuous commander: “order [ . . . ], plenty, justice, peace,” but also “sternness,” since

in those days and in that country only [ . . . ] sternness allowed human life and labor to grow apace and exuberate, thanks only to it did towns and villages appear, the plowman gain the upper hand over the *haidamak*, the merchant ply his craft, bells serenely call the faithful to prayer, the enemy dare not cross the border, gangs of thieves perish on the pale or become disciplined soldiers, and the barren land blossom. (1:96)

For his part, Skrzetuski's rival, Bohun, embodies the Cossack id to Wiśniowiecki's civilizing ego: “Some thought him crazy, since indeed this was an untamed and wild soul. Why he lived in the world, what he wanted, whither he was bound, whom he served—he himself did not know. He served the steppe, the winds, war, love, and his own imagination” (1:63–64). His relationship with the sorceress Horpyna only underscores his Cossack nature and, by this very same token, his function as a dark, disruptive force, “a friend or simply a relative” of the devil (1:318), who “from childhood had grown accustomed to and bonded with [the] untamed (*dziki*) world” of the Ukrainian steppe. Yet it is only after he loses his beloved Helena to Skrzetuski that Bohun, heretofore an anarchic free spirit eager to serve the Commonwealth in its conflict with the Turks and the Tatars albeit only for danger's sake, finally decides to raise his sword against the Commonwealth, in this way echoing and reenacting the story of Khmelnytsky's own loss and response to it.

As the scion of a partially Polonized Ruthenian princely family some of whose members (her guardians) “were ashamed to live with the gentry and instead found the company of wild Cossack *watażkas* more to their liking” (1:68), Helena already contains within herself the two forces at once constituting and dividing Ukraine. Her name, of course, like Rawita Gawroński's fanciful appellation for Khmelnytsky's woman, is an indication of her fate. Helena's guardians first promise her to their friend Bohun but then treacherously change their mind and betroth her to Skrzetuski, to whom she is attracted at first sight. When Bohun returns to reclaim her, she is abducted by Skrzetuski's friend Zagłoba in order to save her from the clutches of the Cossack, who, in turn, himself subsequently kidnaps her and secrets her away with the sorceress Horpyna. Rescued by Skrzetuski's friends, she at last ends up in the arms of the Pole, happy to fully assimilate into the world that her Polish lover defends against the likes of Bohun and his Cossack brethren.

Sienkiewicz concludes *Ogniem i mieczem* with an epilogue recounting in brief the resumption of hostilities two years after the treaty of Zboriv and with them Bohun's fate as a Cossack warrior. Although he is said to have come into possession of Wiśniowiecki's territories after the latter's death, Bohun, like his symbolic alter ego Khmelnytsky, essentially fades away into fictional obscurity, both broken men and both ultimately survived by the chaos that they unleashed. There is not a word in the epilogue about the further fate of Skrzetuski and Helena. After all, the novel *qua* novel, its central plot, that is, what allows the reader to effortlessly internalize its ideological implications, ends with Bohun's humiliation and the reunion of Skrzetuski and Helena. In the final scheme of things, she "declares [herself] on the side of the existing order" (1:128).

And it is in this respect that Sienkiewicz finally achieves what the romantics failed to, albeit at a loss. By transposing the Khmelnytsky story into the story of Bohun, he succeeds in narrativizing it as allegory, but only by displacing the traumatic presence, Khmelnytsky himself. A novel to comfort Polish hearts indeed.



# **Part III**

## **Khmelnysky and the Reinvention of National Traditions**



# 7

## The Heirs of Tul'chyn

### A Modernist Reappraisal of Historical Narrative

Amelia M. Glaser

**AMONG THE BLOODY EPISODES** Natan Hanover chronicles in his 1653 *Yeven metsulah*, one held particular attraction for Jewish modernists. “The Massacres of the Holy Community of Tul’chyn [Polish: Tulczyn]” stood out for its potential to connect the Jewish experience with a universal aesthetics of faith. In 1888, Nikolai Maksimovich Minskii (pseudonym for N. M. Vilenkin) published a five-act play in iambic pentameter titled *Osada Tul’china* (The Siege of Tul’chyn) in the St. Petersburg Russian Jewish journal *Voskhod*.<sup>1</sup> The play focuses on a Jewish community that chose death over conversion during the 1648–49 Cossack uprising. The Khmelnytsky uprisings were in the air: Mikeshin’s monument to Khmelnytsky was unveiled in 1888 in Kyiv’s St. Sofia Square. Although the Jewish and Polish antagonists present in the original model did not appear in the finished product, many Russians and Ukrainians associated the Khmelnytsky uprisings with a caricatured image of Jews as exploiters of Ukrainians.<sup>2</sup> The pogroms of 1881–82, the first widespread incidents of violence against Jews in Ukraine since the times of Khmelnytsky, were still vivid in the minds of Russia’s Jews, and the restrictive temporary legislation, or May Laws, that followed them were still in effect. Solomon Mandel’kern’s Russian translation of Hanover’s *Yeven metsulah* was republished in 1883.<sup>3</sup>

If we are to consider, as Andrei Belyi proposes, that Symbolism was one of many artistic strains that made up Modernism, then Minskii, a founding member of the Religious-Philosophical Society, was one of the first Russian modernists.<sup>4</sup> The play incorporates Nietzschean motifs of destruction and renewal, adapting Hanover’s Hebrew chronicles not



only for a Russian readership but for a modern readership. In the process he subtly reassesses the relationship (metaphysical and cultural) between faith and conversion. Minskii's proto-symbolist text succeeded in carving out an important place for Tul'chyn in the modern Jewish imagination. Mandel'kern's translation of Hanover as well as Minskii's play were links in a chain of translations and adaptations that would bring the Tul'chyn episode to modern readers. In 1905 Avrom Reisin would translate Minskii's Russian-language play into Yiddish, and in 1919 the Yiddish writer Sholem Asch would write many of the episodes from Minskii's play into his Yiddish novel *Kiddush ha-Shem*.<sup>5</sup> Aided by translations produced at key moments of anti-Jewish violence at the turn of the twentieth century, the Tul'chyn episode became an allegory for the relationship between trauma, faith, and self-sacrifice in modern Jewish culture.

Hanover's *Yeven metsulah* details the massacre of several Jewish communities by the Cossack rebels in 1648–49. In his chronicle of Tul'chyn, Hanover describes a fortified city where, besieged by Cossack troops, the Jews and Polish nobles form an alliance. The Cossacks, led by Kryvonos (Krivonos), offer to spare the Poles in exchange for the Jews and their property. The Poles accept, and the Jews, learning of the betrayal, prepare to wage war on their Polish neighbors. The head of the city's rabbinical academy, Aaron, convinces the Jews to lay down their weapons: "If you will lay a hand upon the nobles and the Catholic kings will hear of it, they will wreak vengeance upon our brethren in exile (God forbid). Therefore, if our fate be decreed from Heaven, let us accept the judgment with rejoicing."<sup>6</sup>

The Cossacks, having assembled the Jews outside the fortress, declare, "Whoever wishes to change his faith and remain alive, let him sit under this banner."<sup>7</sup> None move, and, by refusing to convert, the Jews die as holy martyrs. The Cossacks then attack the Polish fortress. After the slaughter, the Ukrainians announce, in the presence of the slain Jews, "He that is still alive may rise and need not fear, for the massacre is over."<sup>8</sup> According to Hanover, three hundred Jews survived the Tul'chyn massacre, and approximately fifteen hundred died.

Hanover's account of the incident emphasizes religious martyrdom in the face of conversion. Later scrutiny by historians has revealed that Hanover employed significant license in constructing this episode. Edward Fram has shown that he borrowed incidents from other episodes for this chronicle, embellishing his descriptions to make "the conversion of the Jews one of the Cossacks' primary goals of the 1648 revolt."<sup>9</sup> The Cossacks tended to kill

at random, without close attention to religion, and although Orthodoxy played a role in the uprising, their central goals were political and economic. Hanover imposes a "linear narrative of chronological progression," as Adam Teller puts it, which creates a sense of the fulfillment of biblical prophecy.<sup>10</sup>

In spite, or more likely because, of Hanover's literary license, the narrative appeal of Tul'chyn led modern writers and historians to repeat Hanover's account.<sup>11</sup> Both Graetz and Dubnow repeat Hanover's description of the Jewish martyrdom at Tul'chyn almost verbatim.<sup>12</sup> Mykola Kostomarov emphasizes religion in the Cossack uprising, over economic motivations.<sup>13</sup> For Jewish writers at the turn of the twentieth century, the story was especially appealing as it seemed to mirror contemporary struggles in the territory of Ukraine. Anti-Jewish pogroms in the 1880s, and again in the early 1900s, led Jewish writers to equate current events with antisemitic episodes of the past. In one of his *Railroad Stories*, Sholem Aleichem, with characteristic irony, has a community of Jews awaiting "Cossacks from Tul'chyn" who ostensibly will guard the Jews against a pogrom.<sup>14</sup> For Minskii, Tul'chyn both represented the history of anti-Jewish violence in the Ukrainian territories and presented a chance to revisit distinct historical moments when Jews were confronted with conversion to Christianity.

Ironically, Minskii's adaptation of Hanover, although exalting the Jewish martyrs of Tul'chyn, exemplifies his own vision of Christianity. Moreover, Sholem Asch's Yiddish version of the Tul'chyn story includes a subtle adaptation of Hanover's accounts of Jewish faith into a universal vision of spirituality. However, this Christianization and universalization in the modernists' texts should not be entirely surprising. After all, historically Christianity has often presented itself as a universalizing translation of the strictures of Judaism. As Roger Ellis has put it, "From the very beginning a vital ambiguity existed about the extent to which the new religion had grown out of, or outgrown, the old."<sup>15</sup> Moreover, literary adaptations and translation are part and parcel of the modern Jewish experience. As Naomi Seidman has supposed, "From the earliest translation project to the 'Holocaust' and beyond . . . the rich details of translation can serve as a map of Jewish-Christian identity, that is, of Jewish-Christian difference."<sup>16</sup> Minskii's adaptation universalizes Hanover's narrative (by carrying it into Russian) and universalizes the message through his privileging of spirit over nation. Conversion is not categorically rejected as it is in the original; rather, to some extent, it provides a means for cross-cultural understanding. Minskii was fascinated

by the idea of faith and conversion and, more generally, with Christian metaphysics. He would later become close to Gippius and Merezhkovsky, and he was a member of the Religious Philosophical Society. An assimilated Jew who had converted to Russian Orthodoxy in the early 1880s, Minskii was also rapidly becoming an aesthetic convert from positivism to anti-utilitarianism. He wrote his play while in the process of inventing the concept of “meonism,” a philosophy based on the idea of perpetual self-sacrifice by God for the sake of renewing and uniting the universe.<sup>17</sup>

Minskii roughly follows Hanover’s plotline but borrows episodes from other chapters in *Yeven metsulah* (furthering Hanover’s project of folding other episodes into Tul’chyn). His dialogue also suggests direct borrowings from Mykola (Nikolai) Kostomarov’s 1857 monograph, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, which was reissued in 1884.<sup>18</sup> A historian of mixed Ukrainian and Russian heritage, Kostomarov was concerned with differentiating Ukrainian history from Russian and relied on Ukrainian folk products, such as *dumas*, as historical sources.<sup>19</sup> Kostomarov, like Minskii after him, readily mixed historical episodes with religious archetypes. He patterned his earlier *Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu* (Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People) on the Hebrew Bible, and, as Myroslav Shkandrij has demonstrated elsewhere, put forward “the image of Ukraine as a suffering Christ.”<sup>20</sup> The central characters in Minskii’s play are the Cossack leader Kryvonis (Krivonos), the Polish Prince Chetvertynsky and Princess Zoya, Rabbi Aaron of Tul’chyn, and a fictitious hero named Yosif De Kastro, a Marrano who has come to Tul’chyn to help fight the Cossacks.<sup>21</sup> By distilling the major antagonists during the Khmelnytsky period into a few actors, Minskii exchanges the idea of collective suffering for the psychological drama of individual suffering. This idea is very much in keeping with his philosophical dissertation, *Pri svete sovesti* (In the Light of Consciousness), a work influenced by Nietzsche and the French Decadents, which would appear in 1890. Here, Minskii argues that life is “motivated exclusively by egoism . . . and call[s] for greater manifestations of individualism.”<sup>22</sup> The Marrano Kastro does just this, epitomizing Minskii’s Nietzschean call for a “new Man” who might rise above the common herd.

Kastro’s past recapitulates much of the history of European antisemitism. Early in the play Kastro confesses to his fellow Jews that he was born a Christian in Spain. He discovered his Jewish roots and Jewish sensibilities through his bosom friend and fellow Marrano Pedro, a young man whom he met while serving in Brazil, and whom he “loved, in a way that is sinful

to love another man: I practically idolized him!"<sup>23</sup> Pedro instructs Kastro in the history of the Inquisition and the Hebrew Bible. "He brought me into the covenant of our ancestors of Israel, and told me of their fate."<sup>24</sup> The two vow to protect their fellow Jews.<sup>25</sup> "And often, not finishing his story, / Pedro would throw himself upon my breast, / And we would cry for a long time, and we swore/to give our whole lives, our hearts' blood for our brothers."<sup>26</sup> In Kastro's description of his relationship with the young Marrano Pedro, we glimpse the erotic friendship that would later become a tenet of Minskii's symbolist writings.<sup>27</sup> The relationship, Kastro confesses, is forgotten when he is dispatched to Lisbon. "Sadly, I forgot the soft voice of Pedro [Uvy, zabyli ia tikhii golos Pedro]. / Habit . . . shame . . . the joys of courtship . . . / I was alone . . . I was carried by the current . . . / And the Lord punished me."<sup>28</sup> This punishment takes the form of the sacrifice of Pedro, who is burned at the stake as a heretic in a square where Kastro is keeping guard. Kastro leaves Lisbon for Holland, where he converts to Judaism and marries a Jewish woman. Learning of the suffering Jews in Poland, he travels to Tul'chyn.

The play includes a broad sampling of conversion narratives, both to and from Judaism, from the Spanish conversos to Hanover's martyrs of Tul'chyn. Both Kastro and his friend Pedro bear certain resemblances to Count Valentin Potocki (1700–1749), the probably legendary Polish nobleman and convert to Judaism who was rumored to have burned at the stake in Vilna in 1749 for refusing to renounce Judaism. The count is said to have received his Jewish instruction from a Jewish wine merchant who had impressed him, along with his friend and fellow nobleman, Zaremba, with stories of the Old Testament. Potocki (like Minskii's Kastro) supposedly received his conversion in Amsterdam, one of the few places in Europe where conversion to Judaism was legal. After his friend's death as a martyr, Zaremba is said to have married a Polish noblewoman, but to have kept his promise to Potocki by converting to Judaism and moving to Palestine with his wife.<sup>29</sup>

Minskii's introduction of a fictionalized Marrano into his narrative of East European Jewish suffering is worth further consideration. As converts from Judaism who maintained aspects of their Jewish identity, Marranos offer a positive precedent to an assimilated Russian Jew like Minskii who, despite his complete immersion in Russian culture, expressed solidarity with those Russian Jews who had been caught in the pogroms of the early 1880s. Moreover, the Spanish hero, whose strength and bravery is in marked contrast to his Ashkenazi brethren, embodies what Ismar Schorsch has called the "Myth of Sephardic Supremacy."<sup>30</sup> Schorsch, writing about

the German Jewish nineteenth-century romance with Sephardic history, scholarship, architecture, and even Sephardic Hebrew pronunciation, observes that “As construed by Ashkenazic intellectuals, the Sephardic image facilitated a religious posture Ash marked by cultural openness, philosophic thinking, and an appreciation for the aesthetic.”<sup>31</sup> Like Heinrich Heine, a baptized German Jew with a strong interest in Spain, Minskii appears to be searching for a strong, semi-Christian Jewish antidote to the Ashkenazi male. Minskii’s Kastro is a Jew who was saved, as a Marrano, by conversion (and who later freely converted back to Judaism). Schorsch notes that the juxtaposition between Ashkenazi martyrdom and Sephardic conversion had long been a point of pride among Ashkenazi Jews.<sup>32</sup> However, Minskii’s Kastro demonstrates a modern pragmatic flexibility that is in utter contrast to the victimhood of the Ashkenazim who, as recently as 1881–82, had suffered pogroms followed by harsh anti-Jewish legislation.

Indeed, the greatest personal tension in Minskii’s play is between the physically powerful, exotic, and untraditional Kastro and the pious Rabbi Aaron. Kastro’s embrace of Judaism hinges on brotherly love and empathy. He shows no compunction when he desecrates the Sabbath to continue building a tower from which to fight the Cossacks.<sup>33</sup> When the Poles agree to trade their Jewish allies for their own immunity, Kastro proposes waging war on the nobles and Aaron prevails upon the Jews to lay down their arms.

Rabbi Aaron, echoing Hanover’s chronicle almost literally, cries out: “O, brothers! / Where is this foreigner leading you? / He advises you to lift your hand / against thirty Polish nobles and their guards. / Think carefully! If this plan succeeds, / you will but save yourselves and your children for a time, / but what will await our people in Poland in time to come? . . . How are we better than our brothers in Bar?”<sup>34</sup>

Whereas in Hanover’s chronicle Aaron refers to Jews in exile (“We find ourselves in exile, cast among peoples; if you lift your hand against the lords here, then other nobles will hear of it” [Mandel’kern’s Russian: *My nakhodimsia v izgnanii, razseiannye mezhdu narodami*<sup>35</sup>]), in Minskii’s version it is Kastro’s presence as a foreigner that recalls the Jews’ precarious position in exile (Where is this foreigner leading you [Kuda vedet vas etot inostranets?]).<sup>36</sup> Kastro, a remnant of the Spanish Inquisition and newcomer to Judaism, personifies Aaron’s fear of Jewish apostasy. In his eagerness to defend his people and willingness to forgo Jewish law, he also serves as an anachronistic model of Jewish modernization. Kastro issues a final, unsuccessful, appeal to the crowd: “Oh, prove for once, that you are

men! / It isn't too late. We can defend ourselves . . . / I entreat you for the last time! Whoever is with me, / let him raise his hand as I do to the sky [Pust' tot, kak i ia, podnimet ruku k nebu]."<sup>37</sup>

Once in the custody of the Cossacks, the Jews are given another opportunity to save their lives in exchange for conversion to Christianity (as we expect from Hanover's account). Krivonos, assembling the Jewish prisoners moments before the massacre, announces, "Whoever is prepared to renounce Judaism / and honestly put the cross around their neck, / Let him come to us and stand under this banner [Pust' vyidet k nam i stanet pod khorugv'iu], and he will be free, and, as a brother, we will share our fortune and bread with him."<sup>38</sup> In Minskii's play, Kastro's call to arms, "let him raise his hand" (pust' . . . podnimet ruku), grammatically parallels the Cossacks' call to conversion, "let him come to us" (pust' vyidet k nam). Without diminishing the Cossacks' antagonism toward the Jews, Minskii thus likens Kastro to the Cossacks in his opposition to the Poles and defiance of Rabbi Aaron. The mythical Sephardic Jew and the mythical Cossacks may be at odds, but the force of their conviction subtly implies the potential for a more likely coexistence than the Jews experienced with the Polish overlords. Minskii's efforts to hint at the possibility of Jewish-Ukrainian sympathy are all the more understandable given the anti-Polish sentiments in the aftermath of the Polish revolt of 1863.

The passivity of the Jews of Tul'chyn notwithstanding, Minskii clearly views the story as an example of Jewish heroism to rival the kind of Slavic Christian heroism present in Russian literary culture. Minskii would refer to this historical episode again in his philosophical treatise, *Pri svete sovesti*: "A few thousand people willingly accepted death for their national unity, died no less courageously than Ostap, and, surely, with the same cry on their lips: 'Father [Bat'ko] where are you? Can you hear all of this?' But alas! The father, the heavenly father [nebesnyi Bat'ko] of the chosen people did not answer, as Taras did, 'I hear you!'"<sup>39</sup> For Minskii the Jewish martyrs, like Nikolai Gogol's Ostap, may have reenacted the role of the dying Jesus, but the Jewish God remained silent. Thus Minskii questions the efficacy of Jewish faith while validating the strength of Jews as individuals.

Let us recall that Minskii published his play in 1888, a year that marked the nine-hundred-year celebration of the baptism of Rus' and the 240th anniversary of Khmelnytsky's uprising against Polish magnates. Collective memory of Khmelnytsky was being restored and recreated across Alexander III's Russia. In celebration of these events, Mikhail Mikeshin's

monument to the hetman was erected in Kyiv's St. Sofia Square; Mikeshin's Khmelnytsky holds a laudatory sword toward Russia in the East and is ready to run toward Poland to defend the country and his Orthodox brethren.<sup>40</sup> Mikeshin's early draft of the monument displayed the Zaporozhians' enemies (a Jew, a Polish lord, and a Catholic priest) beneath the horse's hoof. Faith Hillis, in her discussion of the model, cites a letter from Mikeshin to Iuzefovich, in which the sculptor wrote that "under the steed's hooves lay broken chains and the 'body of a Jesuit or a priest, almost completely covered by a broken Polish flag that is full of holes. . . . Lower, on a ledge, there is a fallen but still living Polish noble, and still lower . . . a Yid in the last throes of death caught red-handed [*u kotorogo ruki zastyli*], holding religious vessels and items and money'."<sup>41</sup> Although the Polish and Jewish figures were eliminated from the finished product, the statue, which linked pan-Slavism, Orthodoxy, and patriotism, fit into the religiously conservative climate of Alexander III's government.

Minskii's play, appearing in the same year in a Jewish periodical, could be read as a counternarrative to this celebration of the baptism of Rus'. Earlier critics have read Minskii's play as commentary on the recent violence and political efforts to generate Jewish self-defense units: Lvov-Rogachevsky, writing in the 1920s, suggests that the play "is replete with the same doubts and feelings of impotence which permeated the sick generation of the 1880s."<sup>42</sup> In *Pri svete sovesti*, Minskii discusses the history of the enmity between Russians and Jews, peoples who had been manipulated to hate one another: "The enmity of Russians toward Jews, more than once leading to pogrom violence, can be explained by the general animosity of the government oppression, moreover by the fact that both peoples were introduced to one another through their contrasting, worst traits,—their laziness and greed, cruelty and fright."<sup>43</sup> However, Minskii writes in a spirit of humanistic optimism: "But this misunderstanding couldn't continue forever and, indeed, there came a time when it was dispelled, and both peoples saw themselves in the light of heroism and love [*v svete geroizma i liubvi*]. This happened when the grandchildren of Taras Bul'ba and Yankel . . . met in university and in literature in the light of knowledge and truth."<sup>44</sup> "With love," Minskii concludes, "all is possible." [*S liubvi vse vozmozhno.*] For Minskii the key to overcoming the kind of animosity that poisoned Jewish-Slavic relations in the early 1880s lay in a universal spirituality.<sup>45</sup> Minskii's interest in a Jewish-Russian spiritual rapprochement helps to explain the hybridity of his hero.

Moreover, Minskii's attachment to the idea of sacrifice in Christianity helps to explain his emphasis on individual acts of martyrdom. In Minskii's play, the most poignant act of holy martyrdom (*kidesh hashem*) is carried out by Sarah, Kastro's wife, who tricks the Cossacks into believing that she is immortal, prompting them to test her by shooting her in the heart. Minskii borrows this episode from a story of female heroism in one of Hanover's earlier chronicles, in which a young woman, forced to become a Cossack's bride, tricks him into shooting her.<sup>46</sup>

As Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi has noted, "the pronounced tendency, after 1648, to fit the recent catastrophe into the mold of past tragedies" reveals a "resistance to novelty in history." Thus, the Cossack uprising, which the chroniclers already equated with the Crusades, became an ur-tragedy for Eastern European Jews that could stand in for the pogroms of 1881–82, 1903–1905, and 1918–1920.<sup>47</sup> Minskii's retelling of the Tul'chyn episode was an especially usable narrative for modern Jewish writers. The popular Yiddish writer Avrom Reisin published his Yiddish translation of "The Siege of Tul'chyn" in Kraków in 1905, at the height of the first major wave of pogroms since the 1880s. Reisin was one of the first to write about the new wave of pogrom violence, publishing a short story, "Der giber" (The hero), a few days after the 1903 Kishinev pogrom.<sup>48</sup> It is striking that the next well-known modern Jewish text about Tul'chyn appeared in 1919, amid the violence of World War I and the Ukrainian Civil War. Sholem Asch's *Kiddush ha-Shem* (Holy Martyrdom) appears to be modeled on Minskii's version of Hanover. Asch, who was living in Poland at the time and attended literary salons with Reisin, would certainly have been aware of his colleague's translation.<sup>49</sup> Asch sets a large portion of his novel in Tul'chyn. His account focuses on acts of individual and collective heroism, the sacredness of collective Jewish prayer, and, interestingly, the power of Jewish faith to move the Cossack antagonists.

Asch embellishes Minskii's and Hanover's accounts, devoting several pages to a description of the religious procession leading up to the attempt to convert the Jews. He emphasizes the aesthetic mixture of Judaism and Christianity:

A choir of church singers, headed by one carrying a banner with a sacred image [a fon mit a heylik bild] graven upon it, followed the priest. The Jews saw neither the Cossack leader Krivonos nor the church procession. They closed their eyes so as not to see the cross and the sacred Christian image [az zey zoln nit zen dem fon mitn heylikn kristn-bild], and raised their voices louder as they sang the Psalms . . . The Jewish voices



mingled with the church choir, and it was as though the murderer and his victim were together intoning to God a song of praise in the glorious sunlight.<sup>50</sup>

When the Jews ignore Krivonos's appeal to "come near the flag and bow down before the cross,"<sup>51</sup> the Cossack leader is momentarily unable to move. Asch thus suggests that the Cossacks recognize, in the Jews, elements of their own faith. Asch applies the story Minskii has used for Kastro's wife Sarah to his own heroine, Deborah. The fact that this departure from Hanover was Minskii's innovation indicates Asch's direct borrowing from Minskii, probably by way of Reisin's translation. Kidnapped by the Cossacks, and betrothed to one Yerem, Deborah is presented with a pair of golden slippers (*goldene shikhelekh*) that were once a gift from her beloved Shlomo. Yerem tells her that he bought them from a peasant. "He found them on a dead Jew whom they had killed in Tul'chyn. The Jew held them pressed to his heart." [Er hot zey bay a toyten iden gefunen, vos zey hoben in Tultshin oysgehartet.]<sup>52</sup> Deborah, assuming her husband to be dead, chooses to die in purity rather than marry the Cossack. She does so by standing beside the fire so as to appear to be a human embodiment of God before the credulous Yerem: "'Oh, God have mercy . . . Now, I know. I have recognized you. You are a holy one, you are a saint. I saw you in church [ikh hob dikh in tserkve gezen]. On the holy icon I saw you. Oh, I know now, sinful soul that I am. Have pity, have pity!' the peasant stammered."<sup>53</sup> The Cossacks propose a test, and Deborah, donning the golden slippers from her childhood companion, instructs Yerem to fire at her. Rather than be converted to Christianity, Deborah, like Minskii's Sarah, manipulates the Cossacks' belief, placing a sin of murder (and false faith) on them.<sup>54</sup>

Both Asch's Deborah and Minskii's Sarah are survived by their husbands. Asch's Shlomo, ignorant of Deborah's fate, is certain that "she had gone up to heaven in holiness and purity" [er hot gevust, az zi iz aropgegangen in himel bekadoshe ubetahara].<sup>55</sup> Kastro lives to bear witness to the Cossack's slaughter and humiliation of the Poles. Whereas in Hanover's account Prince Chetvertynsky must witness the rape of his wife and daughter before his own beheading, in Minskii's version the unfortunate duke, having called out to his wife, watches her willingly depart with a Cossack, a detail that is in keeping with Kostamarov's claim, in his 1870 monograph, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, that Chetvertynsky's wife became a prize for the *polkovnik* Ostap.<sup>56</sup> Kastro dies only later, when, horrified at the Cossacks' gruesome betrayal of the Poles, he refuses to join Krivonos in rejoicing in the triumph of Orthodoxy over Catholicism. We must note that Minskii made

a historical error here: the Chetvertynsky family were prominent members of the Orthodox church, albeit also nobles.<sup>57</sup> Such significant inaccuracies offer further evidence that Minskii was more concerned with the place of religion in his own late nineteenth century than in the seventeenth century: the idea of three competing religions fit neatly into Minskii's fictional play.

Sholem Asch's *Kiddush ha-Shem* appeared, like Minskii's "Siege of Tul'chyn," during a wave of anti-Jewish pogroms. Amid the Jewish physical suffering wrought by the Ukrainian Civil War of 1918–1920, Asch offers a celebration of historical Jewish heroism.<sup>58</sup> However, he does so while emphasizing the universal qualities of love, faith, and sacrifice. The novel ends with a Jew standing alone at the Lublin fair behind an empty market stall. When asked what he is selling, he replies simply, "I sell faith." [Ikh farkhoif bitokhn].<sup>59</sup> Although *Kiddush ha-Shem* is clearly a narrative for and about Jews, Asch emphasizes traits that are not necessarily particular to Judaism. Let us recall, moreover, that Sholem Asch was, by then, well known for his positive portrayals of Christianity. He had sparked controversy among Yiddish readers in 1909 when he published a story about Jesus, "In a Karnaval Nakht," in the Yiddish journal *Dos naye lebn*. (The story centers on a Carnival ritual in Rome, where Jesus steps in and is sacrificed by a mob of Christians as the ritual Jewish scapegoat.) Asch would later complete a series of novels based on the New Testament, as well as several essays urging a Jewish-Christian rapprochement. These texts, written in the United States, spawned false rumors that Asch had converted to Christianity and that he was attempting to lure Jews toward baptism.<sup>60</sup> To the contrary, Asch was fascinated by the potential of the Jesus figure to foster greater respect across faiths. Matthew Hoffman has proposed that in his explicitly Christian-themed stories, as well as in his work more broadly, Asch "tends to cast the Jews with all of their sufferings in the Diaspora as the 'true Christians.' They are the ones who constantly suffer and die for their God, giving their lives as the ultimate sacrifice."<sup>61</sup> The Tul'chyn episode offered an example of Jewish sacrifice that was legible within a Christian, as well as a Jewish, theology. Moreover, within his text Asch portrays Christian Cossacks (Krivonos and Yerem) who briefly recognize the sanctity of this Jewish sacrifice, despite the role they play in it. It is reasonable to suppose that Minskii's play, thanks to Reisin's 1905 Yiddish translation, inspired Asch's choice of Tul'chyn as an example of East European Jewish martyrdom that also promotes the idea of Jewish-Christian fellowship through the shared values of faith and love.

Minskii's play subtly promotes an ecumenical form of faith. "The Siege of Tul'chyn" may celebrate Jewish resistance to conversion, but it also presents conversion as a gateway to self-negation and sacrifice (which Minskii viewed as positive). Kastro is the descendant of converts from Judaism, Marranos whose forced conversion during the Inquisition parallels the forced conversion of many Jews in Ukraine in 1648–49. Kastro, by contrast, has returned to his faith out of love for Pedro, and for the history of suffering that Pedro reveals to him. His commitment to the Jewish people is predicated on compassion rather than law, and ironically he therefore emblemizes the Christian notion of universal grace accessible to all. That Kastro is a convert replaces tribal devotion to a religion with voluntary love for one's fellow human. Therefore, we may understand Kastro, far from epitomizing the choice of Judaism over Christianity, to embody Minskii's idealized form of religious love and self sacrifice, an ideal that Minskii associated with his own invented concept of meonism, but which drew heavily upon Christianity.

In both Minskii's and Asch's renditions of the Tul'chyn episode, the Jewish people are brave and faithful, but the Jewish exceptionalism in Hanover's chronicles yields, in these modern texts, to a more ecumenical form of faith. Both Minskii and Asch deemphasize Jewish law and emphasize sacrifice and love. Both offer heroines who, through their selfless sacrifice, might be likened to Christ figures or saints. In Asch this is explicit in Yerem's observation that he has seen Deborah "in church." If Kastro, dying for refusing to acknowledge Orthodox supremacy over Catholicism, can be read as a martyr, he is not a specifically Jewish martyr but has died for the sake of religious freedom.

Grappling with faith and tradition in a post-Nietzschean world, assimilated writers of the *fin de siècle* and later were interested in what the legacy of 1648 could say about the relationship between faith and catastrophe. For thinkers confronting renewed tensions between Jews and Christians, the personal drama of finding a version of faith suitable to the modern world was paramount, and these writers turned Hanover's mythologized account of Tul'chyn into the blueprint for a modern text about sacrifice and the crisis of belief. It was a Jewish story, but one that could appeal to an increasingly Christian sensibility among new generations of Jewish readers.

# 8

## Hanukkah Cossack Style Zaporozhian Warriors and Zionist Popular Culture (1904–1918)

*Israel Bartal*

THE RADICAL JEWISH SETTLERS who went from the Russian empire to Palestine in the years 1904–1914 were not the first in the modern Jewish national movement to fashion a new image of the Jew. The pioneers of the nineteenth-century Haskalah (Jewish enlightenment) in Central and Eastern Europe were already dissatisfied with the looks of the Jewish product of traditional society and conjured the image of an altogether new Jew for the future: *Homo Europus* in customs and language, physically and mentally healthy, an active player in the life of his polity. The maskilic criticism of the flaws of the traditional Jewish reality traced, among other factors, to the internalization of the aesthetic values of European culture and the acceptance of several social and economic doctrines that defined the Old World Ashkenazi Jew as impaired, physically and intellectually flawed, and economically unproductive. The Jewish national movement, born of the late nineteenth century, also accepted these pejorative yardsticks and internalized negative images of the Jew that were prevalent in European culture. However, while the Haskalah aimed mainly to repair the Jew's flaws so that he might integrate successfully into the various European societies, the national movement transformed this "repair job" into the creation of a new nationality invested with characteristics befitting a nation like all "normal" nations. As the young radical immigrants of the Second Aliyah went from the Russian empire to early twentieth-century Palestine they pitched in to shape a new person, hoisting the cultural baggage that they had managed to pick up in imperial Russia before they headed for the Middle East and set it down in the realities of their new

country. They established cultural patterns born in the Pale of Settlement and Congress Poland and several basic images of the new secular national culture in the Middle Eastern country that they had come to settle. These images, and not only the ideological doctrines or the political-party platforms, left a bold imprint on the grasp of reality that was shaped in the new location. The image of the country, the nation destined to settle in it, the language that the settlers would speak, and a national history that would blend past and future into a continuum that millennia of discontinuity could not defeat: all were designed on the basis of cultural models that intersected with the local reality or were implanted in it by dint of the imagination of the shapers of the new reality.

One of the edifying examples of the effect of an eminently East European model on shaping the image of the new national Jew is the case of the Zaporozhian Cossack model. This model, one of considerable influence in designing the alternative renderings of the new image, had no ideological or political background and was never privileged with intellectual debate at the political party or organizational level. Just the same, it influenced the thoughts, plans, and modes of behavior of not a few participants in the so-called Second Aliyah—the small radical-minded group of immigrants who arrived from Eastern Europe in the years 1904–1914. Furthermore, this model became part and parcel of the nascent popular culture of pre-statehood Land of Israel.

The Cossack character was imported to early twentieth-century Palestine straight from the world of Russian and Ukrainian popular cultures and mated in the settlers' minds with two Palestinian Arab personae: the nomadic Bedouin and the agrarian *fallah*. Below we follow some of the metamorphoses of this character, its acceptance, and its uses as a possible alternative way to reform the traditional Old World Jew—a reform that, for those of the Second Aliyah, meant the replacement of the “Jew” with an “other,” the transformation of a quondam exilic enemy into part of the new Jew's self.

In his preface to the collection *Kovets ha-Shomer* (The Guardian's Anthology), published for the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the eponymous self-defense organization, Shlomo Kaplanski (1884–1950) offers two sources for the idea of all-Jewish defense in Palestine. One source, he argues, was the idea of *self-labor*, flowing from the socialist notion, born in Europe, of the superiority of labor over property. The other source was the idea of *self-defense*, the most salient marker of the psychological

revolution that had taken place among Russian Jews who had chosen the national path. In Kaplanski's opinion, the two sources merged in the nexus that the *shomrim* (guardians, members of Hashomer) established with the second Aliyah group of agricultural laborers and found expression in their goal of returning to agriculture after carrying out their self-defense duties for a specified period. Hence, Kaplanski continues, "the plans to create frontier villages for members of Hashomer, something like settlements of Jewish Cossacks."<sup>1</sup> The integration that Kaplanski had in mind was one of socialism and national activism. To be more precise, it combined Borochoviaan Marxist ways and aspirations relating to national dignity, connecting with Jewish history, and the young immigrants' sentiments and feelings about the Land of Israel. This encounter between nationalism and a set of political arguments couched in quasi-scientific language, on the one hand, and a national romanticism that manifested itself in audacious ways and passionate and extreme rhetoric, on the other, crackled with multiple tensions. Young Jews who had reached Palestine from Lithuania, Ukraine, Bessarabia, and the Caucasus—diverse and geographically remote corners of the tsarist empire—debarked on the shores of Palestine laden with baggage of images and ideas. They had a vague and inchoate image of the Jewish society that would arise on the soil of the old-new homeland. The image of this future society was, as stated, fueled by Marxist precepts and ideas that had crystallized in the East European political reality. The immigrants' thinking and consciousness were also influenced, however, by historical images and subjective feelings that played a role in political and organizational action, their behavior toward the nation and the land, and what was expected of them. The image of the Cossacks, those frontiersmen on the southern fringe of the settled territory of imperial Russia, was one of the factors that made very respectable inroads in the thinking of several members of Hashomer at its inception. The intersection of this image and the romantic image of the Palestinian Bedouin spawned a series of phenomena that, although typical mainly of the behavior of the *shomrim*, wielded an influence that rippled far beyond. (See Fig. 8.1.)

Where did members of that paramilitary organization get the idea, which they cited repeatedly in their writings, letters, settlement plans, and years later their memoirs, of setting up a fighting organization comprising nomadic peasants? How did they create the vision of Jewish warriors who would settle on the frontiers, concurrently expanding the settled area and



**FIGURE 8.1.** Members of the Hashomer organization—a postcard sent from Mandatory Palestine to Europe before World War II. Photo courtesy of Yad Vashem Photo Archive, Rabbin Collection, archival signature 1366/103.

stanching the incursion of desert nomads into the area cultivated by their farmer brethren?

Studying the biographies and memoirs of the *shomrim*, one quickly finds that nearly all of them had imbibed in their earliest youth positive images of the East European peasant—productive, tolerant, and repressed by political and economic forces that lived off his labor. In contrast to the tiller of the soil, trapped in the throes of tyrannical masters—Polish or Russian noblemen—their consciousness also absorbed the counterimage: the rebel warrior, living in the wilderness beyond the border of the settled country and defending the frontier. Alexander Zaid (1886–1938), a legendary founder of Hashomer, recounts in his Russian-language diary a peasant’s son who preached to him the idea of productivization in a childish nutshell way: “If the peasants don’t sell bread to you Jews, you’ll starve to death.”<sup>2</sup> Alongside the peasant, the diary features a Cossack named Vasily, about whom Zaid writes: “I can say that it was he who educated me back then and shaped my character.”<sup>3</sup>

Itzhak Ben-Zvi (Shimshelevich, 1884–1963), the second president of the State of Israel more than fifty years after the founding of Hashomer in 1908, was born in Poltava, Ukraine. According to his memoirs, the peasants in his area of birth were loyal to the Ukrainian peasant culture, whereas

“the middle and upper classes in town spoke and thought in Russian and were assimilated into the culture of the ruling nation in the Empire.” In Ben-Zvi’s rendering, the tradition of the Cossack hetmans still lived among the Ukrainian masses: they saw in Bohdan Khmelnytsky a national hero and nurtured the ember of hope that, with the help of their autonomous brethren in the steppe, they would manage to free themselves of the Russians’ yoke, language, and culture. Ben-Zvi too, in his memoirs, noted the contrast of village and town, a contrast between the downtrodden peasant culture and the imperial rite of the Russian tsars.<sup>4</sup> Mendl Portugali (1888–1917), before moving to Palestine and joining Hashomer, engaged in the distribution of anti-Tsarist material among Bessarabian peasants near his hometown, Călărași.<sup>5</sup>

Seemingly, then, central motives in the image of the Ukrainian nation (as shaped by the radical Ukrainian intelligentsia using materials from Ukrainian history and folklore) found their way to radical groups among Jewish youth as well. These motives identified the Ukrainian nation with the peasant culture, oppressed by the Russian authorities, and partitioned this nation into two classes: a beleaguered peasantry, controlled by the Russians, and a Cossack population that enjoyed much freedom and would eventually hoist the pennant of rebellion against the Russian oppressor, the dominion of city over village, and the influence of West European culture. Some participants in the Second Aliyah had adopted these motives in their early days, at the onset of their pre-Palestine political activity. With the decline of agrarian socialism in the late nineteenth century and the growing influence of the teachings of Karl Marx, the political significance of the Ukrainian villager image also waned. Even so, these images remained central in the radical Russian oppositionist culture at the turn of the twentieth century and in the political literature of the revolutionary movement. They were so important that the Jewish revolutionaries considered them axiomatic, even though they were pronouncedly romantic and “anti-progressive”—diametrically opposed in their ideological and political meaning to the Marxism that Russian social democracy had embraced. More so, these images gave off a very pungent anti-Jewish scent both because they were heavily clouded by previous centuries of bloodshed in Jewish–peasant and Jewish–Cossack relations in Ukraine and because the Jews were an eminently urban element in the rural Ukrainian surroundings and tended to integrate into the Russian-language Imperial culture.<sup>6</sup> The anti-Jewish attitudes that clung to these images did stir discontent among Jewish revolutionaries as far back as



the 1870s and 1880s; the revolutionaries made real efforts to cope with the problem by raising the counterargument that not all Jews should be taken as exploiters.<sup>7</sup> Essentially, however, even the cultural world of the men and women of the Second Aliyah retained the images of the good and productive Ukrainian peasant and his freedom-fighting Cossack relative on the frontier. The persistence of these images in the Palestine context is also evident against the background of the fierce criticism from socially radical immigrants against the reality of Jewish society in the East European diaspora. The immigrants tended to associate it with the Jewish society that they had found in Palestine, which to their minds amounted to an extension of *goles* (Yiddish, exile) Jewry in all its negative characteristics.

However, the immigrants also had a direct source for the identification of their settlement, social, and military goals with the realities of the south Ukrainian frontier and the lives of its Cossack inhabitants: the influence of the romantic dreamer Michael Halperin (1860–1920) on several prominent members of the founding group of the Second Aliyah paramilitary organizations. After the fact, everyone who wrote about Halperin's influence on the Second Aliyah mindset took exception to the great fantasy that wafts from his ideas and preachings, but the importance of this influence on the romantic portion of the Second Aliyah national consciousness is almost undisputed. Rachel Yanait (Ben-Zvi's spouse, 1886–1979) encountered Halperin in Poltava in 1907. Until then, she says, she lacked the sense of the Land of Israel of legend due to her continual occupation with Po'ale Tsiyon's Marxist theory. Now, however, this odd and stirring man kindled the missing legendary and romantic sentiment by preaching passionately for the establishment of defense settlements along the borders of Palestine, patterned after "the Cossacks' settlements on the Don."<sup>8</sup> Alexander Zaid heard Halperin's impassioned rhetoric in praise of the Cossack model in Vilna in 1905. There, Halperin called on young Jews to follow the lead of the warrior-peasants who lived on the Ukrainian frontier "to train us for new lives in the Land of Israel, to work the soil and defend the country. He urged us to transform our lives from the ground up: to wear simple clothing like villagers, to eat dark, simple bread and natural foods, to take lots of hikes, to breathe crisp air, to develop physical strength and nurture it for the roles [that we would need to play] to conquer the country."<sup>9</sup> Zaid also notes that Halperin advocated the development of friendly relations with the Bedouin neighbors, including intermarriage, adoption of customs, and training of mounted and unmounted Hebrew defenders who

would live on “national farms” and function as a people’s army.<sup>10</sup> Zaid, like Yanait, even attests to Halperin’s remarks in Vilna, in which he found “a new element, a glowing imagination” that enflamed young Jews who were so far receiving “a rational education in insight and cold reasoning” in Russia.<sup>11</sup> Halperin’s letters to the Zionist leader Menachem Ussishkin (1863–1941) attest to his link with the paragon of the Cossack military settlement. In one of them, he speaks explicitly about “a hundred-member battalion (*sotnia*) of [Jewish] Bedouins that will hold enough land to bring forth bread for a thousand”<sup>12</sup> and seeks funding for its establishment. Notably, the basic unit of the Cossack settlers’ rural military organization was the hundred-member battalion (*sotnia* in Russian). Were this not enough, Halperin, speaking to a small group of Po’ale Tsiyon members in Jaffa, used national symbols that he adopted straight from the reality of the warrior tribes on the Russian frontier. In the circumcision ceremony of Bar Kokhba, first-born son of Avraham Krinitzi (1886–1969), then of Po’ale Tsiyon, the *sandak* (godfather) was Michael Halperin. This ritual official, who urged the young father to act for the ascendancy of “a Jewish race similar to the Zaporozhian Cossacks,” placed a Caucasian *kinzhal* (dagger) under the eight-day-old infant’s head.<sup>13</sup>

If so, the image of the Cossacks as a warrior-settler class, as a vehicle of integration with the restored national image of forgotten heroes from the past such as Bar Kokhba, Bar Giora, and Judah Maccabi,<sup>14</sup> had nestled in the minds of Hashomer and Po’ale Tsiyon even before they tackled the realities of Palestine in any real way. Unlike other ideas that faded or were rejected due to the different and special conditions of the east, the Cossack image developed, expanded, and even shifted from the world of national romantic mythology and fantasy to the realm of concrete plans and real activity. The fulfillment of the Cossack model was abetted first and foremost by the concrete need to secure the new Jewish community in Palestine. The Jewish farming villages in Palestine were at the turn of the century under the de facto control of the surrounding population. Arab peasants from neighboring villages, Bedouin tribes that dominated unsettled areas in the valleys and lowlands of western Palestine, Circassian colonists who lived in fortified villages at strategically important points, Mughrabis who had arrived from northern Africa after the failure of their mid-nineteenth-century uprisings against the French, and sundry undefined brigands—it was they who really controlled whatever land the Jews did not inhabit. Cultivated lands that the Zionist organizations had purchased were in dire trouble. The Cossack

model, still alive and kicking in imperial Russia, was suited to the security reality of Palestine even without its national romantic overlay. Palestine even had a similar settlement model of its own: that of the Circassians, established at the Ottoman authorities' initiative to cope with the problem of Bedouin control of the desert frontier areas (Transjordan, Golan Heights, and Hauran) and undefended areas that were exposed to the predations of nomadic tribes (in the lower eastern Galilee). This settlement enterprise, in the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, had a clearly military element.<sup>15</sup>

The Hashomer people witnessed the Circassian example; Yitzhak Nadav (1890–1963), a Yemenite Jew who joined the paramilitary organization, speaks of it in his memoirs.<sup>16</sup> Their awareness of security conditions in Palestine and the role of the settler-warrior tribes on the fringes of imperial Russia found expression in various proposals for solving the problem of how to retain national lands and provide the Yishuv with comprehensive defense in danger-prone areas. In a letter to Henrietta Szold in March 1909, Manya Shochat (1878–1961), a most influential woman activist, proposed the establishment of a cooperative organization of “nomadic peasants,” the members of which would combine traits of heroism, superb physical condition, and ability to live cooperatively under grim conditions, working the land and migrating from place to place as required by immediate needs.<sup>17</sup> Israel Shochat (1886–1961), Manya's spouse, who placed many of Hashomer's seemingly fanciful outlooks in practical organizational frames, proposed in a letter from Istanbul in December 1912 an overall Yishuv defense plan based on a general organization of warrior-farmers. Like the Cossacks in the military colonies on the Ukrainian frontier, the warrior-settlers in Shochat's scheme would report for duty at any time of danger: “All the farmers and workers who can bear arms would head out and participate in actual defense,” Shochat put it.<sup>18</sup>

The idea of the defenders' cooperative village, much discussed in Hashomer gatherings, conversations, and writings, was influenced by the Cossack model. Zaid writes in his memoirs: “We will establish our colonies within the borders of the country to be perpetually vigilant and to serve as a bulwark against invaders. We will raise our children for lives of cooperation, cultivation of the soil, and defense. Every boy and girl, without exception, will learn to use weapons and ride noble mares.”<sup>19</sup>

Zvi Nadav states that the defenders' village should be “far from the settled *Yishuv* and from the city; between the mountains and close to a

place where courageous neighbors live, so that we may train the generation growing up with us, too, for lives of defense on horseback and with arms, one that will also be healthy in body and mind and courageous.”<sup>20</sup>

For those of the Second Aliyah, the proximity of the defense imperatives and the overall view of the map of Jewish settlements in Palestine to the model, familiar from Russia, of a warrior-peasant army settling at the edge of the wilderness corresponded well not only with vague romantic fantasies about the Bedouin “noble savage.” It agreed as well with historical and ethnographic concepts that took shape in their consciousness as they encountered the country. The most familiar linkage of this kind was the identification of the Hashomer warriors with Jewish heroes of yore. Rachel Yanait had hardly come ashore in Palestine when she wrote a pamphlet titled *Bar Kokhba*, in which she urged the Jews of Eastern Europe to rise up and rebel against the old world order. Linking the semilegendary image of Bar Kokhba, the leader of the second Jewish revolt against the Romans (132–135 CE), with her own radical political worldview, she stated that only by dint of a popular uprising back then could the individual hero achieve:

Only a few individual heroes, giants, heads of movements are recorded in history; the great and broad masses of the people, sacrificing their lives and delivering the victories with their blood, the memory of these tens of thousands who fell in battle is lost and gone. It should be understood right now, however, that it is not individuals, however outstandingly talented they may be, who create popular movements and bring salvation; instead, it is the nation, which redeems and fights for itself [that does this]. Only then, when the nation is willing, when the nation supports them, may individual heroes also achieve prodigiously.<sup>21</sup>

It was clear to Rachel Yanait that the example of that great popular uprising in the distant past fits the realities of early twentieth-century Palestine. “Now like back then, we are standing within the freedom movement, but the nation that sets it in order, that aspires to freedom—where will it come from? Those heroic people, those knights—where are they? Those haughty Jews, brave of spirit, where do we get them? *The nation will arise and give birth to its heroes! The heroes will arise and set out at the nation’s lead!* [emphasis added]”<sup>22</sup> Yanait, in her memoirs, would offer these remarks about the pamphlet *Bar Kokhba*: “Yes, I drew the entire contents of the pamphlet from the sources, but I must have seen more from my imagination and attempted to pour the gospel of our uprising into it.”<sup>23</sup> Continuing, she likened four *shomrim*—Yehezkel Nisanov (1886–1911), Alexander

Zaid, Zvi Beker (1885–1918), and Mendl Portugali—to Bar Kokhba and recounted that Zaid had regarded Simon Bar Kokhba and John of Giscala “as if they were his brothers, as if he were guarding the fields with them.”<sup>24</sup>

In a leaflet distributed by the Po‘ale Tsiyon central committee in memory of the ha-Shomer “victims” at Sejera, the Yishuv was urged to establish a new “nation” and turn out in lieu of the fallen heroes: “Where are you, where are you sons of the Maccabis, offspring of Bar Giora and Bar Kokhba?”<sup>25</sup> Thus, the image of the fighters from the distant past, identified with the creators of the new Hebrew nation in the present, paralleled with amazing precision the prevalent basic images of the Ukrainian nationality and its history. An especially striking parallel was found between the Jewish uprisings in antiquity and those of the Cossacks and the peasants mentioned above. In 1911, Itzhak Ben-Zvi published in *ha-Shiloah*, a major Zionist periodical, an article that, according to his wife, Rachel Yanait, was well known and commonly found among members of Hashomer.<sup>26</sup> The *shomrim*, she wrote many years later, discussed it during the days of Hanukkah. The article, “The Socioeconomic Causes of the Hasmonaean Uprising,” proposed a Marxist interpretation for the uprising that broke out in Judea in the second century BCE under the leadership of the Maccabis. Ostensibly, the article spoke in an eminently Marxist tenor as it laid bare the economic-class foundations of the Hasmonaean revolt—the event commemorated every year during the eight days of Hanukkah. One who reads the article through the eyes of an East European revolutionary who had migrated to Palestine, however, immediately senses the similarity of its explanations for the eruption, circumstances, and outcomes of the uprising and the historical image of Ukrainian history. The Hasmonaean uprising, according to the young Itzhak Ben-Zvi, was one in which the peasants and shepherds drove out the imperial bureaucrats, snubbed the empire’s urban bourgeois culture, and established a new aristocracy emanating from the people in the course of their national revolution.<sup>27</sup> The article articulates several points of intersection between the self-image of the self-styled descendants of the Maccabis and a secular-national view of history that made it possible to view the “warrior-peasant rebels” as the creators of a new aristocracy that would spearhead a national revolution. The main simile in Ben-Zvi’s 1911 article ties into the analogy between the Maccabis of antiquity and the Cossack warriors on the Ukrainian frontier: the clash of urban culture and rural culture, corresponding to the contrast between the Imperial cul-

ture and the original national culture that foreign rulers had repressed. In short: Hanukkah had been re-invented Cossack-style by a radical pioneer from Ukraine.

Another metaphor from the Ukrainian steppe that made its way to the geopolitical situation in Palestine was the “frontier” and its role. In the Ukrainian national consciousness, the frontier was a free zone to which enslaved peasants escape only to return to their country as a rebel army. There, too, dwelt the “free brethren” who were destined to come and help their enslaved brethren in their war against the imperial captor. This metaphor ostensibly sets on historical foundations the known aspiration among several founders of Hashomer to discover their ancient “brethren” among the Bedouin tribes of southern Palestine or Transjordan.<sup>28</sup> More so, it brings to mind the medieval aspiration of reuniting with lost Jewish warrior tribes, real or imaginary.

One may carry the comparisons further afield by noting the cultural contrast between free men on horseback and peasants bound to the soil, or the love-hate relations between mounted warriors and settlers busily colonizing land on the fringes of the settled area. Beyond this world of metaphors that shaped the Hashomer national worldview, one finds an emotional stance that typified the *shomrim* for many years: extreme disapproval of the “exilic” nature of the already existing Jewish settlements in Palestine. The new radical-minded immigrants tended to despise the colonists of the so-called First Aliyah villages (established in the years 1882–1903) and identified with their enemies, the nomads with their ethos of belligerent nobility. Mordechai Yiga’el (1892–1979) of Hashomer, raised from childhood in one of these colonies (Metulla), recounts in his memoirs an encounter between Druze, who had been dispossessed of their village and their land, and colonists—the Jewish farmers who had usurped them. This story belongs to a larger affair that had implications far beyond the village limits of Metulla. In its aftermath, in his article “The Hidden Question,” published in *ha-Shiloah*, Yitzhak Epstein disclosed the bitter truth about the Jewish settlers’ relations with local population in Palestine.<sup>29</sup> It was clear to Yiga’el, the *shomer*, that one side deserved respect and emulation and the other merited contempt and pity: the Druze warriors, “a tribe that could send thousands of armed warriors into battle,” much in contrast to the Jewish farmers of Metulla, “a handful of members of a people persecuted and accustomed to surrendering for thousands of years.”<sup>30</sup> One who studies the account of the Druze attack on Metulla might imagine a

Cossack battalion raiding a Jewish *shtetl* (the shtetl, by long-term historical reckoning, being an urban colony established under a foreign ruler's auspices on Ukrainian soil). The text reveals as well the overt admiration and identification of Yiga'el, Palestine-born and infused with the values of Hashomer, with the warrior tribe—which had yielded to the Jews, who had gone into hiding in their homes, gripped with fear—because it was not their custom to fight with those who would not fight back.

The *shomrim* swapped the concept of the frontier, in which the Jews had occupied the settled side for centuries and tended to identify with the Imperial culture, for the Palestinian “frontier.” Therefore, sympathy for the oppressed peasant and for his free brother on the other side of the border did not stay within the minds of the East European Jewish radicals. It moved to Palestine along with the Second Aliyah pioneers and nestled in the soil of the new homeland. It was in this manner that the East European influence made one of its most fascinating appearances in the history of modern Jewish nationalism in Palestine.

The internalization of the Cossack figure and his sociomilitary role as a paragon for the Jewish colonization enterprise raises several mordant questions about the roots of modern Palestinian Jewish nationalism. Though not a dominant phenomenon among those of the Second Aliyah,<sup>31</sup> it was not marginal and uninfluential either. Furthermore, the association of this image with the one of the local enemies of the settlers, the Bedouin nomad, transformed the Cossack from a distant apparition and a vague memory into something visceral. In the minds of the East European immigrants, it “translated” the local Palestinian warrior into the most frightening enemy that the Jewish collective memory had known since the ghastly Khmelnytsky massacres of 1648–49. Now this enemy, embodied exclusively in his absolute contrast with East European Jewish society, became an object of yearning among the young members of Hashomer! Even though the ideological roots and experiential origins of the phenomenon have been discussed thoroughly if not exhaustively,<sup>32</sup> we are not absolved from pondering several additional aspects that relate to the deeper strata of the experience of emigration from Imperial Russia to Ottoman Palestine:

- a. **Fear.** The young participants in the Second Aliyah proposed a highly radical solution to the sense of fear that typified their society of origin, that of East European Jewry. The East European Jew, a member of an urban group in a hostile and threatening non-Jewish sea, depended on others for protection.<sup>33</sup> When crisis erupted, he was on

his own. In the new country, a radical solution that no longer seemed possible in the European reality could be invoked: integrating with the enemy on the grounds that the enemy was really an “ancient brother” who had never left the country. Thus, the defender of a Jewish village could imagine himself being on the Cossack-Bedouin side of things as against the cowardly Diaspora Jew represented by the First Aliyah farmer.

- b. **Heroism.** The group that embraced the Bedouin-Cossack paragon was composed of young men. They were in acute erotic distress<sup>34</sup> but were afraid of East European women, who were too domineering for their taste.<sup>35</sup> Both Cossack society and Bedouin society served them as exemplars of the fraternity of men in arms—a society in which women are submissive, occupied with childraising and satisfying the needs of the warrior as he returns from battle. Even the women who took part in this male fantasy aspired to resemble men and soft-pedal their femininity. The Cossack and Bedouin macho warrior ethos replaced the impotence that the émigrés from Russia attributed to their society of origin.
- c. **Aristocracy.** The *shomrim* spoke in terms of “national honor.” They needed an example of a warrior class that had customs, rituals, unbending codes of honor, heroism, loyalty, and fixity of purpose in the style of medieval knights. In the imagined reality of the Cossack warriors and the Bedouin tribesmen, they managed to find it. The ignominious Jewish man, never able to fully integrate into the aristocratic scene in Poland or Russia,<sup>36</sup> found a way to restore his honor by creating a warrior class in local society that could be European aristocracy’s parallel. The defenders’ mastery of the Bedouin horsemen’s expertise in ritual affectations and the art of war bore a clear imprint of the reclamation of lost dignity.<sup>37</sup> Nor is there any contradiction between the Socialist devotion of the *shomrim* and their sense of membership in a special class endowed with exceptional traits. The distance between a clandestine organization in the Russian revolutionary mold and a “tribe” that has special mannerisms to a group of chosen individuals was rather small.

Fear of the East European “other” gave rise to the hope of resembling him; a sense of impotence gave rise to a craving for belligerent virility; the sense of inferiority among members of a rejected and dishonored class gave rise



to a quest for affectations of knightliness. Delving into the two cultural inventories on which they could draw—that of their country of origin (Ukraine) and that of their destination (Palestine)—the *shomrim* searched for materials from which they could fashion images of heroism, masculinity, and nobility. The Ukrainian Cossack and the Mediterranean Bedouin gave them what they sought. Even more amazing was the survivability of these influences over time. The metamorphoses of Cossack and Bedouin influence from the Second Aliyah to contemporary Israeli society is a chapter in cultural history that has not yet ended.

# 9

## The Cult of Strength

### Khmelnytsky in the Literature of Ukrainian Nationalists During the 1930s and 1940s

*Myroslav Shkandrij*

**INTERWAR UKRAINIAN LITERATURE** frequently portrayed Bohdan Khmelnytsky in the light of a discourse that argued the importance of force in the modern world. At this time Ukrainians who lived in Western Ukraine (today's Galicia, Bukovyna, and Transcarpathia) and in émigré communities throughout Europe emphasized the threat to national survival. Most would probably have agreed that an armed struggle was required to win independence. However, throughout this period different strands of nationalism competed. They can be roughly distinguished as a national democratic current, an authoritarian one, and a xenophobic one that sometimes espoused vehement or "ecstatic" forms of expression. The national democratic current supported the struggle for the Ukrainian people's rights (linguistic, cultural, and political), while setting as its ultimate goal an independent Ukrainian state or, at the very least an autonomous Western Ukraine. The authoritarian current eventually produced the "integral" nationalism of the OUN (Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), a revolutionary underground, which was formed in 1929 out of the veterans who had fought for independence in 1917–20 and which soon found support among the youth of Galicia. The third and the most extremist current was represented by Dmytro Dontsov, who published the journal *Vistnyk* (Herald, 1933–1939) in Lviv. He was not a member of any political party, and he used the journal, which was his own private operation, to propagate his pro-fascist views. In opposition to the OUN's "organized nationalism," he called his own ideology "active nationalism." According to Oleksandr Zaitsev, the ideologies of both the OUN and Dontsov can

be called integral nationalism, but they had different priorities: “Dontsov’s was developing the nation’s spontaneous will to life and creating a new voluntaristic Ukrainian, while the OUN’s was a hierarchical disciplined organization capable of realizing a national revolution and establishing a national dictatorship.”<sup>1</sup>

The drift in the 1930s was from the majority creed of the national democrats, who were primarily represented by the UNDO party (Ukrainian National Democratic Association) and the newspaper *Dilo* (Deed), toward the integral nationalism of the OUN, and finally to the xenophobic version of this nationalism represented by Dontsovism. However, all three currents shared some common features, which are abundantly evident in interwar poetry and fiction: an attraction to strong characters, the ideals of masculine virility and endurance, and a contempt for weakness, cowardice, and indecisiveness. These writings favored certain mythical or metaphorical structures. Typical among them was the depiction of national rebirth, or of a character who undergoes a psychological transformation; the image of Ukraine as a new Rome; or of resolute and competent men replacing corrupt and effete leaders. In interwar years historical fiction was particularly fascinated by the periods of Kyivan Rus’ and Cossackdom, and it was primarily in these two “golden ages” that nationalist writers found strong protagonists, among whom none was more iconic than Bohdan Khmelnytsky. (See Fig. 9.1.)

Dmytro Dontsov’s *Natsionalizm* (Nationalism, 1926) is generally viewed as signaling the arrival of the new, authoritarian current of “integral nationalism” that regarded the nation as an organic whole and demanded the unconditional subordination of the individual to the interests of his or her nation.<sup>2</sup> However, Dontsov’s text also elevates the will over intellect, action over contemplation, and instinct over logic. It rejects what he perceives to be the age’s timid rationalism in favor of faith, desire, and the irrational drive. In this book Dontsov states: “For a healthy species the willful instinct has no limits. The affirmation of the right to life, of the genus’ continuity carries an axiomatic character; it is primary. It [the healthy species] elevates the nation’s eternal, arational right to life above everything temporary, phenomenal, ephemeral, rational—above the life of a given individual, the blood and death of thousands, the wellbeing of a given generation, abstract mental calculations, ‘general human’ ethics, and intellectually elaborated concepts of good and evil.”<sup>3</sup> From this moment on, Dontsov consistently attacked liberalism, democracy, and humanism—all of which, in his view,



FIGURE 9.1. Mykola Ivasiuk (1865–1937), *Bohdan Khmelnytsky Entering Kyiv* (1912). National Art Museum of Ukraine.

affirmed the primacy of the individual against the collective and state. He, in contrast, championed the rights of the state over the individual.

In *Natsionalizm* he expresses support for the cult of the fallen soldier who has given his life for “a great idea,” and he laments the lack of great patriotic books that would show not only war’s tragedy, but also its glamor and excitement: “The great crusades of chosen people have led to the creation of mighty monuments to human genius, such as the British Empire, the Europeanization of Africa, the cultivation of India.”<sup>4</sup> Admiration is shown for the settlement of the American West, the Russian conquest of Siberia, the Ukrainian “liberation of the Steppe from nomads,” and the “eternal urge among strong races to extend the boundaries of their dominions” (36–37). At the same time disdain is expressed for the lower classes, who, in Dontsov’s view, fail to understand the national imperative.

He recommends ecstatic, passionate, and frenzied forms of expression, a preference for “chaos, uncertainty, the abyss” (115); calls for a new, daring writing that embraces myths and legends of struggle; and lauds forms of modernist experimentation such as futurism and expressionism. In place of an aesthetics of harmony, balance, and classical restraint, he calls

for an expressionist probing of the irrational in the human soul, a “blind dynamism” that he understands to be a mysterious creative principle allied not to the conscious mind but to instincts and irrational forces (161). The literary hero, he feels, should express this willfulness either by imposing himself upon on the environment, or by rejecting it. On no account should his will be broken; he must perish rather than accept a foreign power over himself. Dontsov advises developing an instinctive desire for conquest, expansion, and struggle—signs, for him, of a healthy organism.

In the interwar years, Dontsov increasingly aligned his political and aesthetic views with fascism. The world, he argued, was both imagined and created by strong personalities. In his introduction to Mykhailo Ostroverkha’s book on Mussolini, published by the *Vistnyk* library in 1934, he lauded the dictator’s concept of creative “leadership” over the amorphous mass.<sup>5</sup> In *Patriotyzm* (Patriotism, 1936) he wrote admiringly of the transformation of Japan within two generations, and the raising of fascist Italy from a plebeian to a master nation by a fascist-inspired spiritual and psychological transformation. Naturally, Khmelnytsky became for him a symbol of the kind of strong ruler he admired.

Although Dontsov’s support for irrationality and his cult of dictators clashed with the Galician habits of patient community building (as represented by the dominant national democratic current), his views were also criticized by figures in the émigré leadership of the OUN. Nonetheless, he found substantial support among Galician youth, where, according to one account, *Natsionalizm* was debated by Lviv’s students for months.<sup>6</sup> Many of these young readers were inspired by the challenge to exercise their will and to treat passivity and cowardice with contempt. Others, however, rejected Dontsov’s amorality and argued for an ethical politics based on love of nation. Although they recognized him as their “spiritual father” and his *Natsionalizm* as their “gospel,” they recoiled from the cult of negativity, the promotion of motiveless self-assertion, and the disdain for Ukrainian history.<sup>7</sup>

Interwar literature in Western Ukraine and the emigration might therefore be seen as a force field in which three kinds of nationalism—the democratic, authoritarian, and Dontsovian—struggled for dominance. Writers were caught in this force field; as their views evolved, they found themselves negotiating between the currents, and sometimes shifting positions.

Take, for example, the writings of Yuriy Lypa. His *Kozaky v Moskovii: Roman z XVII-ho stolittia* (Cossacks in Muscovy: A Novel Set in the XVII Century, 1934) at first glance appears to be aligned with Dontsovism. How-

ever, a closer look at this novel in the light of Lypa's views reveals a fundamental disagreement with Dontsov. Lypa was, in fact, one of Dontsov's competitors for intellectual leadership of the nationalist movement and even attempted to establish publications that would challenge Dontsov's *Vistnyk*.

*Kozaky v Moskovii* describes the adventures of an enterprising group of Cossacks who visit Muscovy during Khmelnytsky's reign. Their knightly ethos is contrasted with tsarism's brutality and xenophobia. Lypa demonstrates that Latin was not only part of the elite culture of Kyiv at the time but penetrated the world of ordinary Cossacks and produced what he calls elsewhere "a fusion of the Rus' and Roman spirit."<sup>8</sup> The author had an expert knowledge of the Cossack state's literary language with its strong admixture of Latin terms, and used this language in this novel to popularize archaic or little-used words and phrases. This was not a form of embellishment or ornamentation (his writing is laconic and direct), but an attempt at giving "authenticity" to his recreation of the past. Malaniuk dubbed the book "the discovery of an entire epoch in the historical-linguistic process."<sup>9</sup>

Eventually, the travelers gratefully return to Ukraine, where individual and collective liberties are valued. In the final scene, which takes place in 1650, the group witnesses Khmelnytsky holding court. He is at the height of his power and is enveloped in an aura of majesty. Many of the *szlachta* (gentry) have come over to his side. He has renewed his alliance with the Sultan of Turkey, and his rule appears impregnable. Khmelnytsky is repeatedly described as "a Great Prince, Ucrainae Rex, God's gift!" One protagonist calls him "a great horseman" with a firm hand under whom the land "trembles like a horse, and dances, and proudly bears the lord Bohdan." He says: "I see a prince of our glory, ambitions, and knightly deeds—and I will not raise my hand against him."<sup>10</sup> The narrator refers to Khmelnytsky as "the monarch of Rus, 'Imperator Rex' seated on a simple throne made from a yew-tree" (217). Foreign powers are portrayed as showing the highest respect for this new Cromwell of the East, who "in 1650 had the largest army in Europe" (217). The scene projects a vision of political strength and unity.

It also offers an "ecstatic" moment. An old Zaporozhian turns to Khmelnytsky and asks him to lead the people as a "Dux et Praefectus" and a hereditary ruler. All listeners are deeply moved during the ensuing church service to God's glory and the "emperor of the great Rus," the "great Caesar" (232). As he listens, one of the Cossack group, Hryhorii, falls in an ecstatic

fit, then rises, sensing immediately that at that moment all bitterness has left him. Transformed, he swells with patriotic pride, and instantly feels an enormous power entering his breast. As the “Caesar of Ukraine” faces him at the front of the church, Hryhorii has a vision of an enormous Cossack lion with its head above the clouds. It roars and stretches its “iron paw over its rich land” (234). The image symbolizes a powerful country unified under monarchical rule; it is meant to reassure readers that their national identity is strong and capable of dealing with any threat from the north.

The narrative might be interpreted as adhering to Dontsov’s prescriptions for literature. However, Lypa’s myths and legends of struggle were not the same as Dontsov’s. Whereas Dontsov had by the thirties become an unashamed admirer of both Mussolini and Hitler, Lypa explicitly rejected “myths of the German type,” by which he meant Nazi racism.<sup>11</sup> In order to survive what he perceived to be the threat from Nazi Germany, he urged Ukrainians to develop their own sense of mission and rely on their own stock of myths. His works attempt to provide the required national mythology and sense of historical mission. In his best-known historic-political tract, *Pryznachennia Ukrainy* (Destiny of Ukraine, 1938), he suggests that in the future, alongside the Anglo-Saxon, Roman, and Germanic, a fourth great “race” will arise in Europe, “the Pontic Ukrainian.”<sup>12</sup> The term *race* is used to describe a political, not a biological, identity. It represents a method of thinking and feeling, an attachment to a collective past. “Race,” he says, “is a great spiritual community in the moral and emotional dimension.”<sup>13</sup> Lypa believed that Ukrainians were able to recover from oppressive rule because they shared core values and a resilient psychology. He also felt that there was wisdom in the passive resistance of common people: it was based on a confidence that they would outlive invaders. Dontsov, of course, had no such faith in the masses.

Lypa interpreted the myth of Japheth, who is mentioned in the Book of Genesis, as Cossackdom’s myth of origins. This myth had been used in Inokentii Gisel’s seventeenth-century *Synopsis* and can be seen as the ideological justification for Cossack expansionism. Gisel portrayed the Cossack elite as descendants of Japheth and inheritors of a great military tradition. Lypa also focused on another myth of origins, one that dates back to the earliest days of Christianity in Ukraine and is recorded in the first written chronicles produced in Rus’. This is the story of St. Andrew planting a cross on the hills of Kyiv and prophesying that a great city would arise there. In Lypa’s interpretation it is a demonstration of the desire felt by the

people, even in the age of Kyivan Rus', "to have their own dialogue with God," to possess "a mystery for their race alone" and a church that could spread unity and love among the people.<sup>14</sup> Lypa counterposes this kind of positive myth to Dontsov's stress on the passivity of the Ukrainian masses. Dontsov's *Natsionalizm*, he says, offers no deeper synthesis of Ukrainian thought. Like bolshevism it is driven by hatred and a need to bring about "the race's internal destruction."<sup>15</sup> According to Lypa, Dontsov is unable to play a constructive role because he fails to understand that the Ukrainian people have their own historical character. The *Vistnyk* editor sees them as a hybrid species, a mixture of Polish and Muscovite elements, a bastard nation, and therefore he wants to sever himself from their ancestral traditions, which he finds "defeatist."<sup>16</sup> The problem, argues Lypa, is that Dontsov is incapable of treating Ukraine as a developing historical organism. He can only envisage driving the population to political action through a series of forced marches.

In his *Ukrainska doba* (The Ukrainian Age, 1936) Lypa criticizes Dontsov for both his hatred of foreigners and his contempt for Ukrainian traditions. Dontsov responded by declaring sarcastically that a "loving heart" had placed Lypa in the enemy camp.<sup>17</sup> According to Dontsov, the age demanded "the sharp sword of criticism, so that the rotten might be severed from the healthy, the old from the new, the puny from the strong."<sup>18</sup>

Lypa's most extensive critique of Dontsovism is in his *Pryznachannia Ukrainy*, in which the masses are praised for their stolid resistance to bolshevism during the struggle for independence in the years 1917–1920. Lypa was on the whole favorably disposed toward spontaneous revolts and had an optimistic faith in the population's capacity for self-organization, whereas *Vistnyk* writers like Olena Teliha, Oleh Olzhych, and Yevhen Malaniuk felt strongly that anarchy, individualism, and political immaturity had been the bane of Ukraine's history.

Moreover, the Ukrainian masses, in Lypa's view, have always exhibited a remarkably strong sense of belonging to a collective and over the centuries have demonstrated an extraordinary capacity for self-organization. Like the Jews, they have maintained a sense of their enduring presence in this world and an awareness of their distinctive, deeply rooted identity. The people's moral conservatism and faith in its myths were cause for optimism. Moral conservatism, according to Lypa, was a good thing insofar as it strengthens resistance to the inhuman social experimentation of both Nazis and bolsheviks. A *Vistnyk* writer once lamented that "Ukrainians



have no inclination for Baltic or Ural mysticism, and it is not easy to ‘shift them from their place’.”<sup>19</sup> Lypa, on the other hand, viewed this immovability as a strength. He insisted that the “Nietzschean bombast” of Malaniuk and Teliha, and the desire to discredit the past in favor of the present, had proven ineffective.<sup>20</sup> From this perspective the Cossack group in his novel *Kozaky v Moskovii* can be seen as embodying the message of inborn group solidarity and resilience. They exhibit a strong group spirit, rely on their different talents to get them through adventures, and instinctively recoil from the despotic traditions of Muscovy.

The Cossack group also demonstrates the opposition to regimentation that, in Lypa’s view, had always been the Ukrainian strength. Popular solidarity had expressed itself in economic organizations (such as cooperatives, and the *chumak* trading convoys), in education (the Prosvita society, Cossack brotherhoods), and in the military. In *Pryznachennia Ukrainy* Lypa contrasts this spirit with the approach of *Vistnyk* writers, whose “frenzied intolerance toward others shows how far they are from understanding real individualism.”<sup>21</sup>

Unlike Dontsov, he does not dismiss the many nineteenth-century intellectuals who devoted themselves to nation building, a process he describes as guided by an “antlike” instinct of construction that was stubborn and admirable.<sup>22</sup> Accordingly, the socialists, in his view, should not simply be blamed for the defeat of 1917–1920, but praised for the struggle they put up: “Many who died for Ukrainian socialism were strong characters who can only be treated with respect.” Moreover, he reminds readers that socialist and collectivist myths have played a role in Christianity and the humanist renaissance. It was the “perversity of Marxism” that injected class hatred into these myths.<sup>23</sup> With these considerations in mind, the images of Khmelnytsky and the lion in the final pages of *Kozaky* should be seen not as a capitulation to authoritarianism but rather as expressing faith in a collective identity.

Another important historical novelist of this period is Yurii Kosach. His fiction also presents a critique of Dontsovism by expressing profound concern with authoritarian rule and unbridled violence. During the thirties he celebrated the man of action, but his *Rubikon Khmel'nyts'koho* (Khmelnytsky’s Rubicon, begun in 1936 and published in 1943), which reconstructs the atmosphere of a past age and shows the birth of a “hero-leader” (*heroi-vozhhd*), is an ambiguous portrait of Khmelnytsky.<sup>24</sup> Based on a reading of French, German, and other sources, the novel is set in the

year 1646, during which Khmelnytsky's Cossacks fought in Flanders on the side of the French against the Spanish. The location is Danzig (Gdańsk), where they arrive after winning a victory at Dunkirk, and where they rest before returning to Ukraine. This city of political intrigues is a crossroads of "empires and kingdoms" (21). It is clear that another conflict is brewing among the great powers, one in which Ukraine will play a major role. Khmelnytsky has consciously developed his Cossacks into one of the best fighting forces in Europe: they have learned from Beauplan's engineering techniques and have been hardened through fighting in European wars. Khmelnytsky himself has won a reputation as "one of the best warriors of the century" (43) and is described by Beauplan as "the most dangerous man in the East" (78). Cardinal Mazarin hopes that he will play a role in the European coalition that is being organized. Poland, however, has thus far prevented the appearance of a "Cossack Caesar" on the territory of Ukraine (48).

Khmelnytsky's virtues are apparent to all who meet him. He is a consummate diplomat, who knows how to talk to kings and generals; an excellent judge of people, who is able to gather talented individuals around himself; and a man of great foresight. He has used the Flanders campaign to train his troops in modern warfare. The young men who had until then known only brigandage in the steppe have now been hardened in combat. More than one coward and deserter has been executed. Ammunition makers, sappers, engineers have been educated. Khmelnytsky realizes that he can raise the *chern* in the Steppe, instantly creating an army of 150,000. However, he is aware that he needs qualified engineers, cavalry officers, and cannon makers. The Western diplomats realize that he is a remarkable personality with a burning thirst for action, and they indicate to him that "war, a holy war" will break the chains that hold Ukraine in bondage and present it with an outlet to the Black Sea and the West (67). The scene is therefore set for a cooperation of West and East in a revolution that will liberate Ukraine.

Khmelnytsky loves the Polish king, who has, unfortunately, fallen under the control of magnate princes and whose spirit has been broken by them. With this awareness Khmelnytsky makes the decision to "cross the Rubicon," to declare himself Ukraine's ruler and throw off the Polish overlords. He reads Caesar's *Commentaries on the Gallic War*, then returns to Ukraine with his powerful legion, metaphorically crossing the river on the other side of which lies power and glory (125). His Western ally, Achilles,

encourages him, whispering that the time has come for his land's rebirth: "I believe in this in the same way as you believe in your country, captain, because you suffer for it, torture yourself for it. There is a ruler, who will show Germany the path to glory. . . ." When he asks who this is, Khmelnytsky receives the reply: "Friedrich Wilhelm, the Elector of Brandenburg" (135).

The novel's narrator reminds the reader that the state-building Goths once passed through what is today Ukraine. Since then Gothic hardness has "dissolved itself in Scythian softness, in quicksands." Once in a thousand years, however, the warrior Goth awakens. After he removed "the blindness from his eyes, throwing off his sleepiness and laziness, he looks into the distance like a Steppe pirate, a builder of the future" (170). Khmelnytsky is clearly such a reborn Goth. He is repeatedly called the new Caesar of the East, and is compared to Attila, Tamerlane, and Genghis Khan (263). The Western observers believe that not only a new leader but a new people have appeared in the place of the former slaves who populated Ukraine (264). Achilles, the German soldier and diplomat, realizes that his own country is growing in strength but still needs Khmelnytsky as an ally in order to hold in check the ambitions of France, Sweden, and Poland (243). The East, says Achilles, "is our New World, our America," and there will be no peace on German lands "until the gates of the East are opened to the German soldier, merchant and artisan" (228). In his estimation the people of Roxolania (Ukraine) can become the legions of a Third Rome, since they have already produced the kind of man who only appears once in three hundred years (237).

It is more than tempting, of course, to read into this text a commentary on the situation that existed at the outbreak of the German-Soviet war, and a reflection of the temptation offered to some Ukrainian nationalists on the eve of Operation Barbarossa. Kosach indicates that the book was completed in 1941–42, although it appeared in 1943 during the German occupation of Ukraine. The characters are, however, ambiguous. Although richly suggestive of the dilemmas of the time, the book eludes an allegorical reading. It is, however, illustrative of the fascination with strong personalities and forceful leaders.

In the 1930s, Kosach, like Lypa, wrote for periodicals that challenged *Vistnyk*. His postwar works are violently anti-Dontsovian. In particular his *Enei i zhyttia inshykh* (Aeneas and the Life of Others, 1946), *Diivstvo pro Yuriiia-Peremozhtsia* (A Play About Yurii the Conqueror, 1947), and *Den' hnyvu: Povist pro 1648 rik* (The Day of Rage: A Novel About 1648,

1947–1948) represent explicit challenges to authoritarian ideologies and Dontsovism in particular. The structure of characterization in the first two novels implies a rejection of all fanaticism and tendentiousness, and especially of the megalomaniac or mad leader. The first book, according to Yurii Sherekh, played a programmatic role in the attack by postwar Ukrainian writers on the *Vistnyk* ideology. In his 1952 essay “Proshchannia z uchora” (Goodbye to Yesterday, 1952), Sherekh interprets the novel as a rejection of wartime violence with all its “bestiality and Machiavellianism.”<sup>25</sup>

In fact, many writers of historical fiction challenged Dontsovian ideals in the interwar years. Semen Ordivsky, whose real name was Hryhorii Luzhnytsky, was a founding member of Logos, an organization of Ukrainian Catholic writers centred in Lviv. In the twenties he studied in Graal and Prague and became editor of the Lviv journal *Postup* (1921–1931), which popularized the works of Catholic writers from around the world. His novels were aimed at younger readers and highlight the need for civic-minded figures committed to state building.<sup>26</sup> These works contain a defense of Ukraine’s right to an independent existence and depict Muscovy’s encroachments upon Cossack rights. However, the *chern* (rabble) is described as an anarchic, destructive force that is often motivated by greed, personal gain, and jealousy of riches and privileges. Its communist-sounding rhetoric is only a cover for the desire to plunder. The reader is led to understand that Ukraine needs a ruling class—one that understands the importance of state rule. In *Sribnyi cherep: Istorychna povist* (Silver Scull: A Historical Novel, 1938 and 1942) Khmelnytsky, it is said, should immediately have created “leading strata.” Without such an elite, the *chern* is easily bought and manipulated by external powers. At the end of the book one protagonist makes the message clear: “I am not saying that the *chern* is everything worst, basest, that it is exclusively a destructive force. No, it has its good sides, especially when it has reigns, when it is guided properly, in the manner of the late hetman Bohdan. But I condemn the *chern* for its disobedience, revolt, desire for power, mutual contempt, lack of faith in its own . . . These are the characteristics of the *chern* and I see that it will for a long time be the cause of our fatherland’s downfall.”<sup>27</sup> This sentiment is not so much an expression of support for autocratic or authoritarian rule as a fear of disorder. A stable social order would in fact lessen the need for a charismatic ruler. The portrayal in this novel of a weak Khmelnytsky at the end of his life and of rising internal strife conveys a craving for stability. Its message clashes with the Vistnykite apotheosis of headstrong conquistadores sweep-

ing all before them. Ordivsky's work therefore represents a form of Catholic conservatism rather than authoritarianism or integral nationalism. It is more aligned with the national democratic current.

A similar fear of the *chern* and its proclivity for violence is expressed in Panas Fedenko's 1942 *Homonila Ukraina . . . Epopeia z doby Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*,<sup>28</sup> which shows Khmelnytsky being challenged by Kryvonis, his chief lieutenant and the man who goes against orders by raising the *chern*.<sup>29</sup> As in Ordivsky's narrative, this does not represent a defense of authoritarianism but rather a fear of the amoral instincts that Dontsov had celebrated. Fedenko was a member of the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers Party (USDRP). In the years 1917–18 he served in the Ukrainian Central Rada and then emigrated to Prague. After the Second World War he moved to Munich and headed the USDRP, which was renamed the Ukrainian Socialist Party.

Harsh attitudes and the cult of martial virtues were widespread at the time. It is important to recall that they also dominated Soviet historical fiction. Soviet novels produced in the years 1939–1941 express a particularly violent attitude toward Poles, Catholics, and Uniates. Yakiv Kachura's *Ivan Bohun* (1940) and Ivan Le's *Severyn Nalyvaiko* (1940) can serve as examples. At this time the Soviet Union, after allying itself with Germany, had partitioned the Polish state in accordance with the Hitler-Stalin pact. Tens of thousands of Poles were arrested and exiled in the newly acquired territory of Galicia, along with thousands of Ukrainians. The novels were written in part to whip up anti-Polish feelings.<sup>30</sup> They stress the personal charisma, military prowess, and diplomatic skills of Khmelnytsky. However, whereas novels produced outside the Soviet Union treat Muscovy as an enemy of Ukraine's state aspirations, those written in Soviet Ukraine suggest that help "from the North" can be relied on—that it is in fact required for the Ukrainian state's protection and stability. Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, the Western Ukrainian and émigré "nationalist" writers are less motivated by animosity toward Poles than these Soviet authors. They differ from their Soviet counterparts most obviously in the focus on statehood. Khmelnytsky in the interpretation of "nationalist" writers is focused on building a state, whereas the Soviet texts present him as motivated by anger at injustices committed against the people. However, whether written from a Soviet or anti-Soviet perspective the novels of the 1930s and 1940s share an obsession with courage and strength, and a faith that willpower can bring about political change.

This focus on “masculine virtues” reflects the tenor of the time. For example, futurist writings on both the left and right of the political spectrum admired primitive energy and virility, and they expressed a fascination with violence. Jack London and Rudyard Kipling were popular in the interwar years; D. H. Lawrence and Ernest Hemingway wrote their own versions of masculinity into literature; and popular cinema enjoyed its romance with the feral child Tarzan, and with cowboys and pirates who provided a seemingly endless supply of athletic action heroes. Meanwhile in Soviet Ukraine authors such as Yurii Yanovskii, Oleksa Vlyzko, and Arkadii Liubchenko produced narratives of the strong hero, and a literary current that represented militant bolshevism glorified men of steel: unbreakable Chekists and hardened party leaders. The nationalist portrayals of Khmelnytsky are part of this cult of strength; they employ much of the same imagery but also incorporate the contemporary discourse around authoritarianism, popular revolution, and statehood.



# **Part IV**

## **Khmelnysky in Twentieth-Century Mythologies**





# 10

## **Jews and Soviet Remythologization of the Ukrainian Hetman**

### **The Case of the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky**

*Gennady Estraiikh*

**DURING WORLD WAR II**, the Red Army did not have Ukrainian Cossack units, though Don and Kuban Cossack divisions were introduced in 1936, when the Soviet government hailed the socialist transformation of the Cossacks and, essentially, absolved them of their sins of fighting against the Bolshevik regime during the Civil War. That year five existing cavalry divisions of the Red Army were morphed into Cossack ones.<sup>1</sup> While Don and Kuban Cossacks were recognized as an existing subethnic group of the Russian nation, the terms *Ukrainian Cossacks* or *Zaporozhian Cossacks* remained elements of the history-related vocabulary. The so-called Chervony (Red) Cossack units, formed in Ukraine during the Civil War, did not reappear during World War II.

Some Ukrainian intellectuals, notably the film director Oleksandr Dovzhenko, advocated the formation of Ukrainian divisions, similar to the Polish one—the First Tadeusz Kosciuszko Infantry Division formed in May 1943. Moreover, beginning in the fall of 1941, Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Turkmen, Uzbek, Armenian, Georgian, and several other divisions or other combat units had been baptized in fire. However, the main objective of these national formations was to deal with the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the non-Slavic peoples, whereas Russian-speaking officers did not face such problems with Ukrainian and Belorussian recruits.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Soviet ideologists were generally reluctant to overemphasize the ethnic divides between Russians, Belorussians, and Ukrainians. Characteristically, in 1942 the party's ideological watchdog, agitprop, banned the publication of Dovzhenko's story "Peremoha" ("Victory"), about a military

unit of predominantly Ukrainian combatants.<sup>3</sup> As a result, Ukraine and Belorussia appeared, beginning from 1943, only in the names of several *fronts* (army groups) and thus reflected the geographical area of their operation rather than their ethnic composition, though Ukrainians did make up the majority in many units of the four Ukrainian *fronts*.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, Ukrainian Cossack traditions were honored in the anti-Soviet Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). The UPA restored Cossack military ranks and units and celebrated the Day of Pokrova, October 14, known as the Day of Ukrainian Cossacks.<sup>5</sup>

In October 1943, the importance of Ukrainian Cossackdom as a propagandistically valuable constituent of the usable past was recognized by the Soviet leadership through the introduction of the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the only Soviet military order named after a non-Russian historical personality. (See Fig. 10.1.) As the story goes, this idea, which was initially Dovzhenko's, found support in some top brass and, most importantly, in Nikita Khrushchev, then the party boss of Ukraine. Josef Stalin gave the green light to the initiative.<sup>6</sup> Concurrently, the town of Pereiaslav, where in 1654 the Pereiaslav Agreement between the Russian Tsar Aleksei I and the Ukrainian Cossacks led by Khmelnytsky had laid the foundation for Ukraine's integration into the Russian state, was renamed Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky.<sup>7</sup> The town had received this new name soon after its



FIGURE 10.1. Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Second Class. Photo: David Frenkel.

liberation from German occupation, which lasted for two years. On September 21, 1943, the Red Army captured Pereiaslav, where by that time the entire remaining Jewish population had been murdered by the Nazis and their collaborators.<sup>8</sup> Celebrating the liberation, Oleksandr Korniiichuk, the premier Soviet Ukrainian writer-cum-functionary, wrote in *Pravda*:

Pereiaslav! This word resonates dearly and warmly with Ukrainian hearts. Here our great hetman of Ukraine Bohdan Khmelnytsky, together with his officers and with representatives of the people and Cossacks, was deciding Ukraine's future. In Pereiaslav, there had been defined our people's historic destiny, which awarded Ukrainians with national and state independence. Pereiaslav is the cradle of the unbreakable brotherly unity between the Ukrainian and Russian peoples.<sup>9</sup>

This chapter analyzes first the ideological climate that brought about the decision to elevate Bohdan Khmelnytsky to the status of a pan-Soviet hero, and second the reaction of Soviet and non-Soviet Jews to this decision.

. . .

A legendary figure in Ukrainian history, Hetman Khmelnytsky has a murderous reputation in Jewish popular consciousness: generation after generation of East European Jews condemned him as a monstrous personality, responsible for the annihilation of whole Jewish communities, most notably in 1648 and 1649. Any mention of Khmelnytsky would be accompanied by the curse “may his name be blotted out.” At the same time, inexplicably, some Jews carried the same surname, a derivative from eastern European geographic names, such as Chmielnik in Poland or Khmel'nik/Khmil'nik in Ukraine. One of the Jewish Khmelnytskys, Melech Chmelnitzky, as he spelled his name, was a significant Yiddish poet and journalist, while Odessa-born Aleksandr Khmelnitski was a leading Bolshevik in Ukraine. This fact can be interpreted as an indicator of chronological or geographical lacunas in collective remembering, later reinforced or sometimes revived by Jewish and non-Jewish historians.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, Khmelnytsky remained in the bad books of Soviet historians, led by Mikhail Pokrovsky (1868–1932), the uncontested authority in the field. Khmelnytsky's image, entrenched in Jewish memory, played a minor role, if any, in Pokrovsky's assessment of the events in the mid-seventeenth century. Rather, according to the doctrine of his school, the Pereiaslav Agreement was an “absolutely evil” act of Russian imperialism. Looking at history from a different angle, some Ukrainian intellectu-

als also tended to blame Khmelnytsky for helping Russia colonize their homeland. Taras Shevchenko poeticized this ideological stand: “Had I known, in the cradle / I’d have choked you [Khmelnytsky], in my sleep / I’d have overlain you.” The national poet could not forgive the hetman that Ukrainian “steppes have all been sold, / In Jews’ and Germans’ hands” and that his “dear graves the Moskal [Russian] / Is plundering utterly.”<sup>10</sup>

Following Pokrovsky’s death and Stalin’s critical reevaluation of his legacy, Soviet historians had to follow a new guideline that defined Russia as a “lesser evil” for its smaller peoples, because it saved them from colonization by culturally alien and still more reactionary Poland or Turkey. In this context, Khmelnytsky and his Cossack officers were pursuing a progressive policy.<sup>11</sup> Pokrovsky’s oft-cited maxim that “history is present-day politics projected into the past” explains the reasons for reconsidering the official attitude to imperial Russia’s historical legacy. According to the Ukrainian Canadian historian Serhy Yekelchyk, the new ideological climate reflected the turn to the “construction of socialism in one country,” which “weakened the class ethos of Soviet ideology, and the emerging void was gradually filled by the default imagery of modern nations and nation-states.”<sup>12</sup> In the new climate, every ethnic group was supposed to have national heroes. It is no coincidence, for instance, that in 1937 Stalin’s right-hand man Lazar Kaganovich chastised the Moscow State Yiddish Theater for not having in its repertoire plays about the ancient Jewish heroes, leaders of uprisings—the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba.<sup>13</sup>

The evaluation of Khmelnytsky began to change around the same time, especially as the hetman gave the agitprop a more applicable material than the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba.<sup>14</sup> This historical material became particularly pertinent in 1939, when the Pereiaslav Agreement, celebrated for the first time in the Soviet Ukraine, was used as a justification for the annexation of the Polish territories following the outbreak of World War II in September of that year.<sup>15</sup> The 1939 book *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, included in the book series of illustrious lives (“Zhizn' zamechatel'nykh liudei”), already mentioned the “reunification” of Russian and Ukraine. This book, written by the historian and belletrist K. Osipov (pseudonym of Osip Kuperman, 1900–1955, a master of literary portrayals of canonized historical figures), put flesh on the bones of a rebranded Khmelnytsky. Significantly, the book was signed to print one month after the Soviet annexation of Western Ukraine. Osipov’s Khmelnytsky was a heroic, honorable statesman rather than a “headsman of the Ukrainian people” and

a double-crosser of the worst sort, as he was previously characterized in Soviet publications.<sup>16</sup>

In 1940, Natan Rybak (1913–1978), a young but already recognized Ukrainian writer, shared with Nikita Khrushchev his idea of writing a novel set in the Khmelnytsky period. (As early as 1937, Rybak coauthored with Korniiichuk a newspaper article, mentioning *inter alia* Khmelnytsky as the liberator of the Ukrainian people from the Polish *szlachta*, or nobility.)<sup>17</sup> Rybak realized this plan after the war: his novel *Pereiaslavs'ka rada* (The Pereiaslav Council) came out in 1948–1953, when the “lesser evil” theory gave place to unreserved glorification of the “reunification” of two brotherly Slavic nations.<sup>18</sup> Rybak’s novel emphasized Russian–Ukrainian friendship and treated Khmelnytsky as an ideal ruler with traits similar to those of Stalin. Rybak, who was himself Jewish, tried to demonstrate Jews’ support of the popular Ukrainian rebellion, using insights of the Odessa-based historian Saul Borovoi, whose publication of archival documents revealed the existence of Cossacks of Jewish origin.<sup>19</sup>

On June 25, 1940, Borovoi successfully defended his doctoral dissertation at the History Institute in Moscow. One of the chapters of his thesis concentrated on the Khmelnytsky uprising. Borovoi, whose father was on friendly terms with such Jewish literary celebrities as Sholem Yankev Abramovitsh (Mendele Moykher-Sforim) and Khaim Nakhman Bialik, entered the field of Jewish history in the 1920s and continued to work in it as, essentially, an independent scholar; his salaried job was at the Odessa Credit-Economic Institute, where he was a professor of political economy. His 1940 dissertation was accepted by the doctoral committee and praised by the reviewer, Vladimir Picheta, the leading historian of the period. Borovoi argued *inter alia* that it was wrong to follow the apologetic Jewish tradition of presenting the Jews as victims of the Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants. He used archival material to show that the Jews of Ukraine were divided into exploiters and exploited rather than being “between the hammer and the anvil” as the Jewish historian and political thinker Simon Dubnow used to describe their societal position.<sup>20</sup> More than five decades later, the North American historian Henry Abramson came to a similar conclusion:

Dubnow’s characterization of Jews as caught between “hammer and anvil”—that is, between the demands of the Polish lords and the anger of the Ukrainian peasants—is simply misleading. The Jews were very much part of the “hammer,” part of the economic machinery that executed Polish control over the Ukraine. [ . . . ] Certainly

only a minority of the population was involved in the active exploitation of Ukrainians, yet the very existence of the Jewish community in Ukraine depended on this livelihood.<sup>21</sup>

There are no grounds to contend that in his research Borovoi simply followed the prevailing winds in Soviet academia and, generally, agitprop. However, the timing of his doctoral thesis defense could not have been better. It took place following the Kremlin's favorable reception of the 1938 play *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*, by Oleksandr Korniiichuk. Whether Borovoi wanted it or not, his dissertation became part of the Soviet remythologization of Khmelnytsky that took place in the late 1930s and early 1940s, with the play and, later, the film script by Korniiichuk at the center of the process under Stalin's personal control.<sup>22</sup>

Some communists considered such cultural products to be signs of rising nationalism. Vladimir Blum, a (non-Jewish) theater critic, argued that Korniiichuk's play would have pleased Aleksandr Shvarts, the most reactionary minister of education during the reign of Nikolas I.<sup>23</sup> As Borovoi recalled in his memoirs, his interpretation of one of the bloodiest pages in modern Jewish history also provoked disagreement or even outrage among some Soviet Yiddish academic and literary notables, such as the historians Zacaria Greenberg and Abram Yuditsky, the literary historian Isaac Nusinov, and the poet Shmuel Halkin; they could not accept that—in Halkin's words quoted by Borovoi—the “murderer” Khmelnytsky was hailed as the leader of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement.<sup>24</sup> It may well be that Borovoi exaggerated the resistance on the part of Nusinov and the Yiddish literati to his concept of Khmelnytsky's role. It is known, for instance, that in February 1940, when that same Nusinov spoke in Białystok at a meeting with Yiddish writers, refugees from Nazi-occupied Poland, he cited Khmelnytsky as an example of healthy nationalism. His statement even triggered a wave of protests by the writers, who were angered that the Moscow professor had not mentioned the massacres of 1648–49.<sup>25</sup>

There is little doubt that Stalin, Korniiichuk (appointed in 1943 to the position of a deputy commissar for Soviet foreign affairs), and the majority of other politicians and intellectuals involved in the canonization of the legendary Ukrainian figure, did not pursue any Jewish-related agenda by doing it. Rather, the government sought to send an encouraging message to the second-largest ethnic group of the Soviet population. Significantly, from January 1943, the Red Army began to recapture Ukraine and, as a

result of recruiting people from the previously occupied territories, the share of Ukrainians among the Soviet troops began to grow from about 12 percent in July 1943 to 34 percent in July 1944.<sup>26</sup>

At the same time, the introduction of the Order of Khmelnytsky and the renaming of Pereiaslav as Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky could be interpreted as signs of rising anti-Semitism, especially as 1943 has been seen as the year that bookended the pre-anti-Semitic period in Soviet history. According to Mikhail Romm, the Soviet film director, “until 1943 we had no anti-Semitism . . . Somehow we managed without it . . . Signs of it began to appear in 1943.”<sup>27</sup> In this climate, Oleksandr Dovzhenko even allowed himself to describe in clearly antisemitic terms his and his colleagues’ unpleasant experience of being subordinates of Natan Rybak. Married to Kornichuk’s sister, Rybak, then de facto head of the Union of Soviet Writers of Ukraine, had full support of his influential Moscow-based brother-in-law and treated members of the union badly. Dovzhenko, however, did not characterize the situation as “writers versus their dishonorable boss.” Rather, he saw it as “writers versus nasty *Jews*,” arguing that “the kikes” were “greatly harming Ukrainian culture.”<sup>28</sup>

Private diaries, memoirs, or secret policy reports may contain information revealing the reaction of Soviet Jews to the introduction of the new order and renaming of Pereiaslav. However, I failed to find such sources. Granted, silence also can be open to interpretation: *Eynikayt* (Unity), then the only Soviet Yiddish newspaper (published by the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee), never mentioned the corresponding decrees of the Soviet Supreme Council. Much more information is available reflecting the reaction abroad.

. . .

The decision to aggrandize Khmelnytsky resonated in Jewish circles all over the world. Significantly, the pogroms in Ukraine in 1919 and 1920, during the civil war, had reinvigorated the collective memory of the atrocities of the seventeenth century and linked them with contemporary experiences, including the catastrophic events of the 1940s. It is no coincidence that Sholem Asch’s Yiddish novel *Kiddush ha-Shem*, which depicted the massacres of 1648, was first published in 1919 and saw a new edition in 1942, brought out in New York under the imprint of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute’s publishing house Matones. Simon Dubnow, too, saw 1648 as the beginning of a continuous saga of Ukrainian massacres of Jews.<sup>29</sup>



Still, the pro-Soviet North American Jewish press cultivated the image of Cossacks as liberators from the Nazis. For instance, Zishe Weinper, a left-wing American Yiddish poet and activist, had developed this theme in his poem "When a Cossack Rider Came to the Dniepr River."<sup>30</sup> Similar topics inspired left-wing literati, including the Canadian poet Sholem Shtern, also before October 1943.<sup>31</sup> Significantly, Ukrainian and Jewish left-wingers often operated under the same institutional umbrella, notably the International Workers Order.

Meanwhile, the New York-based *Forverts*, the main forum of American anti-Soviet Jewish socialists, contended that the Soviet government's decree was a step similar to renaming a town after Hitler.<sup>32</sup> Adding insult to injury, Pereiaslav was the birthplace of the Yiddish classic writer Sholem Aleichem. Mendel Osherowitch, reputed as the main expert in Ukrainian affairs among *Forverts* journalists (he also played a leading role in the American Federation of Ukrainian Jews), wrote a decade later, when the three-hundredth anniversary of the Pereiaslav Agreement was celebrated in the Soviet Union, about the bitter paradox that no town other than Pereiaslav was fated to be named after the "Ukrainian hetman, the murderer, who had outdone all other murderers of his time, and of all times before his own, in shedding Jewish blood."<sup>33</sup>

Osherowitch had discussed a similar topic a year before the introduction of the order, when he criticized George Vernadsky, then a research associate in history at Yale University, whose 1941 book *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine*, presented a romanticized image of Khmelnytsky:

It is hardly possible to write about the Ukrainian Hetman, Bogdan Khlemnitsky (Chmielnicki) without dealing at length with the bloody pogroms which he perpetrated upon the Jews in the years 1648 and 1649. This period has gone down in Jewish history as one of bitter suffering and terrible persecution. And if a biographer of Khmelnytsky chooses to pass this by, or to touch upon it cursorily, as something casual and unimportant in the life of the Hetman, he stands accused of a grievous crime against the Jewish people. It is as if one were to write about Hitler without mentioning his vicious hatred of Jews and his bloody persecution of them.<sup>34</sup>

Vernadsky's reply to Osherowitch's criticism and Osherowitch's note to this reply appeared in the *Forverts* on September 20, 1942. Vernadsky argued that it would be wrong to treat his book as an indication of an attempt to avoid the discussion of the anti-Jewish violence during the revolt led by Khmelnytsky. This aspect of the period under consideration played

a minor role in his book only because the massacres of Jews, who found themselves “between hammer and anvil” and did not play an active role in the events, were committed predominantly by peasants rather than by the hetman’s Cossacks. Khmelnytsky, according to Vernadsky, was not responsible for the massacres. This explanation did not satisfy Osherowitch, who could not justify any attempt to whitewash Khmelnytsky.<sup>35</sup> Like many other journalists, he cited estimates that the number of Jews murdered by Khmelnytsky’s Cossacks was between 100,000 and 650,000.<sup>36</sup> The Israeli historian Shaul Stampfer, who analyzed the scale of anti-Jewish violence in seventeenth-century Eastern Europe, came to the conclusion that the chronicles gave very inflated numbers of victims and that “the impression of destruction was greater than the destruction itself.”<sup>37</sup> Indeed, the “impression,” or national historical memory, was so strong that some Jews, especially in pro-Soviet circles, simply could not believe that the Soviet Union had introduced the new military order and renamed the town of Pereiaslav. On January 13, 1944, Jay C. Hoffer, a Bronx-based surgeon dentist, wrote to Osherowitch (in Yiddish):

Several weeks ago, the *Forverts* published your article where you wrote that the Soviet Union had changed the name of the Ukrainian town of Pereiaslav for that of Bogdan Khmelnytsky, the mass murderer in the [Jewish] massacre in 1648.

I showed this article to a communist. His reaction was quite remarkable: “It’s a lie! If it appeared in the *Forverts*, it must be a lie!”<sup>38</sup>

So the reader asked Osherowitch to confirm the information about the town’s renaming, especially as the “communist” had contacted the New York Public Library, did not find there anything about the renaming, and interpreted it as proof that it was an anti-Soviet canard.<sup>39</sup> To all appearances, both Hoffer and his communist acquaintance did not read the short note in the *New York Times* informing its readers about the renaming and explaining it as a reiteration of Soviet “claims to the part of the Polish Ukraine that was united with the Soviet Ukraine in 1939.”<sup>40</sup>

*The New Republic*, a journal generally sympathetic to the Soviet Union, published a short editorial titled “Khmelnytsky, the Hero”:

Soviet Russia may well serve as a model for countries that have not yet solved the problems arising out of racial and cultural friction and the oppression of minority groups. We are therefore at a loss to explain her action in renaming the Ukrainian town of Pereiaslav, recently captured from the Germans. The name of the town was changed

to Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky, after Bogdan Khmelnytsky, a Cossack leader who waged a war for Ukrainian independence against Poland in 1648–49. In the course of his insurrection he carried out a full-scale pogrom against the Jews, slaughtering hundreds of thousands. So severe was the pogrom that Khmelnytsky's name has remained synonymous with murderer throughout 400 [in fact, 300—G.E.] years of Jewish history, finally yielding only to that of Hitler.

We understand that Russia, in her growing nationalism, has been reviving heroic figures from the past to serve present war purposes. But if this be the reason for summoning Khmelnytsky out of ignominy—if not a desire to please Ukrainian nationality—then certainly a shabbier hero could not be found.<sup>41</sup>

The London newspaper *Jewish Chronicle* commented on the Soviet government's decision:

This man Chmielnitski was a Cossack Hetman in the seventeenth century and under his direction 300,000 or more Ukrainian Jews were massacred by the Cossacks. Naturally this elevation to the status of a patriot or a hero whose deeds are presumably to be regarded as an inspiring example to all Russians was not a little painful to Jews. It is not surprising, therefore, that the two distinguished representatives of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee in Russia—Professor Mikhoels and Lt.-Col Fefer—who are now in London, should have been asked to explain.<sup>42</sup>

The director of the Moscow State Yiddish Theater, Solomon Mikhoels, and the Yiddish poet Itsik Fefer were winding up their tour of the United States, Canada, Mexico, and Great Britain. On the longest, American, leg of the Soviet Jewish representatives' trip, the Cossack topic had already been mentioned in one of Fefer's speeches. The poet, who was referred to as a lieutenant-colonel of the Red Army (during the war many writers had military ranks as political instructors), told a joke that should show the American Jews that their Soviet counterparts had become stronger than the Cossacks, once the most terrifying enemy of Russian Jews:

I was told that a tourist from Argentina came to Birobidjan once and he stopped to talk with a Jewish settler there.

"How are things going," he asked.

"Very well," answered the Jew from Birobidjan.

"Who are your neighbors," the Argentinean wanted to know.

"Cossacks."

"Cossacks?"

"Sure," said the Jew from Birobidjan, "but we leave them in peace."<sup>43</sup>

The *Jewish Chronicle*, however, expected to get a serious explanation. “Their [Mikhoels and Fefer’s] reply that what Chmielnitski did was to lead a rising of subjugated Ukrainian masses against their Polish oppressors and those whom they believed to be associated with them can scarcely be regarded as very satisfactory.”<sup>44</sup> We don’t know whether the Jewish representatives had been briefed by London-based Soviet officials on the issue of the new military decoration or they simply followed the official interpretation of Ukrainian history, publicized in the 1941 film based on Korniiichuk’s play. Interestingly, some people in the Soviet Union interpreted the introduction of the new military order as a signal that there would be war with Poland.<sup>45</sup>

The British Jewish establishment found the introduction of the new military decoration humiliating:

In late October, Marcelli Dogilewski, head of the newly created Benelux and Jewish desk in the Polish Ministry of Information, noted dissatisfaction among Jewish circles in Great Britain with certain recent Soviet actions, including the establishment of a military order named for . . . Bogdan Chmielnicki. . . . According to Dogilewski, . . . Selig Brodetsky, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jewry, who but a short time earlier had welcomed Feffer and Mikhoels to the British capital, had requested the Soviet ambassador to receive a delegation to discuss the matter. In addition Dogilewski indicated that the head of the Jewish Committee for Aid to Soviet Russia had called for that organization to meet, arguing that it could no longer take part in assisting “a country that glorified one of the most abominable figures” in Jewish history.<sup>46</sup>

In the meantime, the *Jewish Chronicle* expressed the hope that Soviet Jewish combatants would not “through an act of sheer forgetfulness, be insulted by decoration with the order of Bogdan Chmielnitski.”<sup>47</sup>

In reality, a number of Jews were “insulted” by this award and, apart from a couple of unverified cases when Jewish combatants rejected the order,<sup>48</sup> they, products of Soviet upbringing, either did not know about Khmelnytsky’s historical record or saw the calumnious event as ancient history, with no direct relevance to their world, in which the war and the Holocaust had eclipsed the events that took place three centuries ago. In 1943, Lazar Fagelman, a heavyweight among the *Forverts* writers (in 1962–1968 he would edit the paper), wrote about the abyss that had divided the Soviet Jewish and the American Jewish worlds: “Now we have to understand that Soviet Jews differ from us: their habits, values, and manners are different; their vision of life is different; they have a different

attitude to people, to the world, and to all political, economic, and moral problems.”<sup>49</sup> The Order of Khmelnytsky was perceived differently too, especially as by that time the Soviet propaganda had denuded the hetman of human characteristics, turning him into a mythological epic *bogatyř* warrior.<sup>50</sup> (See Fig. 10.2.)

Coincidentally, or most probably intentionally, among the first officers honored by the new military distinction was Lieutenant Colonel Yosif Kaplun, an infantry brigade commander.<sup>51</sup> Among other Jews decorated by the Order of Khmelnytsky were the Heroes of the Soviet Union Army General Yakov Kreizer, Colonel General Leontii Kotliar, Lieutenant Gen-



FIGURE 10.2. Colonel Zalman Abramovich Frenkel (1908, Konotop–1986, Moscow), awarded the Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Second Class by a decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, April 28, 1945. Photo courtesy of Alexander Frenkel.

eral Matvei Vainrub, and Colonel Abram Temnik. The poet Boris Slutskii, whose wartime memoirs provide an insight into the interethnic relations in the army, argued that by 1943 soldiers of various nationalities had gotten used to each other and that their relations became much friendlier than in the earlier stages of the war. He also wrote about Jewish officers who did their utmost to show that Jews were not cowards. One of the bravest young officers was physically not a strong man, who before the war studied philology at the Kiev University. He volunteered for a reconnaissance detachment, and in the short interval of six months was decorated by four orders, including the Order of Khmelnytsky. Significantly, in Slutskii's memoirs the award is not mentioned as an affront to Jewish combatants.<sup>52</sup>

In other words, Soviet remythologization of Khmelnytsky in the name of creating a universally acceptable Ukrainian historical narrative can be seen as a successfully realized project. Following the Soviet interpretation, the Ukrainian hetman was first and foremost a hero; therefore it was honorable to be awarded with such an exotic order. As I argue elsewhere, "Cossack valor" became generally, and for Jews in particular, a yardstick for Soviet-style heroism.<sup>53</sup> In the 1946 story "Flora," by the Soviet Yiddish writer Der Nister, the protagonists, heroic Jewish partisans, dance "in the Cossack manner"—apparently, dancing the *hopak*—at the reception given by "a Jewish social organization" (the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee) on May 9, 1945:

In a non-Jewish way, he gave her a lift with his right hand, on the right side of her back, going in a trot and a circle around her. She smiled, yielded, and danced with him.

Then, he exchanged the right hand for the left. Holding the left side of her back, he performed the same as before—this time with bended knees, crouched at half his height and dancing as if seated.<sup>54</sup>

Thus, the *hopak*, which often was part of the nonritual repertoire of traditional Jewish weddings,<sup>55</sup> became a dance of victorious Jewish men and women at arms, whose worldview accommodated, or was supposed to accommodate, the Sovietized mythology of Ukrainian Cossackdom.

# 11

## On the Other Side of Despair

Cossacks and Jews in Yurii Kosach's *The Day of Rage*

Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern

**YURII KOSACH**, an avid reader and ardent supporter of the radical Ukrainian nationalist thinker Dmytro Dontsov (1883–1973) in the 1930s, emerged after World War II with a new, refreshing, and unexpected vision of Ukraine.<sup>1</sup> Kosach left behind the image of his fatherland as that of a race-based state belonging exclusively to ethnic Ukrainians and to no one else, a concept deeply rooted in Dontsov's integral nationalism. Instead, Kosach turned to the ideas of Viacheslav Lypynsky (1882–1931), Dontsov's opponent, who saw Ukraine as a multiethnic culture modeled on the Anglo-Saxon polity.<sup>2</sup> "This book has been enlightened by the personality of V'iacheslav Lypyns'kyi," emphasized the author in the preface to the first publication of his novel *Den' hnivu* (The Day of Rage), "whose great and solitary spirit illuminated with its light and glow the entire heroic epoch of 1648–1657 as nobody before or after him."<sup>3</sup>

A lucky survivor of the war, Kosach realized that Dontsov's rabid nationalism had been partially responsible for transforming his fatherland into "bloodlands," to use Timothy Snyder's apt metaphor. Kosach had traversed the breadth and width of these lands and by 1945 he had had enough. The time had come to try new models of the Ukrainian historical past—and of its political future. The quest for such models became a literary and historical desideratum, particularly since the 1945 Yalta agreements brought together within a unified Ukrainian Soviet Republic what were previously known as ethnic Ukrainian territories, unevenly divided and at various times partially under Romanian, Polish-Lithuanian, Ottoman Turkish, Habsburg-Austrian, and Russian control.<sup>4</sup> In addition,

Ukraine became a voting member (independent only on paper) of the newly established UN. Apparently, the sole remaining problem was how to secure the cultural and political independence of Ukraine.

Kosach tested this new vision of Ukraine in his four-hundred-page historical novel, which he wrote in 1946–47 in a displaced persons camp in Germany, where, among other activities, he tried to relieve his fellows' postwar trauma by galvanizing them with the idea of a revived Ukrainian theater. Kosach achieved a real breakthrough by his new vision of Ukraine, reaching out to his Ukrainian Diaspora readers, many of whom still cleaved to Dontsov and bowed down to the idol of radical nationalism. His *Day of Rage* boldly and uniquely challenged received wisdom about the mid-seventeenth-century Cossack rebellion under Bohdan Khmelnytsky. A new adept of Lypynsky's multiethnic Ukraine, Kosach created a literary version of early modern Ukraine by imagining it as a multiethnic European country, reconstructing the rebellion as a popular anticolonial national-democratic (not nationalist) revolution, and portraying its leaders as vacillating—like other early modern leaders, from Luther to Cromwell—between elitist political loyalties and popular religious enthusiasm. Kosach's version had little in common, if anything, with the ethnocentric Ukrainian, pan-Slavic Russian, anti-Cossack Polish, or martyrdom-centered Jewish traditional histories. As we shall see momentarily, Kosach also put a particularly interesting spin on what the Jewish national memory recorded as *gezeyres takh vetat*, the catastrophe of 1648–49.

Kosach's *Day of Rage* focuses on the events of 1648, which Orest Subtelny once called the Cossack Revolution. Seeking to destroy the Dontsovian xenophobic image of Ukraine, which had been so dear to him in the 1930s, Kosach presents Ukraine in his *Day of Rage* as a land and a territory, casting the Cossack revolution in what Paul Robert Magocsi would call the multicultural mold. It is precisely this multiculturalism that allows Kosach to bring together under the Cossack banner people of different origins, creeds, and nationalities, Jews included.<sup>5</sup>

Ukraine emerges from the novel as the crucible of European politics, not as the barbaric godforsaken southeastern edge of the faraway Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth on the European periphery. The Ukrainian revolution is presented as the talk of the town in Istanbul, Lviv, Vienna, Venice, London, and Rome. Cardinal Mazarin discusses Ukrainian current events as a continuation of the Thirty Years War, which had just ended in Central Europe. "For us," advises his agent Pierre Chevalier (P'ier



Sheval'ie), "the Cossack rebellion is as useful as the rebellion against Spain in the Netherlands or the uprising of that puritan general Cromwell against the Stuarts" (1: 13). The Russian envoys ponder out loud what they can get out of that rebellion for the state of Muscovy. Khmelnytsky's closest advisers arrange for Cossack envoys to be sent to Regensburg, Vienna, Istanbul, and Venice and order them to place the Cossacks' political agenda firmly on the European diplomatic map (2: 7).

Kosach centers the rebellion at the intersection of the horizontal plane of the European continent and the vertical plane of European history. His Cossack rebels are on the minds of politicians in the western capitals, while the classical past of the West is on the minds of the Cossack rebels. One of the double agents in the novel compares Poland to legalistic Rome and the rebels to Lucius Sergius Catilina, although his interlocutor retorts with a foray into Roman history to dismiss the parallel (2: 69–70). Khmelnytsky imagines himself talking to Gaius Sallustius Crispus, a Roman politician from a plebeian family (2: 78). Kosach compares Piliavtsi, the locus of one of the key battles, to Pharos, the Poles to the Romans, and the Cossacks to Cleopatra's troops (2: 207).

By the same token, Khmelnytsky as the leader of the rebellion is also seen at the crossroads of European politics. From the perspective of the French-German rivalry, he is a *condottier*, talented and ambitious, who fought under France at Dunkirk, dreamt of a war with Turkey, and is now fighting the Poles. "A man made of the clay from which they make Caesars," comments Cardinal Mazarin. A diplomat from Istanbul compares Khmelnytsky to "the shadow of Cardinal Richelieu over the Ukrainian steppes" (1: 30). Pater Mokrski, a Catholic priest, sympathizer of the rebellion and a former mentor of Khmelnytsky, adds to this universalistic portrayal of his disciple by comparing him to the leaders of the Dominican order: like them, Khmelnytsky is aware of the secret "of an iron-clad organization" (1:33).

Kosach's seventeenth-century rebellion is of a paramount importance for many in Europe—and outside Europe. The Cossack army embraces everybody ready to fight for their beloved Roksolianiiia. Their rage draws on the destructive power of the "Cossack sword, Moldavian yataghan, and the steel of the Magyar hussars" (1: 31). Entire companies of German, Dutch, and Scotch landsknechts and harquebus shooters hired to provide military support for the szlachta eventually leave the Poles and join the rebels. The Catholic philosopher Trankvilion Rymsha crosses the breadth and width of Ukraine to get to the Cossack encampment and offer his services as

an agent and a messenger. Several Polish Catholic magnates and military leaders, including landlords Wygowski, Kryczewski, and Teodorowicz join the Cossacks as well (2: 9). One young Jewish participant observes among the rebellious troops Croats, Moldavians, Cherkessians, Scots, Dutch, Armenians, Gypsies, and Cheremises (2: 91).

Faistele, most likely from the Dutch military transport, who is depicted as a Gypsy, is probably a Jewess, at least according to her Yiddish diminutive name, and she travels all the way from Augsburg to Ukraine, where she joins the Cossack troops. Her origins remain murky, yet Kosach brings her up repeatedly in the novel to make sure the reader understands his point: rebellious Ukraine embraces people of indeterminate origin, be they Gypsies, *déclassé* bastards, or abandoned orphans, individuals with a prominent ethnic or class pedigree or without it. As long as the idea of anticolonialism prevails, Kosach's Ukraine welcomes people of all creeds, ethnicities, and religions. The Cossack leaders do not ask for one's "faith, coat of arms, origin"; they only ask whether one knows how to "crush a landlord's skull with an ax" (1: 114). We will see momentarily that this vision singles Kosach out not only among his Diaspora brethren but also among Ukrainian twentieth-century writers who portrayed the Cossack revolution in their historical novels.

Ukraine and Ukrainians in the novel embody the concept of a nation in the making for which nothing has been set in stone, even its ethnonyms. Khmelnytsky calls it Roksolaniia, Ukrainon'ka, and even coins the "brotherhood of the Roksolans" (1: 30, 2: 5). At the outset of the rebellion he, usually described as the relentless leader of the nation, does not see the events as a national struggle but calls the rebels "plebes, lowly multi-headed riff-raff" (1: 134). The Ukrainians are *cherkesy* (plural of Cherkessian, 1: 17) to the Russian envoys and *khlopy* and *bydlo*, serfs and cattle, to the Polish magnates (1: 18).<sup>6</sup> They are *kozakoukrains'ka natsiia* (the Cossack-Ukrainian nation) to Mazaraki, a Greek from Lviv (1: 28); *kozats'ko-rus'ka natsia* (the Cossack-Ruthenian nation) to Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, one of the rebellious atamans, *kosakoroksolians'ka natsia* to an Eastern Orthodox preacher (2: 112), and the "children of Roksolaniia," to a Cossack (2: 16). Naturally, they are *khamy* (dirty peasants, serfs, lowly people or rednecks), "jerks, traitors, rebels, spies," "worse than Tartars, a nation with a wolf's soul," and "a horde of jerks" to the Polish officers (1: 76, 91, 96, 119, 121). According to Kosach, the Cossacks and peasants along with their leadership were exploring their identity during the course of the rebellion.

Only at the height of the events did Khmelnytsky adopt the idea of his troops and his people as a *nation* of Cossacks and Ruthenians (Ukrainians).

The Ukrainians are a great discovery for many in Europe, as they observe “a nation that rose up for its own rights” (1: 101, 107). The discrepancy between the perception of the Ukrainian people as lowly and rustic non-entities by the Poles (and also by the Russians from Muscovy) and as a rising nation for everybody else is the driving mechanism of the novel. It also attempts to rationalize brutality and violence, if not justify them. The rejection of the “Cossack Ukrainian nation” among the Poles fuels their hatred and increases interethnic violence. This rejection makes Ukraine not only into “a pearl of the Orient” but also into a “forever damned land, doomed to be Campus Martius” (1: 34, 128).

Kosach strips Moscow of its messianic role as the Third Rome and Russia as the savior of Christianity—and instead ascribes these roles to his Ukraine, radically changing the substance of the Slavic redemptive scenario (2: 37). This scenario is now about bringing freedom to the oppressed East Europeans (of any ethnicity), rather than about saving true Christianity from the corrupt West. The Ukrainian rebellion appears in comparative context as a continuation of the early modern Czech and German peasant wars, which began for religious reasons and turned into a war for national liberation. To build up this messianic momentum, Kosach compares his Ukraine to the biblical promised land flowing with milk and honey, the Ukrainians to the people of Israel going out of bondage, and the Poles to the Amalekites (2: 64–66, 113). Kosach supports these theologically shaped metaphors with historical analogies. He repeatedly juxtaposes the two European “incendiaries” Cromwell and Khmelnytsky (2: 250). Moreover, he transforms this metaphor into a metonymy, by bringing to the Cossack encampment a weird and extremely pious individual, most likely a Puritan messenger, who presents himself as “Brown from [the town of] Market.” Significantly, he reads the Bible, speaks English, and, an idiosyncratic Puritan seeking to imitate early Judeo-Christians, answers in fluent Hebrew (of all other languages!), which one cleric can understand and translate. Brown claims that all his hope is “in the liberation of Jerusalem,” and that “Joshua son of Navin is already at the head of the troops” (2: 64–65). He does not say more, but his biblical reference cleverly leaves the reader in suspense: did he mean Cromwell or Khmelnytsky?

The language of the novel replicates the idea of the European magnitude of the events and implements the concept of multiculturalism with

amazing consistency. Khmelnytsky's Ukrainian is replete with Polonisms. King Ładisław of Poland swears in English. Every now and then the envoys of the Polish troops use Latin. The mercenaries from the Schaumberg corps pepper their rich vocabulary with French curses of the seventeenth-century landsknechts. Intellectuals such as Rymsha speak in a macaronic mixture of German, Western Ukrainian dialect, Polish, and Latin. The vagrant thinker Roslavets resorts to Church Slavonic, which also appears in the sermons of the Eastern Orthodox clergy before the Cossack troops (2: 18, 110–113). In Kosach's novel, one can *zbonifikuvaty sadybu*, that is, obtain a garden as a benefit (1: 99). Another can claim, fusing Ukrainian and Latin, that he is *nazionale Polonius ritu romano, ale vol'nyi sertsem*—Polish by nationality, Roman Catholic religion, but with a free heart (1: 110). *Ordnons—impetuvaty*, says Kosach, and his Cossack troops know that this Latin-Ukrainian order means to attack. All of these argots, dialects, barbarisms, and jargons end up organically synthesized in the Ukrainian discourse of the narrator, creating an image of the Ukrainian language as an exceptionally self-confident cultural entity never ashamed of borrowings and open to any influence, replicating the openness of the Cossack army. Of course, Kosach also places the Jews among these many languages and peoples of differing origin.

The innovative poetics of Kosach is better understood in a comparative framework. Take, for example, Ivan Le (pseudonym of Ivan Leontiovych Moisia, 1895–1978), the Soviet Ukrainian writer, who, like Kosach, started to work on his epic novel *Khmelnytsky* in the 1930s, perhaps with an ambitious idea to produce a formidable epic novel by the three-hundredth anniversary of the 1648 rebellion or 1654 Pereiaslav Treaty.<sup>7</sup> Ivan Le portrays Khmelnytsky from his youth as a student at a Jesuit school through the first year of the Cossack revolution, a narrative that takes up three large volumes. Like Kosach, Le brings Russians, Italians, Dutch, Germans, Turks, Gypsies, and Poles into his story and seeks to place Ukrainian events firmly on the larger European map. He has Rembrandt and Mazarin meeting the future Cossack leaders and Cossacks pondering aloud the legacy of the Italian utopian philosopher Tommaso Campanella. Le enriches his Ukrainian vocabulary with Latin, Turkish, Polish, and Russian words—yet he does so in a manner very different from that of Kosach. For Kosach, foreign words are a complex and rich multilingual stylistic layer and characteristic of both the narrator and the protagonists, while for Le, these foreign borrowings are alien elements that help him single out his ethnic characters. Kosach

weaves foreign-language vocabulary into his Ukrainian parlance, opening Ukrainian to any borrowings; Le shows that some languages can be assimilated into Ukrainian whereas others remain alien to it.

Whereas Kosach brings the entire European continent into Ukraine and makes the Ukrainian language embrace all of Europe, Le maintains that Polish and Latin would never enter Ukrainian; Turkish, perhaps, sometimes; Russian, yes, of course. Ivan Le associates elements of Polish vocabulary with falsehood, hatred, hypocrisy, and treason.<sup>8</sup> Latin emerges as the language of Catholic domination, elitist culture and despotic legislation.<sup>9</sup> Le associates Turkish with slavery, death, disdain, and falsehood—but if it is spoken by runaway Turks ready to adopt Christianity, then Turkish represents brotherhood and fraternity.<sup>10</sup> And of course, Church Slavonic brings a promise of brotherhood, love, mercy, and joy, whereas the Russian language shows political alliance and religious solidarity.<sup>11</sup>

The internationalist aspect of the Cossack rebellion is to be found in various other novels on Khmelnytsky, for example, in the novel *Pereiaslav'ska rada* (The Pereiaslav Council) by Natan Rybak (1913–1978), written contemporaneously with Kosach's *Day of Rage* in the Soviet Ukraine, on the other side of the Iron Curtain and published first in part in 1948 and then in full between 1950 and 1953. However, all Rybak's references to European diplomacy are viciously xenophobic, anti-Western, and anti-Polish. From the Roman nuncios to Polish *szlachta* to a German officer joining the Cossacks, all his foreigners are hypocritical, treacherous, and repugnant, worse than the Poles and Turks of Ivan Le.<sup>12</sup> Unlike the politicians of Ivan Le and Natan Rybak, Kosach's Europeans are genuinely fascinated by the events in Ukraine and seek to include it in larger European diplomacy. This context makes Kosach's stance particularly graphic: his Ukraine is no more the pawn of Russian or Polish policies, and it has matured to choose its own fate—and it chooses Europe. Although it is difficult, if not impossible, to read Kosach's novel allegorically, it is quite clear that Kosach rejects the racist Ukraine of the Ukrainian nationalists, barely accepts the current colonialist Soviet present, and imagines its future in the form of its distant seventeenth-century past: a rebellious multiethnic nation thrown into the fulcrum of European geopolitics and led by elites that were slowly but steadily accepting responsibility for their redemptive mission.

In order to construe Ukraine as a multiethnic land at the crossroads of European geopolitics, Kosach brings into his narratives individuals of various creeds, among them Jews. Unlike most Ukrainian historical nov-

elists in the Diaspora and in Soviet Ukraine, Kosach firmly places the persona of the Jew at the center of his writings—on par with Poles and Russians. In his short novel *Sontse v Chyhyryni* (The Sun in Chyhyryn), Kosach portrays Jewish taverns where tsarist army officers of Russian and Ukrainian origin—future participants in the 1825 Decembrist rebellion—join in debates about the fate of the Ukrainian lands and its people. Jews do not participate in their heated conversations, but they do perform important functions as messengers of the rebels, hosts of the debates, and spies ingratiating themselves with the Russians or Poles. Amazingly well read, Kosach brings together such notorious (and real historical) figures as Captain Maiboroda, who denounced Pavel Pestel, one of the key leaders of the Southern group of the Decembrists; and Shlomo Koslinsky, a sleazy informer who inspired disdain even among the addressees of his revelations.<sup>13</sup>

Jews are sometimes present only in the background in Kosach's narratives, but they are almost always there. Thus, for example, in his short historical novel *Hlukhiv's'ka pani* (A Lady from Hlukhiv) Kosach portrays a certain Anastasiia Skoropads'ka (née Markovych, 1667–1729), the wife of a Ukrainian hetman, on her last trip from Russia back home to Ukraine. It was a well-known fact that she came from the family of the Jewish leaseholder Markovych and then converted to Christianity, and she juxtaposes Jewish and Ukrainian exile in a poignant image of decaying glory, spiritual serfdom, and political helplessness.<sup>14</sup>

Thematically and chronologically, the closest of Kosach's works to his *Day of Rage* is his historical tragedy *Diistvo pro Yuriiia-Peremozhtsia* (Drama about Yurii the Winner), a Macbethian play about the last days of Khmelnytsky's son Yurii (1641–1685). This work also has two prominent Jewish figures, central to the tragedy. Caught between conflicting military and political loyalties to Russians, Poles, and Turks, Yurii Khmelnytsky attempts to fight the Poles, who are trying to woo him into a strategic alliance; the Russians, interested in geopolitical control of the southern Slavic lands; and the Ottoman Turks, who use him as their puppet. Entrapped, powerless, and confined to a Turkish-controlled fortress, Yurii Khmelnytsky turns to a certain Orun, a Kabbalist and “a wise Jew,” with a request for him to arrange a meeting with Satan. When Orun refuses and meets his death in a pit, his daughter Judith arrives at the fortress to take revenge. She sees and perceives herself as the biblical Judith coming to kill Holofernes and she does not conceal her vengeful aspirations from Yurii,

who is ready to accept his fate: he has too many enemies and everybody, including his own Cossack bodyguard, is trying to kill him. Judith dies from the same potion she prepared for the murderer of her father, ceding to the Turks the honor of killing Yurii Khmel'nyts'kyi by strangling.<sup>15</sup>

When Kosach, in the *Day of Rage*, writes about Jews, he finds unusual ways to overcome the received wisdom and inherited stereotypes, although his imagery sometimes draws heavily on them. The Jews as an ethnic group appear above all in the Polish context, joined with the Poles, and as their accomplices. Polish landlords and Jews “live not badly on the Ukrainian lands;” Poles and Jews “suck the people’s blood and grow fat” (2: 10). Some Jewish musicians, freezing and wet, entertain the Polish troops on their march into the Ukrainian mainland (2: 207). Besieged by the Cossacks, frightened Jewish leaseholders become “greyish with their premonition of upcoming death.” The Jewish quarter of Zasław (today Iziaslav), one of the oldest towns in Volhynia, appears in its stereotypical and ahistorical form as a “ghetto.” Of course its suffocatingly moldy atmosphere is more reminiscent of Mykola Bazhan’s poetic imagery in “Uman’s Ghetto” than of the historically vigorous and prosperous Jewish urban community that knew no residential restrictions in historical Zasław (2: 137).

Before we explore how Kosach the novelist treats the Jews, we must look at how his character, the Jewish historian, treats the Ukrainians. The image of a Jewish chronicler, a witness of the events, whose portrayal of the Cossacks competes with that of Kosach is perhaps one of the most inventive moments in the narrative. Naturally, Kosach chooses for his imaginary Jewish chronicler Natan Hanover, who appears in the novel under his real name. The real Natan Neta Hanover from Ostróh (d. 1683), lived in the town of Zasław as a preacher, learned about Khmelnytsky’s rebellion firsthand, personally knew the victims of the massacres, fled the Ukraine after the Cossacks besieged Zasław, and wrote his famous *Yeven metsulah* (The Abyss of Despair), a chronicle considered by Jews as the most trustworthy account of a Jewish victimhood during the Cossack rebellion.<sup>16</sup>

Published in Venice in 1653, *The Abyss of Despair* offered a highly charged theological version of the events, presenting them as a war of the Cossacks against the Jews, in which the Jews appeared as blameless victims, the Poles as treacherous accomplices, and the Ukrainian Cossacks as violent, bloodthirsty, and brutal rebels. Unlike the real Hanover, who became a *dayan*, rabbinic judge, later in his career, Kosach’s Hanover is a rabbi, the teacher of yet another major Jewish character to be introduced momen-

tarily, and also (quite strangely) a *tsadik*, dressed in a fox hat and silk kaftan, definitely a modernistic twist since Hasidism, a movement of religious enthusiasm with its spiritual masters, the *tsadikim*, came to the fore more than a century after the Cossack revolution and after Hanover's death.

Born in Kyiv and raised in Galicia, Kosach most likely saw real Hasidim in the streets of Lviv—by and large poor pietists, religious enthusiasts whose reign is not of this world, far removed from politics yet caught between the antisemitic Nazis, the nationalist Poles, the desperate Ukrainian guerrillas, and the xenophobic Red Army. Be that as it may, Kosach needed to make his Hanover a *tsadik* because the *tsadik* is believed to have a personal connection to the divine, hence to absolute truth. Besides, the Cossack rebellion and Polish oppression put that *tsadik*, a bookworm, truth seeker, and reclusive thinker from Zaslav, face to face with the suffering and death of the Ukrainians.

The Hanover in the novel is precisely this truth seeker, a keen and not unsympathetic observer of the unfolding calamity. In a word, he is Kosach's double, his rival and colleague, sometimes incapable of describing gory events the way Kosach claims—in his imaginary dialogue with the Jewish chronicler—that he himself is capable of. As a character in the novel, Rabbi Hanover is scared by the bloody deluge, by the approaching Cossack troops, by the already captured and plundered town of Bar, by the imminent destruction of the Jewish community. Ultimately, however, Kosach presents Hanover as a man of dignity and honor who transcends his frightened imagination and tells an accurate story—the opposite of what the real Hanover had done in his synoptic chronicle. A historical text within a historical novel, Hanover's chronicle mimics and emulates the objectivity of Kosach's historical text, comparing Ukraine to the biblical Promised Land and justifying the bloodthirsty rebellion: "A heavy punishment Jehovah has sent to this sinful land flowing with milk and honey. And the only reason for Jehovah to punish this *rzecz pospolita* is the oppression of its subjects. Because—thought the rabbi—other countries also know rebellions, but one such as this had never occurred before, since nowhere else are subjects oppressed as they are by us" (2: 82).

During the siege of Zaslav, Rabbi Hanover bumps into several publicly tortured Cossacks, put alive on stakes, live cadavers with their faces twisted in pain. This scene and his own ruminations about the revolt make Rabbi Hanover emphasize in his chronicle—glimpses of which Kosach shares with the reader—the suffering of the Ukrainians as a people and the



suffering of Khmelnytsky as an oppressed Cossack. The victimized Jews from the real Hanover's *Abys of Despair* turn into victimized Ukrainians in the chronicle of the imaginary Hanover. This is, for Kosach, the highest level of transcending ethnic, economic, cultural, and religious bias. Yet Kosach puts Hanover on an even higher level, making him a tacit accomplice of the Cossacks. This occurs through the mediation of Berakha, Hanover's disciple from Zasław, the second key Jewish image in the novel.

With people from so many backgrounds, cultures, and ethnicities joining the Cossack holy war, a Jew also could join the troops. Kosach did quite a lot of research to write his novel; he lists a number of sources, several of which have the Lypynsky imprimatur and preach Lypynsky's multi-ethnic approach to Ukraine, while others obliquely refer to Lypynsky's multicultural Ukraine. Kosach states explicitly that he had read about Jewish Cossacks in historiographic accounts; thus we know exactly what his source or sources were. The article he refers to is by Avraam Harkavy (Abram Garkavi, 1835–1919), the father-founder of East European Judaic studies, the Russian version of the German Wissenschaft scholars, who served as custodian of the Oriental Division of the Imperial Library in St. Petersburg. Obsessed with examples of Jewish-Slavic rapprochement—he even claimed that Jews spoke Slavic in Kyivan Rus'!—Harkavy came across the responsa *Bayit hadash* of Rabbi Joel Sirkes (1561–1640) and found the story of a Jewish boy named Berakhah ben Aharon from Tyszowiec, who joined the Cossacks of Nalivaiko together with eleven other Jews and who died a heroic death as a warrior in 1611.<sup>17</sup> Harkavy prefaced and translated the excerpt from Sirkes's responsa and published the story of Berakha twice: it was the second publication in a Kiev-based scholarly journal that caught Kosach's attention.<sup>18</sup> A man of prodigious intellect, Kosach could have also known the historical analysis of the Cossacks of Jewish origin who either traded with Zaporozhian Cossacks or joined them, research conducted by Saul Borovoi and first published in Ukrainian in the late 1920s and then in Russian in the mid-1930s.<sup>19</sup>

These articles also had an impact on Natan Rybak, who used (although censored in several editions) Jewish names for some Cossacks.<sup>20</sup> Kosach, however, takes Berakha's story as published by Harkavy, moves it forty years ahead, and changes Tyszowiec to Zasław: his Berakha, a Ukrainian instead of a Polish Jew, joins the rebellious Cossacks not in 1611 but in the midst of the 1648 revolution in Ukraine. He becomes a rebel and a brother of the rebellious Cossacks, while still remaining a Jew. Likewise,

Kosach moves Hanover from Polonne to Zasław and leaves him there as a compassionate witness of the siege of the town.

Kosach's Berakha is a well-built Jewish boy with eyes "like burning coals" (2: 84). Taught by Hanover to be a good Jew and seek the truth, he finds this truth in a Ukrainian-Jewish parallel: "Jews also bend their back before the landlords," claims Berakhah. "Khmel' [nyts'kyi] raised his banners [ . . . ] for all of us, saddlers, tailors, and poor Yids." Berakha is fascinated by the openness and welcoming treatment of aliens among the troops: "Khmel' does not ask your faith," claims Berakha. "He takes everybody" (2: 85). Kosach, one should add to that observation, embraces any language into his arsenal in exactly the same way.

In the company of a certain Kyryk, the male-disguised runaway daughter of a magnate; and Vovhura, the supervisor of the magnate's hunting dog kennel, Berakha seeks to join Maksym Kryvonis (known also as Perebyinis)—"Father Maksym"—one of the Cossack commanders whom they consider a true leader of the popular revolt. After his first fight with the szlachta, Berakha proves his skills and loyalty to the Cossacks. Although they treat him with suspicion, Berakha demonstrates his excellent marksmanship and is enlisted in a company of musketeers. He is not the only Jew among the troops: other Jews recognize him (although he has cut his earlocks) and greet him as one of the Jewish Cossacks (2: 88). Kosach does not miss any chance to glorify the physical strength and astuteness of Berakha, who can be found helping the smiths in a smithy ("he could bend a horseshoe") and convincing Cossacks to send him on a mission to besieged Zasław (2: 137).

The regimental commander grudgingly takes a risk and trusts Berakha, who swims through the moat surrounding the town, climbs the wall of the fortress, takes two Polish guards by surprise, confiscates their pistols, and comes to Rabbi Hanover to ask him for the keys to the secret door in the town wall. Berakha makes no secret of his plan: he will take the keys, open the door, let a dozen Cossacks in—and then they will overpower the guards, capture, and open the town gates. Berakha passionately explains to the skeptical rabbi that the Cossacks would not murder Jews: the colonel of the regiment himself had promised. Aware of the confessional differences, social conflicts, and ethnic hatred between Jews and Ukrainians, Kosach avoids the facile class struggle categorization—which most Ukrainian writers in the USSR used, for that matter. He argues that Ukrainians and Jews of any social origin, aware of their religious

and ethnic identities, are capable of joining one another in an anticolonial democratic revolution. Kosach also knows well that those who use the leveling Marxist explanation in fact destroy the uniqueness of Jews, Poles, Turks, and Ukrainians. Kosach prefers to leave this shallow approach to the Soviet writers.

The rabbi laughs at Berakha's naïveté, yet the ensuing conversation between the two Jews is a serious one. In fact, the two Jews, Berakha and Hanover, have a disputation about Ukrainians and Jews, their historical fates and their missions, and the choices Hanover and Berakha face in view of these missions. Berakha does not know about Hanover's treatment of the Cossacks in his chronicle, whereas Hanover has little understanding of Berakha's relation to Jews and Judaism after joining the troops. Now, all the secrets come out in the open as the two Jews debate what *Yeven metsulah* is all about—the title, which Kosach translates as the “Cossack marshes,” not without some revealing insight into Hebrew semantics.

Berakha reassures the rabbi that he has not converted, has no plans to convert, and truly believes in the chosen nature of the Jewish people. Hanover in turn readily accepts some uncomplimentary characteristics of the Jewish role in the Polish exploitation system, which Berakha shares with his rabbi, and which the perspicacious Kosach most likely draws directly from Hanover's *Yeven metsulah*. Although the dialogue of the two Jews about the Ukrainian rebellion is quite fresh and elaborate in the structure of the novel, the content of the conversation is based on sweeping generalizations, predominantly inaccurate, drawn from traditional and xenophobic Ukrainian and Russian sources such as the anonymous *Istoriia rusov* or Mykola Kostomarov—and from the no-less-Ukrainophobic Jewish ones, above all, the same Hanover's *Abyss of Despair*.

In the conversation, Rabbi Hanover focuses primarily on Jewish suffering: the death of Rabbi Aron and his yeshivah in Niemirów (today Nemyriv), the alleged twelve thousand Jews who perished in Polonne, and the Torah scrolls that the rebels used to cover their feet. “Why should we die in this fire?” asks Rabbi Hanover. Berakha replies by bringing up Ukrainian suffering: he points out how Jewish leaseholders take advantage of the insecure peasants' and Cossacks' daughters. He scolds the Jews, the purported key keepers, who prevent the burials or weddings of their Eastern Orthodox (*pravoslavni*) debtors. We are dying in this fire, Berakha sums up, because “we are also fed by this land.” Those Jews who understand the injustice that the Jewish leaseholders and their Catholic masters

commit toward the Eastern Orthodox peasants extend their help to the Cossacks and fight against the Polish troops. Whatever the historical accuracy of Berakha's accusations, the Ukrainian truth of the Jewish Cossack has the upper hand over the Jewish truth of the Ukrainian rabbi. Hanover hands over the keys (2: 139–142).

Kosach describes the Cossacks capturing Zaslav and taking revenge on the Poles, but he makes no mention of what happens to the Zaslav Jews. Nor do we know what happens to Rabbi Hanover. However, Berakha reappears in the novel in a conversation between Cossack officers—in a multicultural context: “A Greek, a Roman, and a Jew have come, all of them enraged. And the Jew—have you heard about the Jew Berakha from Perebyinis’ regiment? He captured Zaslav, and near Piliavtsi he took some thirty of Montgomery’s soldiers prisoner, and killed uncounted others . . . the Poles would not saddle us . . . With these soldiers we can go against the shah himself” (2: 244). Apparently Berakha has distinguished himself to the extent that he becomes a legendary figure among the Cossacks, who identify him both as a Jew and as a Cossack.

The Jewish images in the *Day of Rage* are not just another addition to the arabesques of Kosach’s multiculturalism; they perform a key function in the novel. Kosach cannot win the Jews for the Ukrainian cause as a people, but he manages to win some of them as individuals. Neither Rabbi Hanover nor Berakha need to convert to be supportive of the Ukrainian cause: it is enough for them to acknowledge their responsibility—and of course, guilt—as Jews for the enslaving system of latifundia, for what historians have called the second serfdom, for serving the oppressive magnates, and for abusing their exclusive role as leaseholders of the magnate estates. Paradoxically, Kosach needs this acknowledgment not to justify the Jewish massacre (which he leaves behind a curtain) but to emphasize the universality and messianic overtones of the Cossack revolution, joined by individual Puritans, Dutch, Polish Catholics, Tatars, and Jews. Furthermore, Kosach has his two Jews ponder the reasons and the purpose of the Cossack rebellion, because only Jews, in his mind, with their long record of suffering, can truly perceive and assess the level of Ukrainian victimhood. It is one thing to have a regimental scribe or an Eastern Orthodox cleric write down an account of the incessant corvée that the Orthodox peasants have to pay the Catholic landlords. It is quite another thing if a Jew, a rabbi, a *tsadik*—a divine vessel and a righteous one—left a record of an honest and wealthy Cossack thrown into prison,

of an entire people subjugated and humiliated, and of the docile peasants becoming enraged predators.

With all due consideration of the epic magnitude of Kosach's novel, one should not miss its intimately personal note: after all, Kosach's family name is a shortened diminutive (*kosachen'ko*) or vocative (*kosache*) of a Cossack. Thus, the *Day of Rage* is an extended commentary on the author's own name, Kosach—the name of a person of Ukrainian descent, who survived the bloodiest of wars and is reimagining his homeland in a DP camp, trying to understand his time through the prism of another bloody catastrophe that shook Ukraine exactly three hundred years earlier.

# 12

## Khmelnysky in Motion

### The Case of Soviet, Polish, and Ukrainian Film

*Izabela Kalinowska and Marta Kondratyuk*

NATALIA JAKOVENKO'S *Historia Ukrainy: od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku* (History of Ukraine from the Early Period Through the End of the XVIII Century) gives us an idea about Khmelnysky's outward appearance and character as described by his contemporaries. For example, an emissary from Venice observed that the hetman "was rather tall than middle height, thick boned and of a strong build." "There survive some testimonials of the Hetman's character," continues Jakovenko,

in which two natures appear to be in conflict: one tumultuous and acrimonious, the other silent, reflexive and moody, capable of being both tender and cunning. Contemporaries described frightening outbursts of anger on several occasions (during which) Khmelnysky could scream "with such unbelievable fury, that he would pounce from room to room, tear his hair out, stamp his feet," or dash around "like a madman who had lost his mind." In public appearances and in his relations with rank and file Cossacks he behaved with considered sincerity, as he possessed a great ability to show off as being open and capable of decisive, stately gestures.<sup>1</sup>

In pictorial art, Khmelnysky has generally been represented as a figure who towers above all those surrounding him. Likewise throughout the post-Soviet space Khmelnysky is monumentalized in a strong and determined figure. Obviously, this uniformity of pictorial and sculptural representation has little to do with the bits and pieces of historical records that Jakovenko mentions, but it results from the overwhelmingly positive interpretation of the hetman within imperial Russian and Soviet state ideologies. As Volodymyr Kravchenko explains, already toward the end of the

eighteenth century, “Khmelnysky was included among the ranks of the defenders of the Orthodox faith, loyal servants of the tsar, fatherland, and empire.”<sup>2</sup>

What happens to Khmelnytsky when the picture is set in motion and the ideological context of its making changes? In this chapter, we examine and compare the constituent elements of the cinematic Khmelnytsky in *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* (1941), directed by Igor Savchenko, based on a play by Oleksandr Korniiichuk; Jerzy Hoffman’s film adaptation of Henryk Sienkiewicz’s *Ogniem i mieczem* (With Fire and Sword, 1999); and *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* (2007), a Ukrainian film directed by the veteran Soviet filmmaker Mykola Mashchenko. Although the Stalinist Soviet Union, postcommunist Poland, and newly independent Ukraine in many ways provide radically different contexts for the telling of the story of Khmelnytsky, the three films have a lot in common.

First, each of them occupied a privileged position within the film industry that produced it. Sizable resources were earmarked for the production of these costly period dramas, beginning with Savchenko’s 1941 film, which Sergei Kapterev calls “one of the biggest productions of pre–World War II Soviet cinema and one of the most accomplished period dramas of its time anywhere.”<sup>3</sup> Jerzy Hoffman’s picture was the costliest film ever produced in Poland at the time of its making, and Mashchenko’s *Khmelnysky* enjoyed unprecedented financial backing by the Ukrainian government. The narratives of all three films revolve around a love story, and none includes more than a cursory mention of the anti-Jewish pogroms that accompanied the uprising. In contrast to stationary pictorial and sculptural representations, the cinematic Khmelnytsky is at times conflicted and ambivalent, yet the outlines of his character remain the same. The national ideologies that have co-opted him may be at odds, yet every time, they present Khmelnytsky as a strong leader and a visionary who is motivated by the greater good of his community.

Significant differences between the three pictures emerge in the constellation of familial and intimate relationships around Khmelnytsky. In each case, the film’s political message is articulated on the level of heavily fictionalized melodrama just as much as through the construction of Khmelnytsky as a statesman and a historical actor. Thus, in Savchenko’s film, Soviet enmity toward Poland that was prevalent at the time of the film’s making crystallizes in the figure of Khmelnytsky’s duplicitous Polish wife, Helena. The Polish *With Fire and Sword* in turn partially disarms

Khmelnysky by making him lose and never regain the woman he loved. Both Sienkiewicz and Hoffman reinforce the message of a Cossack defeat by transferring the real-life love triangle that involved Khmelnysky onto a triad of fictitious characters, whereby the Pole Skrzetuski is rewarded with the hand of the woman whom both he and the Cossack Bohun desired. Finally, in the Ukrainian *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnysky*, Mashchenko posits two competing models of femininity, as Khmelnysky oscillates between the Polonized and ostentatious Helena and the modest Ukrainian Anna. Although Anna's presence in the picture is subdued, Helena's violent death hints that a melodramatic restoration of the world of familial unity is possible only along national lines.

In most general terms one can posit an underlying question as informing our analysis: Why and how does Khmelnysky, a controversial and divisive historical figure, become a hero not only in the Soviet Union and independent Ukraine, but in postcommunist Poland as well? The hetman's movie career certainly brings into sharp focus the utilitarian character of historical filmmaking: the overtly ideologized Stalinist biopic is in this sense a precursor of both Polish and Ukrainian heritage cinema. The telling of the stories of Khmelnysky in film has more to do with the ideological requirements of the present than with a restaging of an objectively ascertainable past.

Making Khmelnysky into a film hero in 1941 may at first seem like a risky move on the part of the Soviet propaganda machine. Ukraine suffered such tremendous losses, both during the 1930–1933 *Holodomor* and as a result of Stalinist policies aimed at the eradication of Ukrainian nationalism, that any invocation of the Ukrainian dream of greater independence articulated within the mainstream of Soviet culture of the time appears cynical at best. In order to understand the motivation behind the making of the film, we need to situate it in the context of the cinematic production of the early 1940s.

First of all, *Khmelnysky* is one of many biographical films that dominated Soviet filmmaking roughly from 1939 to the 1950s.<sup>4</sup> These films focused on powerful leaders who, in the first phase, just before and after the outbreak of the war, were predominantly military commanders. The series begins with Eisenstein's *Aleksandr Nevsky* and includes, in addition to *Bohdan Khmelnysky*, Pudovkin's *Admiral Nakhimov*, Petrov's *Kutuzov*, and others.<sup>5</sup> In addition to forming a part of the series of Stalinist biopics, *Bohdan Khmelnysky* belongs to a group of films united by their thematic



focus on Polish-Russian and Polish-Ukrainian relations. Vasili Tokarev estimates that approximately seventy films referring in varying degrees to the Polish theme were made during the interwar period. Their content mirrored the tense political relations between the two countries.<sup>6</sup> *Khmelnytsky* (1941) belongs to a subgroup of movies whose appearance followed the Soviet occupation of parts of Poland, which resulted from the signing of the secret protocols of the Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty that had stipulated German-Soviet collaboration in dividing up the Polish state. This group of virulently anti-Polish films included other historical films, like Pudovkin's *Minin and Pozharskii* and *Suvorov*, as well as documentaries, of which the most noteworthy was Oleksandr Dovzhenko's *Osvobozhdenie Zapadnoi Ukrainy* (Liberation of Western Ukraine from the Polish Yoke by the Red Army in 1939). All these films represented attempts to both cover up the Nazi-Soviet treaty and legitimize the occupation of Poland's eastern territories by the Soviets. In fact, the Ukrainian writer and Soviet activist Oleksandr Korniiichuk, who authored the script for *Khmelnytsky*, was around the time of its writing involved in an effort to coax Polish writers who found themselves on the Soviet side of the new border to collaborate with the Soviets. As Marci Shore writes: "From room 31 of the Hotel George Korneichuk [Korniiichuk] ruled over cultural life in Lvov."<sup>7</sup> While reaching back in time to tell the story of Khmelnytsky's uprising in a way that underscored the Polish threat to eastern Slavdom, Korniiichuk was also actively participating in the staging of the next phase in Polish-Russian relations.

Savchenko begins his film with a scene set in a palatial, churchlike interior. Following a dramatic announcement of Khmelnytsky's escape to the Sich, Czaplinski, standing next to Khmelnytsky's wife, tells her that in five days Khmelnytsky will be captured, and the Cossack Sich destroyed. She supports the anti-Khmelnytsky effort and joins in the calls that denounce the hetman as a schismatic. The elaborate sets are presented predominantly in long shots, emphasizing the high number of Polish troops gathering for battle. In the film's first part, Savchenko's montage relies on a set of contrasts that are also marked stylistically. The long shots of the "Polish" exposition are followed—quite abruptly—by a medium close-up of a man seated in a statuesque pose on a rock that overlooks a body of water. The elaborate interiors of the Polish palaces provide a stark contrast to Khmelnytsky's natural environment. The Cossack leader-in-the-making does not wear noble garb, but simple Cossack clothes: just a white shirt,

which contrasts with his black mustache and hair, and baggy pants. Deep in thought, Khmelnysky looks at the world with the determination of a leader. The *mise-en-scène* points to a convention in Stalinist biopics that was established by Eisenstein's *Aleksandr Nevsky* (1939), in which the prince is first introduced as a simple fisherman. In the case of both Aleksandr and Khmelnysky, the simple dress and the protagonists' closeness to the natural environment are used to cast them as folk heroes. Both emerge as effective leaders because they are presented as being *of* the people.

In the sequences that follow the introduction of Khmelnysky, Savchenko provides a concise sketch of a typical member of the community that surrounds the hetman and then skillfully builds on that to provide the rationale for the Cossacks' ethos. An Orthodox priest admits a growing number of Cossacks arriving to join the ranks. "Who is your lord?" asks the Orthodox priest of a new arrival. The Cossack admits that he killed his lord, to which the priest responds: "you have fulfilled a holy deed." The interviewer's formulaic-sounding questions add up to create a composite portrait of good Cossacks. They know "Our Father," they have not sold out to the Greek Catholic church, and they drink vodka. A folk bard, who details Ukraine's suffering under Polish rule in a later sequence, explains their motivation in opposing the Poles. The director then proceeds to illustrate the bard's narrative with images. Polish troops march by a row of Cossacks who have been tied to the stake and are being set on fire. Relying on the affective potential of the figure of a martyred woman, Korniiichuk and Savchenko introduce a common-looking, distraught woman, who is at first hiding behind a stake but then throws herself in a desperate attack on Stefan Potocki, the son of a Polish magnate who leads his forces against Khmelnysky. She is killed in an instant, and in the following shot we see her dead body in the foreground, while Polish horses gallop by, nearly trampling her. Topped with the following shot of a dark smoke rising above the stakes on which the martyred Cossacks burn, the sequence aims to stir the audience's emotions by narrating the suffering of Ukraine and its people. The martyred woman becomes a metaphor for the Ukrainian land. An exchange between Potocki and the emissaries from Moscow, whom he encounters along the way, completes the film's ideological frame. The Russian mission to the Polish court asks for the right of way, claiming that in Russia emissaries are granted the right to pass. Potocki responds harshly, stating that in Poland the right of way is granted only by the power of the sword. The message of the Poles' ruthlessness resounds loudly once again.

Khmelnytsky, who is a decisive and strong leader, knows how to be humble before the assembly of his countrymen as well. In humility he comes to the Cossacks in one of the following sequences to dispel any rumors about his negotiations with the Poles, and to reveal that he has turned to the Russian people for help instead. He announces that the day of the Cossacks' attack on the Poles is near. Although Khmelnytsky is a monolith of personal strength and charisma from the moment we meet him, and the simple Cossacks who begin to gather around him exude hearty and endearing qualities, the Cossack community is not free from divisions. Some Cossack elders do not want to fight against the Poles and oppose the union with Russia. The Poles threaten from the outside, but Lyzohub emerges—in a truly Stalinist fashion—as the enemy within, a pro-Polish Cossack and a challenger to Khmelnytsky's growing power.

Thus, a binary system of forces representing the moral categories of good and evil emerges. Khmelnytsky's virtues are highlighted when juxtaposed with the vices of Polish nobility, in particular the Potockis and Czaplinski. The Cossack masses are at odds with the Cossack elders, especially Lyzohub. Finally, the virtuous Orthodox priest can be juxtaposed with Khmelnytsky's Catholic wife, Helena, whom we first meet in the opening scene, later riding with the Polish forces, and finally back at Khmelnytsky's side. The sharp contrasts that emerge are there to guide the audience in formulating a binary system of attributes that characterize the Cossacks and the Poles. The Cossacks, like their leader, are generous, valiant, true to their faith, and ready to sacrifice their lives for the cause, while the Poles and those close to them are cruel and treacherous infidels.

The peculiar ideological mix of class, nation, and religion is consistent with the Stalinist variant of Russian nationalism that emerged at the time. As Evgenii Dobrenko points out, "Soviet historicizing art was resolving the goal of the unification of at least three mutually exclusive constructions: socialist ideology, national state, and empire [ . . . ] condemning it to be notoriously ill defined, but at the same time endowing it with a dramatic quality and an internal plot line. In it one thing contradicted another."<sup>8</sup> In fact, the Stalinist Khmelnytsky champions class struggle, Ukrainian nationalism, and Russian/Soviet imperialism, all at the same time. Conveniently, from the point of view of Stalinist discourse, the figure of the hetman allows issues of class, nation, and religion to coalesce. The Orthodox Cossacks struggle against Catholic Poles, and at the same time they participate in the people's rebellion against their overlords. The

nationalist message is tied with religion throughout the film. The priest who agitates for rebellion is granted a significant amount of screen time for his fire-and-brimstone sermon, in which he threatens with eternal damnation all those who refuse to take up their arms against the Poles. Savchenko and Korniiichuk chose to emphasize the Cossacks' allegiance to Orthodoxy most likely to lend full force to the Cossack-Polish antagonism. Orthodox Christianity provides a bond between the Cossacks and the Russians, and it differentiates the former from the Poles. Moreover, while championing the liberation of the Ukrainian people from the Polish yoke, the movie carries out a systematic annexation of Ukraine into the Russian cultural and political sphere. This process becomes manifest on several levels. Linguistically, the predominant language of the film is Russian. Ukrainian is present only as an ornamental element, for example in the speech that Koshevyi delivers as a summons to the Cossacks. More importantly, the laudation of Ukraine's political union with Russia, solidified in the course of the uprising, emerges as one of the film's main points.

*Bohdan Khmelnytsky* demonstrates the ideological underpinnings of narrating history in cinema in a most overt way. As was the case with other Stalinist narratives, the main protagonist becomes a vessel for extolling the virtues of Stalin himself. Yet, unlike other films of the same group, the political message of *Khmelnysky* becomes coded in terms of the plot's gender dynamic. This element provides an interesting link to the other two cinematic stories of *Khmelnysky*. In order to articulate the ideologies for which the three films become platforms, their authors rely uniformly on the gender/familial/sexual constellations around *Khmelnysky*.

For a fleeting moment, Savchenko posits Ukraine as the feminine when Polish troops ride by the dead body of the young woman who attempted to challenge them. But femininity is primarily associated with the threatening otherness of Poland, which finds its embodiment in *Khmelnysky's* wife. Helena is very clearly marked as both Polish and Catholic. She agrees to serve as the Poles' secret weapon somewhat reluctantly, but after being smuggled back to the Cossack camp, she becomes outright treacherous and eventually attempts to poison *Khmelnysky*. Even though his affection for Helena reveals *Khmelnysky's* only weak spot, the presence of the love story does not necessarily make him less statuesque. *Khmelnysky*, who throughout the film recites his lines in an exaggerated, theatrical manner, sounds rather ridiculous when he confides in his comrades after Helena's return, enunciating each syllable separately: "Ia liub-liu e-io"

(I love her). The Cossacks disapprove of Helena's presence in their camp, first because she is a woman, and then, of course, because "She is Polish, she will betray," as one of them puts it. Yet they stand by their leader, and eventually they save him from the Polish plot. Ironically, at the time when Korniiichuk was working on Khmelnytsky, he was intimately involved with the Polish communist activist Wanda Wasilewska. The two married not long after the NKVD killed Wasilewska's first husband. She and Korniiichuk would later co-write the libretto for *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, the opera.<sup>9</sup> Note that Korniiichuk's Helena is not the first Polish woman who comes close to causing a good Cossack's downfall. Gogol used a similar construction in his *Taras Bul'ba*, although there, severe punishment follows the Cossack's indiscretion. Charmed by a Polish beauty, Taras's son Andrii goes over to the Polish side and is subsequently killed by his own father. Just as Vladimir Bortko's 2008 film adaptation of *Taras Bul'ba* seems to rely on the 1941 Savchenko film for some of its dramatic effect (the sequence centered on Bul'ba's speech bears a striking resemblance to Khmelnytsky's address to the Cossacks in Savchenko's film), so Korniiichuk may have relied on Gogol when penning the story that spoke of the dangers of Polish-Ukrainian love.<sup>10</sup>

Compared to earlier historiography, Korniiichuk takes great liberties in developing the character of Khmelnytsky's wife. In his two-volume biography of Khmelnytsky written at the end of the nineteenth century, for example, the Slavophile Ukrainian historian Nikolai Kostomarov provides little information about Khmelnytsky's nameless second wife.<sup>11</sup> According to Kostomarov, the woman was Khmelnytsky's wife already at the time of her kidnapping by Czapliński, Khmelnytsky's belligerent neighbor, but it is not clear whether the latter used force to marry her.<sup>12</sup> Khmelnytsky later remarries the same woman after the annulment of the previous union by the Metropolitan Yosaf.<sup>13</sup> Kostomarov notes that Khmelnytsky's son (Tymofii) was unhappy about the marriage already at that time. The fact that he later hanged his stepmother is noted in passing and presented as an action that was sanctioned by Khmelnytsky.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, Kostomarov does not allude to the woman's "Polishness" at all.

In a more recent biography of Khmelnytsky, the Polish historian Janusz Kaczmarczyk adheres to a similar sequence of events in his account of Khmelnytsky's personal life. As he writes, "In the spring of 1647, a woman appeared in the area of Czehryn [ . . . ] We do not know where she came from and we know nothing about her background. But we do find

her in Subotiv, by the side of Bogdan Chmielnicki, who was already then a widower. It is difficult to determine today whether it was her striking beauty or the fact that it was difficult to find female partners in the borderlands—but she awoke the passions of two men, who were by then not in their prime, at the same time.”<sup>15</sup> Kaczmarczyk refers to the adventuresome beauty, whose marriage to Khmelnytsky occurred around the time of the hetman’s triumphant entry to Kyiv, as Helena.

Khmelnytsky’s rivalry with Czapliński over Helena undergoes an interesting permutation both in Henryk Sienkiewicz’s fictional account of the turbulent year 1647 provided in *With Fire and Sword* and in the novel’s film adaptation, written by Jerzy Hoffman. The novel mentions the Khmelnytsky triangle only in passing, in chapter 2. When Skrzetuski inquires about Khmelnytsky, his interlocutor, Zaćwilichowski, an older Cossack officer in Polish service, describes him as a man of unique military ability, endowed with the brains of a hetman. At the same time, Zaćwilichowski notes that Khmelnytsky is “imperious and unquiet; and when hatred gets the better of him . . . can be terrible.”<sup>16</sup> He dismisses the conflict with Czapliński as the usual squabbles between two noblemen: Khmelnytsky was alleged to have flirted with Czapliński’s wife, but the woman had previously been Khmelnytsky’s mistress, and Czapliński kidnapped her from him. According to Zaćwilichowski, Khmelnytsky’s conflict with Czapliński was not the cause, but just a pretext for Khmelnytsky’s escape to the Sich. Khmelnytsky’s deceitful appropriation of the king’s letters to the Cossacks was at the root of the problem.

In an interesting interpretation of Sienkiewicz’s trilogy and its film adaptations Elżbieta Ostrowska points out that both the Sienkiewicz and Hoffman narratives appear to unintentionally empower the other men, that is, the Poles’ Tatar and Cossack adversaries. She mentions Khmelnytsky when discussing *With Fire and Sword* but focuses on the Cossack Bohun in particular, and she suggests that the *other* man’s empowerment casts Polish masculinity as ambivalent both in Sienkiewicz’s novel and in its film adaptation. Ostrowska interprets this ambivalence as a function of a postcolonial Polish mentality that is wrought with inferiority.<sup>17</sup>

Yet it bears emphasizing that for Sienkiewicz, the main premise of the narrative depends on providing his Polish and Polonized male protagonists with greater agency. The narrative’s structuring, and in particular how Sienkiewicz strips Khmelnytsky of parts of his biography, points to the means he uses to accomplish this goal. In order to contain the

historical Khmelnytsky, the successful rebel leader who effectively undermined Poland's military greatness and her political and economic dominance over the expansive eastern borderlands, Sienkiewicz transposed the story of the love triangle onto the novel's fictional characters. Skrzetuski, the "manly and noble" Polish officer, falls in love with Helena Kurcewiczówna, a Ruthenian beauty who has already been the object of the Cossack Bohun's passionate glances and marital designs.<sup>18</sup> In real life, Khmelnytsky, the Cossack, emerged victorious in the sense that he also "got the girl." In Sienkiewicz's account, Skrzetuski, the Polish warrior, secures Helena's hand for himself by his decisive actions and the threats he directs against her crude guardians, the Kurcewicze. He outmaneuvers Bohun and has no qualms about it whatsoever because he is convinced of his own superiority vis-à-vis the Cossack. Whereas Korniiuchuk and the 1941 production presented the Polishness of Helena as a menace, in Sienkiewicz's narrative the Polonization of Helena Kurcewiczówna, the dark-eyed and hot-blooded Ukrainian who descended from a princely Ruthenian family (Chapter Four) is marked as a positive feature. Moreover, Skrzetuski's victory in the love contest with the Cossack compensates for the military losses that the Polish troops suffer. Thus the threat posed by Khmelnytsky as both a man and a rebel leader is partly neutralized and contained by Sienkiewicz through the introduction of another Cossack, Bohun, who, in spite of his masculine power and charisma, suffers a defeat in his rivalry with Skrzetuski over Helena. The real-life Czaplinski-Helena-Khmelnytsky triangle is transformed into the fictitious one of Bohun-Helena-Skrzetuski. The transformation allows Sienkiewicz to articulate a message that is "heartwarming" from the point of view of Polish nationalism. Hoffman makes the substitution of Bohun for Khmelnytsky very palpable in the film adaptation, as well. At the film's beginning, as Khmelnytsky, mounted on a horse, departs for the Sich, we see him against the background of a sky suddenly split by lightning. A similarly arranged shot comes at the film's end, but this time it's Bohun, rejected by Helena and magnanimously pardoned by Skrzetuski, who literally rides off into the sunset.

Skrzetuski first comes into contact with Khmelnytsky when he rescues him from the attack of Czaplinski's men, at the novel's outset.<sup>19</sup> Sienkiewicz's narrator describes the runaway Cossack in guardedly positive terms, noting that "his powerful face indicated courage and pride," yet quickly adding that "there was in it something at once attractive and repulsive—the

dignity of a hetman with Tartar cunning, kindness, and ferocity.”<sup>20</sup> Grateful for Skrzetuski’s intervention, Khmelnytsky later saves Skrzetuski’s life and eventually frees him after the lieutenant becomes a captive of the Cossacks. Right after Khmelnytsky buys Skrzetuski’s freedom from his new military ally, the Tatar Tuhai-bei, a verbal exchange that is crucial for the construction of both characters takes place. In the course of his conversation with Skrzetuski, Khmelnytsky rejects Skrzetuski’s accusations of self-interest and treason and explains why Cossack troops rallied around him to fight against the forces of Polish nobility. He argues that his motives go beyond private reasons for revenge, pointing to the suffering of his people under the Polish yoke as the reason the Cossacks responded to his call to arms. The argument sounds compelling, but Sienkiewicz finds a way to undermine it, pointing to the many glasses of vodka that the hetman imbibes during the exchange. Skrzetuski’s argumentation and his accusations that Khmelnytsky fomented unrest and incited brotherly Slavs of the borderlands to violence anger the Cossack. He drinks himself unconscious. As a result, the verbal confrontation ends in Skrzetuski’s victory, as he is the only man left standing. Sienkiewicz effectively undercuts Khmelnytsky’s criticism of the magnates’ abuses of power in the eastern borderlands by presenting him as a quick-tempered drunkard.

In her assessment of Polish heritage cinema, Ewa Mazierska concludes that *With Fire and Sword* promotes “a conservative, reactionary ideology,” yet all the same she subscribes to a widely held opinion that “the brilliant acting and charisma of the famous Ukrainian actor, Bohdan Stupka, playing Hetman Bohdan Chmielnicki, the leader of the Cossacks’ uprising, forces the audience to respect the Ukrainian cause.”<sup>21</sup> (See Fig. 12.1) Indeed, the empowerment of the Poles’ Cossack adversaries pertains to the film adaptation by Jerzy Hoffman much more than it does to the literary original. Although Hoffman’s casting decisions were of crucial importance, the new interpretation of Khmelnytsky does not depend solely on Stupka’s masterful performance. Hoffman, one of Poland’s senior filmmakers, whose historical superproduction became commercially the most successful film of the first decade after communism’s collapse, wrote new lines for Khmelnytsky to make him fit the new times. The differences between the scene of Skrzetuski’s verbal duel with Khmelnytsky as described in the novel and Hoffman’s rendering of the two men’s encounter in the film provide the best illustration of how historical films tell us just as much about the time of their making as they do about the past.





FIGURE 12.1. Bohdan Stupka as Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Jerzy Hoffman's *With Fire and Sword* (1999)

Hoffman adheres fairly closely to Sienkiewicz's text, but he presents Khmelnytsky without the admixture of barbarity that was quite pronounced in the literary original. His hetman is both honorable and shrewd. He is a man with a vision for Ukraine's future. After Khmelnytsky buys Skrzetuski's freedom from Tuhai-bei, the camera presents him in a medium close-up, addressing Skrzetuski, in the background, in a lucid voice. Khmelnytsky holds a glass in his hand and, upset by Skrzetuski's accusation of merely trying to avenge the kidnapping of his wife by Czapliński, spills the drink, but he soon regains his composure. He ignores the reference to his wife altogether and retorts that although indeed Czapliński killed his son, the Cossack masses would not have followed him if he had thought only about himself. The Cossacks have suffered many privations at the hands of Polish landed nobility. It is not the Cossacks who are the scourge of the country, but the magnates. Were it not for their selfishness, "the Republic of not two but three nations would have thousands of warriors at its disposal in conflicts with Turks, Tartars, Moscow," concludes the filmic Khmelnytsky, hinting at the possibility of Ukraine's political union with Poland-Lithuania.

Jerzy Hoffman thought about adapting *With Fire and Sword* for a long time prior to the film's making. According to an anecdotal account, at a meeting of filmmakers in Moscow in 1980, Hoffman declared that it was his dream to adapt the novel. "Bondarchuk gets up upon hearing this—remembers the filmmaker and says: 'In this case, I am going to make *Taras Bulba*' . . . Later Bondarchuk and I concluded that one could make two co-productions—my *With Fire and Sword* and his *Taras Bulba*. He even received permission from the Ukrainian Central Committee, but later Moscow reprimanded the Committee for nationalism and everything collapsed."<sup>22</sup> Although the first version of the script for the adaptation of *With Fire and Sword* dates back to 1986, there can be little doubt that the way Hoffman eventually constructed Khmelnytsky in the film's final version depends on the ideological demands of the moment of its making.<sup>23</sup> Hoffman's creative recasting of Khmelnytsky corresponds to Poland's geopolitical situation in the aftermath of 1989, its accession to the European Union and to NATO, and—most important—the emergence of independent Ukraine. Ewa Hauser notes that "to touch upon the nationality issues pertaining to Polish-Ukrainian-Russian relations would have been too politically volatile under even the most reformist communist governments," yet the same concerns about offending the Ukrainian's national pride must have been present after 1990.<sup>24</sup> How Hoffman constructed Khmelnytsky is a testament to that. If Savchenko's Khmelnytsky embraced the idea of Ukraine's union with Russia wholeheartedly, the hetman in Hoffman's film shows more interest in aligning himself with the Polish crown but is weary of the abuses of the local nobles. *With Fire and Sword* ends with a voiceover commentary whose last line came not from Sienkiewicz but from the film's director/writer: "A hundred and fifty years later, Catherine the Great, the queen of Russia, conquered the Crimean Khanate, abolished the Zaporozhian Sich, and vitally contributed to the collapse of the Rzeczpospolita." The conclusion emphasizes a parallel positioning of Poland and Ukraine vis-à-vis the threat of Russian expansion, and it suggests a common ground for a reconciliation and cooperation.

Accompanied by great pomp, in the fall of 1999 *With Fire and Sword* premiered in Kyiv. Hoffman's film was quite well received by cinema audiences throughout Ukraine, but many Ukrainian intellectuals were rather critical of the director's attempt to have his cake and eat it, too. Yurii Andrukhovych, for example, though praising Hoffman for the way he captured the beauty of the steppe and for a superior use of Ukrainian

dialogues, pointed out some cases of cultural insensitivity in the film adaptation.<sup>25</sup> Yurii Tarnawsky did not see any merit in the new rendition of Khmelnytsky: “Bohdan Stupka . . . plays Khmelnytsky for all the role is worth. He is busy trying to convince the Ukrainians to rebel and to justify his rebellion to the Poles, but there is no life in the character of the Great Hetman.”<sup>26</sup> Ultimately, claims Tarnawsky, Hoffman could have made a movie that “would not have been offensive to Ukrainians,” “but then it would not have been the national classic *With Fire and Sword*.”<sup>27</sup> With Mashchenko’s 2007 production, Ukrainians finally got a chance to make Khmelnytsky their own.

In an attempt to play an active role in national identity building, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Ukraine commissioned not one but three films about Cossacks from three acclaimed film directors: Yurii Il’enko’s *Molitva za Hetmana Mazepu* (A Prayer for Hetman Mazepa, 2001), Mykola Zaseyev-Rudenko’s *Chorna Rada* (Black Counsel, 2002) and Mykola Mashchenko’s *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* (2007).<sup>28</sup> All three films dealt with the theme of Ukraine’s heroic Cossack past and featured Cossack hetmans as their main protagonists. The government’s involvement and the use of such historical material would make it logical to expect that these films fall into the genre of heritage cinema, but that is not quite the case. Moreover, not one of the three accomplished film directors, whose careers began already in Soviet times, managed to meet the expectations and produce the first great national film. All three films failed to reach a wider audience, and none of them has been recognized as a significant contribution to art cinema.

Instead, the closest that Ukrainian filmmakers came to making a popular heritage picture was the widely successful TV series *Roksolana* (1996–2003, dir. Boris Nebeyeridze), a mixture of a soap opera and a heritage show that featured a young woman kidnapped from a village who became a favorite wife of the Ottoman Sultan Suleiman I. Unlike the three historical dramas about Ukrainian hetmans, this TV series was a commercial Ukrainian-Russian coproduction (Ukrtefilm and Nashe Kino). *Roksolana* was widely popular both in Ukraine and Russia and successfully sold abroad.<sup>29</sup>

Although both Mashchenko and Il’enko blamed their failures on the undeveloped tastes of the general audience and on limited budgets, they evidently struggled with developing coherent and cohesive visions for their own projects.<sup>30</sup> Yet of the two, Il’enko is closer to achieving stylistic and

interpretive originality. Stagey, eerily nightmarish, and bizarre, his *Prayer for Hetman Mazepa* represents Ukrainian history as a sadomasochistic perversion, Ukraine as an old whore, Tsar Peter I as a madman, and Mazepa as a sorcerer. This iconoclastic interpretation of history led to the film's ban from Russian distribution. But despite the director's previous and unquestionable claims to fame, the film did not receive a warm reception from any quarters.<sup>31</sup>

Compared to Il'enko's *Prayer*, the narrative of Mashchenko's *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* is more conventional, yet it suffers from numerous formal flaws that reflect its somewhat tortuous production history. A recipient of many state awards and accolades for films he directed in the 1970s and 1980s, he became a director at the Kyiv Dovzhenko Film Studio in 1986. By the time he embarked on *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* in his midseventies, he was considered one of the classic directors of Ukrainian Soviet cinema. Mashchenko discussed his ideas for the Khmelnytsky film in these terms: "I want to depict the Cossack leader Bohdan and his Cossacks, as they prepare for their battle for freedom as if true Spartans. They know they can win or lose, but they do not care about the outcome because they know their fame will live forever. Their cause is immortal; it's calling them to fight, to free their land from cruel Polish domination, to create their own independent state on the lands that belong to Ukraine."<sup>32</sup> Once again, the comments point in the direction of heritage cinema. But transitioning from Soviet stagnation-era filmmaking formulas into Ukrainian national epics proved to be quite difficult.

Several years after production started, the film stalled and dragged on. From the beginning, Mashchenko's project appears to have been too ambitious and overblown: the director envisioned a trilogy for a theatrical release and twenty-one episodes of a television series. In 2002 at the Molodist festival, Mashchenko presented a part of the project under the title *Zbarazh*. The film was met with many disapproving voices and critical reviews, but Mashchenko continued filming and editing. In 2007, after eight years of production and with no more money left in the budget, the director edited together the material that he had filmed and put it into one film and four TV installments, neither of which found a way to the hearts of Ukrainian audiences. *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* finally premiered in 2007. Initially, the release was planned to be a national event: the film was to be shown not only in hundreds of movie theaters but also on large TV screens installed for that purpose on the main squares of Ukrainian cities

and towns.<sup>33</sup> In the end, unable to compete with Hollywood blockbusters, the film was shown only in a few Ukrainian theaters at off-peak times. Most Ukrainians are still unaware of its existence.

Similarly, critical response was weak and unsupportive. In an extensive review, Ihor Hrabovich pointed out the film's formal weaknesses and lack of generic consistency, concluding that it was "indigestible" and "unimpressive."<sup>34</sup> He commented unfavorably on its "weird symbiosis" of frozen and stalled dramaturgy and bad acting.<sup>35</sup> Critic Oleh Sidor-Gibelinda observed that the film was "too rushed for a reconstruction, too controlled for a waltz-fantasy, too boring for an action, too accurate for an experiment."<sup>36</sup>

For what was meant to be an inspiring and identity-forming heritage film, *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky* is quite pessimistic and painful. Compared to, for example, the Russian adaptation of *Taras Bul'ba*, Mashchenko's film does not recreate the seventeenth century as the Golden Age in the history of Ukraine. Quite the contrary, the film represents it as a tremulous period of fighting between the Cossacks and the Poles, with Russia and Turkey involved as observers and unreliable allies. The film picks up where Hoffman's *With Fire and Sword* ends. It covers the period of the Cossack uprising against Poland between 1648 and 1657, starting with the siege of Zbaraż. After months of being besieged, the Polish Duke Vishnyvetsky awaits help from the Polish king Jan Kazimierz's army. The Cossacks gain a strategic advantage by destroying the king's army and capturing the king himself. Yet, Khmelnytsky refuses to storm Zbaraż and grants freedom to the king. Meanwhile, Khmelnytsky's wife Helena and his personal enemy Czapliński are captured and brought to face him. Boldly, Czapliński accuses Khmelnytsky of turning their personal feud into a big-scale national war. He admits that he is responsible for the death of the hetman's son but claims that Khmelnytsky is the greater villain because he bears the guilt for thousands of innocent deaths. Khmelnytsky lets Czapliński go, while Helena decides to stay with him. As the Cossacks uprising develops, the Polish king is pressed to officially recognize Khmelnytsky as a hetman and promise privileges to the Cossacks. But the moment of triumph does not last long. Soon the treaty is broken and many Cossacks are captured, tortured, and executed. Khmelnytsky is completely devastated and demoralized. Adding insult to injury, Khmelnytsky's son Tymosh catches Helena cheating and executes her. Khmelnytsky returns to Chyhyryn and refuses to sign a peace treaty brought by a Polish ambassador. The film

ends with Khmelnysky declaring war on Poland. The picture's choppy editing makes it difficult for an audience that may not be familiar with historical details to follow the plot. Moreover, its characters, including the main protagonist, do not inspire identification.

The conceptual problem with the film is that it presents Bohdan Khmelnysky in three contradictory roles: a military leader, a pious Christian, and a husband of the beautiful Helena. He is determined and ruthless as a hetman, humble and meek as a Christian, and childish and powerless as a husband. As a consequence, Mashchenko's Khmelnysky is a deeply troubled and neurotic person who is unable to reconcile his inner struggles. The director justifies his rendition of Khmelnysky by referring to historical sources that describe him as "a controversial figure . . . they say that Bohdan inherited a neurasthenic character. He could burst into tears for no reason, and in the same way, for no reason get angry and smash Cosacks' heads with his pike."<sup>37</sup> Complex historical circumstances make matters even worse: Mashchenko portrays Khmelnysky as being caught up in a bad situation and trying to do the best under very unfavorable circumstances. Khmelnysky appears to be confused and torn. Unlike the hetman of Hoffman's film, he does not have a vision for his people. Even though he is often presented on horseback like the great leaders of the past, he has not mastered history. For Mashchenko, as for Fredric Jameson, "History is what hurts, it is what refuses desire and sets inexorable limits to individual as well as collective praxis."<sup>38</sup> Mashchenko's Khmelnysky is hurt, ridden by guilt, and burdened by power. It is painful to watch Khmelnysky as a sickly, disassociated, and neurotic man. It remains a mystery whether such a portrayal was the director's vision or a reflection of the failing health of the actor, Volodymyr Abazopulo. Mashchenko justified his choice of the actor by claiming that "Abazopulo has insane inner energy, nerve plus sentimentality, infantilism. He is very much like Khmelnysky."<sup>39</sup>

To emphasize Khmelnysky's importance, Mashchenko repeatedly places him in a towering position: the camera gives him the effect of looming over the other characters, and he speaks in a loud voice. In addition to occupying a central position in the shot, Khmelnysky caresses his spiked mace, threatens his enemies with his saber, and uses a bandura as a pointer. All of the phallic objects that he holds in his hands further emphasize his position of power. He does not enjoy it; the power eats him alive and fills him with sorrow and torment. This may be why he threatens to step down and warns that power is a burden and a curse.

Mashchenko's Khmelnytsky is torn between being a good hetman and being a good Christian, between the duty to avenge and an imperative to forgive. From the beginning, Mashchenko repeatedly emphasizes Khmelnytsky's belief in God. The church provides a narrative frame for the film. In the opening scene, Khmelnytsky prays to God: "Show me the way. Do not abandon me." The final scene is set in a church, where Khmelnytsky preaches about war to the Cossacks who hold candles in one hand and sabers in the other. Mashchenko underscores Khmelnytsky's tolerance and his respect for Catholicism by having him stop the Cossacks from plundering a Polish church and killing the worshipers. The hetman even kneels in front of a Catholic priest, asking his forgiveness. A positive image of Khmelnytsky as hetman is juxtaposed with a negative image of Polish soldiers who do not hesitate to kill wounded Cossacks hiding in an Orthodox church. Such a religious binary venerates and ennobles Khmelnytsky and denigrates and blames the Poles for religious abuse.

Compared to the Soviet discourse that treated Khmelnytsky predominantly as a wise leader who was determined to unite Ukraine with Russia, Mashchenko's attempt at nationalist discourse positions Khmelnytsky as a conflicted and flawed character pressured by historical circumstances to turn to the Russians as the least of several evils. Personally, Mashchenko sees the move as a mistake: "history did not forgive Bohdan the defeat near Berestechko nor the Zboriv treaty. History did not forgive the Pereiaslav Treaty."<sup>40</sup> Building on his own understanding of the hetman, Mashchenko overburdens Khmelnytsky with historical guilt.

Mashchenko portrays Khmelnytsky as a talented military leader: he besieges Zbaraz', issues orders to the Cossacks, and conducts negotiations with the Polish, Turkish, and Russian side. He is a brilliant strategist when he turns a bridge into a deadly trap for Polish soldiers. However, he is unable to benefit from the victory because his Turkish ally forbids him to capture the Polish king and destroy the Polish army.

*Khmelnytsky's* symbolism is chronotopic in the Bakhtinian sense because in it, "spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history."<sup>41</sup> Mashchenko resorts to the recurring images of the bridge, the grave, and the church throughout the film and uses them as chronotopic markers of history that acquire symbolic meaning.

After he learns that many Cossacks have been captured and hanged on a bridge, Khmelnytsky travels to see this with his own eyes. The bridge transformed into an execution site terrifies him. The camera lingers on the dead Cossacks hanging and swaying in the fog. Khmelnytsky orders his men to bury the dead Cossacks and to blow up the bridge. The explosion signifies an end of peaceful negotiations with Poland. The bridge, which first was covered with the killed Polish soldiers and later with the hanged Cossacks, becomes a symbol of a mutual history of violence and hatred between the two nations.

As he walks away from the bridge, the hetman is crestfallen and desperate. He finds himself at the bottom of the grave prepared for the dead Cossacks, and the gravediggers blame and curse him. He tells them to bury him with the dead Cossacks, and old men do start throwing dirt on the live Khmelnytsky before a priest begs everybody to come back to their senses. This very symbolic scene emphasizes again Khmelnytsky's overwhelming guilt and anguish. The hetman walks away, sits on a hill, and then looks behind him. The reverse shot of the cross suggests that his whole world is turned upside down.

In addition, the subverted ritual of a banquet serves as a symbol of hubris and the impossibility of reconciliation on a couple of occasions. This is mostly evident in the scene where Khmelnytsky climbs onto the king's dinner table to perform a traditional Cossack dance—the *hopak*—swinging his saber around. At the end of the film, when Khmelnytsky refuses to accept a peace offer from Polish ambassadors, he overturns the richly set table, signaling the end of negotiation and the beginning of war.

Mashchenko associated Khmelnytsky's failures as a leader with his turbulent love story. Without his armor and weapons, a wolf turns into a sheep. Bohdan is soft and meek when interacting with his wife Helena, whose story has too many loose ends to make it understandable to the viewer. Since she is not fully developed as a character, Helena functions first of all as eye candy. It is left unclear whether she ran away or was kidnapped by Czaplinski. When the two are captured, Khmelnytsky lets her choose whether to stay or to leave. She stays with Khmelnytsky, but there is something treacherous about her. Mashchenko drops hints here and there, suggesting that Helena is sympathetic toward the Poles. Even though in the film she speaks Ukrainian (as does everybody else), her appearance and dress mark her as Polish: she is blond and slender, and she wears Western-style clothes. Interestingly, she bears a strong physical resemblance both to



Duke Vishnyvetsky and to King Jan Kazimierz. In addition to her Polonized look, she is eroticized as she runs around in a white lace nightgown, with her hair loose, and stares at herself in a mirror. Her abundant sexuality leads to her ultimate downfall when she is caught with a lover.

A Polish-looking Helena is juxtaposed with a Ukrainian-looking Anna, an episodic character who appears toward the end of the film. Anna brings Khmelnytsky news about the impending uprisings in Poland. As they meet in the middle of a burning village, Khmelnytsky dismounts his horse and takes Anna's beautiful face in his hands and thanks her for caring for his children. He seems to have feelings for her. Dressed in black, Anna is portrayed as a caring mother figure in mourning. She is beautiful, modest, and asexual, in contrast to Helena, who is vain and sexualized.

Helena's beauty challenges Khmelnytsky's masculinity. He is completely under her spell. In a bedroom scene, a half-naked Helena runs to Bohdan and professes her love for him. He questions her about her association with Czaplinski and asks her to tell him the truth. As Helena insists that Bohdan is her only and true love, Bohdan kneels in front of her and buries his head in her belly, not like a lover but like a child. Does beautiful Helena function as a symbol of Poland, desirable but unreliable? If we assume that Helena symbolically represents Poland, then the scene suggests Khmelnytsky's longing for a return into the fold and for acceptance.

In Mashchenko's film Helena receives more attention and is granted greater significance than in *Khmelnytsky* of 1941, but she remains within the same paradigm of a deceitful woman, hurting and compromising the reputation of a great military leader. Later on, when Khmelnytsky learns that his son caught Helena cheating and executed her, he reacts with anguish: "How could he do this to me? I do not want to live," suggesting that he loved Helena even at the expense of his military goals.

As in Krylov's fable *A Swan, a Pike and a Crawfish*, Khmelnytsky's three conflicting roles tear his character, and consequently the film, apart. As a result, Mashchenko falls short of constructing a coherent national narrative in *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky*. Even though the director blamed budgetary constraints for the shortcomings of his film, his inability to articulate the film's relationship to Ukrainian identity and statehood reflects a greater discursive problem facing the Ukrainian nation in the post-Soviet period. Mashchenko's fragmented and incoherent film is symptomatic of a fragmented and incoherent Ukrainian postdependence identity. It remains in constant flux, caught between Europe and Russia, East and West,

unable to define itself and maintain a more or less stable position, but endlessly maneuvering, reshuffling, and negotiating under the pressure of its powerful neighbors.

Ultimately, a juxtaposition of the three Khmelnytsky films brings into focus the issues of agency and the historical process. The Stalinist *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* constructed the hetman as a paradigm of a great leader, endowed not only with the will but also with the power to shape history. Mashchenko's Ukrainian production resulted in a Khmelnytsky who finds himself at the opposite end of the spectrum: he is tragically caught up in history and has no power to resist the geopolitical whirlwind that engulfs him. Finally, the Polish *With Fire and Sword*, although poignant about historical contingency, holds a promise that arises from a re-appropriation of a past moment of trauma for the establishment of greater historical agency in the present.

Moreover, the fascinating longevity of Khmelnytsky as a filmic subject and the ease with which the hetman has moved across boundaries of time and space in the region indicate that he belongs to the cultural borderlands that continue to function as an ideological battleground. Khmelnytsky has become a Jamesonian ideologeme, a "historically determinate conceptual or semic complex which can project itself variously in the form of a 'value system' or 'philosophical concept', or in the form of a protonarrative, a private or collective narrative fantasy."<sup>42</sup> Every time he reappears on the screen, he is an ideological construct that promises to provide a "symbolic resolution to a concrete historical situation."<sup>43</sup>



## Afterword

*Judith Deutsch Kornblatt*

MANY YEARS AGO, a fellow graduate student assured me that we choose dissertation topics as subconscious extensions of our true selves. He had chosen childhood, and that seemed to make sense. I had chosen the Cossacks. To explain my choice in the preface to my book on *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature*, I boldly recounted the liberation of my Menshevik grandmother from prison by a group of “gallant horsemen” shortly before her forced emigration in 1918.<sup>1</sup> But that was my grandmother, not me. I’ve never been captured, much less liberated, and a ponytail in elementary school is the closest I have come to a forelock. A bread knife to a saber. Midwestern prairie to the steppe. It’s hard to imagine that this American Jewish academic female is really a Cossack at heart.

Only now, after a career immersed in Russian literature, religion, and history that on my retirement has come full-circle to Khmelnytsky, do I understand the choice of Cossack as having been displaced to my 1992 book’s subtitle: *A Study in Cultural Mythology*. The macho horseman of Gogol and Babel, of Pushkin and Sholokhov, it turns out, simply served me as pretext for the exploration of collective identity formation more generally. A case study. Given a different field, I might have written about the Irish Travelers. Or the Maccabees. Or, closer to the topic on which I settled, the Cowboys and Indians of the American frontier. Cromwell could have replaced Mazepa and Stenka Razin. As could have Tamerlane or Genghis-Khan. Even Tarzan, despite, or maybe because of, his utter lack of flesh-and-blood reality, could have formed the core of the study. What fascinated me in the end was not the topic itself but its malleability,

its defiance of definition, its refusal to be fixed in one, two, or even three different histories, in other words, its amorphous role in the very creation of cultural identit(ies).

Yet the Cossacks in and of themselves *are* fascinating—and not only to me—in a very contextualized and specific way. As we have seen throughout this volume, the Ukrainian Cossack hero Bohdan Khmelnytsky, in particular, turns out to be the perfect subject for an exploration of the self-identities of at least four cultures, providing both a universal model *and* a singular, rich example with its own ambiguous and contradictory borders.

Clearly, editing a scholarly volume on Khmelnytsky is no small task. Historians, literary specialists, art and film historians all have a stake in parsing the Cossack image. Experts in Ukraine, in Russia, in Poland, in the Jews of Eastern Europe have all written on the subject. Yet few have expertise across boundaries, and certainly not across all the boundaries that the myth of Bohdan—the Gift of God for some, the Scourge of Humankind for others—itself has traveled. Nor should they. It is only in the juxtaposition of all their work that we can even begin to understand the tapestrylike image of the Cossack hero. If nothing else, this volume makes us aware that even binary definitions of Khmelnytsky do a disservice to the subject. His story is not Polish or Ukrainian. It is not a question of Russia versus Poland or Ukrainian versus Jew. If, by focusing on the variously named geographic areas in which he operated, Eastern Poland and Western Ukraine, we leave out his role in the development of a displaced Russian or Jewish identity as well, we miss the point. Furthermore, speaking generically, if we fix the vast and varied writings on him as solely either fiction or history, we lose him. And we limit ourselves when we ask if he is an extraordinary individual or some kind of a collective hero. Does his memory apply to the elite, or to the masses? Is his story political, or religious? Was he a lover, or a warrior? A rabble-rouser, or a compromiser? The answer to all these questions is both and neither. In fact, he turns out to be the perfect image for cultural myth building.

The volume that precedes this Afterword leaves us with a number of takeaway lessons, which I will raise here in no obvious order, just as no one aspect of Khmelnytsky's story can ever take primary position. The editor writes in her Introduction that the goal of this volume is to “collectively examine the importance of the tales about a Cossack leader and the 1648 uprising to coexisting East European literatures,” so we know from the beginning that we will likely learn as much about those coexisting East

European cultures as about the hero/villain himself, or more. In the end, we might be left with a series of dates and events related to the flesh-and-blood Bohdan, the son of some mother, the husband of some wife. More rewarding for readers, however, is how his later audiences identify aspects of themselves in their attempts to articulate or define him. It is this that the editor suggests when she invokes “contested memory and the emergence of cultural products.”<sup>2</sup>

First, we learn that the multiple retellings on display here affect not only the memory of Khmelnytsky but also that of Cossackdom as a whole. Cossacks in the texts and other media that feature them shift between decades, sometimes even centuries, and across borders in some cases, to efface distinctions between various rebellions and even Russian or Ukrainian hosts. Thus can features of Khmelnytsky easily migrate to the Cossack Mazepa fifty years hence, as Taras Koznarsky shows us.<sup>3</sup> Even more surprisingly, we learn in Israel Bartal’s analysis that Jewish settlers to Palestine at the beginning of the twentieth century embraced the image of otherwise antisemitic Cossacks they knew more from the “historical” fiction of Nikolai Gogol than from their own holidays along the Dnepr. It is no small, if contradictory, coincidence that the Ukrainian-born Gogol calls the Zaporozhian Cossacks “an unusual demonstration of *Russian* strength,” who are capable of “gallivanting recklessly, drinking, and carousing as only a *Russian* knows how.”<sup>4</sup> Gogol increasingly deemphasized the local, “Little Russian” aspects of his Cossack host as he revised *Taras Bul’ba* between 1835 and 1842, perhaps as much to universalize their image and assimilate it into his own self-identity as a new literary champion as to curry favor with his “Great Russian” audience. So too did the new Jewish immigrants to the Middle East shuffle the fictional Cossack Taras Bul’ba in with romantic notions of their Bedouin neighbors, and arrive at models for their own roles as pioneers in a great new land.<sup>5</sup>

The next effacement of fact, and thus contested memory, is in the very space, and name, of Ukraine. Wedged between Catholic Poland and Orthodox Russia, home to the Jewish Pale of Settlement, geographically today Ukraine is the largest fully European country. (Russia is obviously bigger, but it has much of its territory on the continent of Asia.) Yet even the name of the Ukrainian Eastern Rite Catholic Church demonstrates a pull between allegiance to the pope in Rome and the rituals of the Orthodox service. It is just this hybrid status that is contested now, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, as Ukraine has again become the center

of political and geographic struggles. To whom do the land and its people “belong”? The first question asked in recent invasions, quasi-invasions, and legal or illegitimate elections was to whom the Crimean Peninsula belongs: to Ukraine, into which it was incorporated after the fall of the Soviet Union, or to Russia, which has controlled it since the eighteenth century? Very little credence was given to the possibility that this strategic landmass “belongs” to the Crimean Tatars displaced already several hundred years ago. More generally, Ukrainians are now forced to ask themselves whether their “true” identity aligns with Western Europe or with a Russia that is increasingly alienated from the West. Bordered by seven other countries and two seas, over the centuries this territory was successively ruled by the Varangians, the Tatars, the Lithuanians, the Poles, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Russians, and the Soviets. And now again some of it has rejoined Russia. Ironically, the origin myth of ancient Kyivan Rus’ relays a willful “calling” of the Varangians, a subjugation to be repeated under the Russians by Khmelnytsky himself in the 1654 Pereiaslav Treaty and is now playing out again as Eastern and Western Ukraine face off over rapprochement toward Russia or Western Europe. Given its history of subjugation, it is no doubt more than a mere plot device that so many of the retellings of Khmelnytsky’s story involve the kidnapping, betrayal, or death of a woman (although a different woman in many of the versions). As Roman Koropeckyj elegantly suggests, “The violent fate of the woman, like that of Ukraine, suggests . . . on a more fundamental level, the impossibility of Ukraine as such.”<sup>6</sup> So much more ambiguous is the image of the fated female land when Ukraine is equated with “Cossack Nation.” Is this space the ultimate collective masculine hero? Or is it/she a maiden in distress? Or, as we have come to see, do the contradictory images coexist in wonderful narrative tension?

As already mentioned, not only space but time is ambiguous in many of these texts. Gennady Estraiikh asserts that “Soviet propaganda had denuded the hetman of human characteristics, turning him into a mythological epic *bogatyry* warrior.”<sup>7</sup> But Adam Teller demonstrates that mythologizing of one kind or another occurred already three hundred years before the Soviet Union laid claim to all of Cossack territory.<sup>8</sup> If we did not already realize it, this volume on Khmelnytsky drives home the knowledge that history itself is not made of facts, but of stories. We can label retellings of the Cossack past variously as chronicle or history or fiction, but in every case literary tropes and rhetorical strategies predominate over hard

data. And we certainly cannot count on the generic label provided by the authors themselves, as the meaning of the terms chronicle, history, and fiction morph throughout the centuries. Can we call the hetman of the Soviet, post-Soviet, Polish, and Ukrainian films cited by Izabela Kalinowska and Marta Kondratyuk historical fact?<sup>9</sup> Certainly not. He remains an old-fashioned romantic hero, whether evil or good, despite the late date of many of the films' releases.

In his study of the Romantic Khmelnytsky, George Grabowicz suggests that the hetman's story has a "profound cathectic function." He continues that it, "like the broader Ukrainian Cossack theme in which it inheres, dealt with collective memory and trauma and the collective shadow and (for the Poles and Ukrainians, and even in part for the Russians) with identity as well."<sup>10</sup> The examples from contemporary film, as mentioned above, or in the texts of twentieth-century Ukrainian Nationalists, as described by Myroslav Shkandrij,<sup>11</sup> and even as far back as Sabbatian sources from the seventeenth century, as Ada Rapoport-Albert shows,<sup>12</sup> prove that the events of 1648 and their aftermath capture the imagination of diverse people for their protean ability to embody collective identity.

The image of the Cossacks alerts us to the fact that all historical images easily jump boundaries. The Jews can even be Egyptians in our cultural imaginations, and Frank Sysyn suggests that Khmelnytsky might be the Ukrainian Moses. Or perhaps he is Alexander the Great, or Hannibal.<sup>13</sup> Why can we so easily assimilate him in so many guises? Perhaps because each identification, each new reiteration, helps all of us, the propagators and consumers of those images, erase boundaries ourselves, thus dealing with the memory of trauma—but not only of trauma—as we continually create our own collective identities. Khmelnytsky proved particularly important in the formation of Ukrainian identity before and during World War I, as Shkandrij demonstrates. But how convenient Khmelnytsky turns out to be for the writer Yurii Kosach in Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern's reading, however, in that Ukrainian author's move from "rabid" nationalist to spokesperson for a "revived Ukrainian theater" as a multiethnic European country.<sup>14</sup> Over the centuries, we have transformed Khmelnytsky from an individual into a hybrid hero-traitor and then into an all-purpose border effacer. It is perhaps, again, no coincidence that conversion plays a role in many of the texts that deal with the Cossack rebellion, as Amelia Glaser explores in her look at turn-of-the-twentieth-century Jewish writers in their "modernist reappraisal of historical narrative."<sup>15</sup> Each instance of



Khmelnysky gives us a chance to appraise and reappraise, to construct and reconstruct, to articulate and rearticulate who we want to be.

To repeat, as the ever-converting image of Khmelnysky continuously does, the Cossack hero can represent at once a particular time and place and a universal erasure of all times and places. In the chronicle accounts we can seek the man who led an uprising in 1648, betraying the Polish crown and sparking the murder of Jews in the Ukraine; and who became hetman of the Zaporozhians in 1649, and with his new authority signed a treaty with the Russians at Pereiaslav in 1654, ceding Ukraine to Muscovy, a situation that would last for almost 350 more years. But we can also find a protean, universal boundary jumper who is malleable enough to inspire writers, artists, composers, and filmmakers over those same three and a half centuries, all in their own ways struggling to express the unfixable, intangible nature of who they are.

Ultimately, who can speak of the Cossacks? As this volume shows, the answer can be anyone from the Ukrainians, Poles, Russians, Jews, and so many more. In *Taras Bul'ba*, the Ukrainian/Russian/world-class, but in 1842 still rather young, writer Gogol invokes an ancient, traditional bandura player, "still full of ripe courage, though already a white-haired old man, inspired by prophetic spirit. He will utter his thick and mighty word. And the [Cossacks'] glory will gallop throughout the entire world, and all who are born in the future will speak of it."<sup>16</sup> Bohdan Khmelnysky will no doubt jump back and forth across borders on his grand steed in countless narratives yet to be imagined. As the metaphorical sons of Taras Bul'ba leap into the Dnepr River and escape into the equally metaphorical sunset, they can morph from Cossacks to Cowboys for this reader. Who is Khmelnysky? Is he Amalek or is he Moses? He is, indeed, neither and both.

## Reference Matter



## Notes

### Introduction

1. Mikeshin also collaborated with Shevchenko and Kostomarov by providing illustrations for the 1860 and 1876 editions of *Kobzar*. Faith Hillis, “Ukrainophile Activism and Imperial Governance in Russia’s Southwestern Borderlands,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* (Spring 2012), vol. 13, no. 2: 315.

2. Frank Sysyn has called attention to the relationship between the Polish insurrection and Mykeshin’s design. Sysyn also notes that Mykhailo Maksymovych initially proposed the monument in 1857. Sysyn, “The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmel’nyts’kyi Uprising,” *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (1998), vol. 4, no. 46: 531–545; Sysyn cites Maksymovych’s *Vospominanie o Bogdane Khmel’nitskom* and *Pis’ma o Bogdane Khmel’nitskom*, in *Sobranie sochinenii M. A. Maksimovicha*. Tom 1. (Kiev: 1876), 396–397 and 475–485.

3. As Faith Hillis has put it, “The model melded expressions of Little Russian patriotism with reminders of the ways that Ukrainophilism reinforced imperial unity.” Hillis, “Ukrainophile Activism and Imperial Governance in Russia’s Southwestern Borderlands,” 316.

4. “Union” refers to the Uniates, or Polonized Greek Catholics in the region. *Ibid.*; Hillis cites Mikeshin, “Mikeshin to Iuzefovich, 19 February 1869” (TsDIAK f. 873, op. 1, d. 48, 1. 30 ob.); and M. G., “Istoriia Odnogo Pamiatnika,” *Golos Minuvshogo* (1913), vol. 7: 284. Hillis notes that Mikeshin is referencing the Union of Brest of 1596, under which the Ruthenian Church became part of the Catholic Church. The translation is Hillis’s.

5. This inscription, too, was streamlined. It originally read “We desire to be under the Eastern Orthodox Tsar” [Volim pod tsaria vostochnogo, pravoslavnogo] and “To Bogdan Khmel’nitskii a united, indivisible Russia” [Bogdanu Khmel’nitskomu edinaia nedelimaia Rossiia]. Mikhail Bulgakov refers to this inscription in *The White Guard* [Belaia Gvardiia] when he describes “Gray men belted with dashing straps and bayonets could be seen climbing the stairs up Bogdan’s crag and trying to knock off the inscription on the black

granite.” [I bylo vidno, kak podnimalis’ na lestnitsu serye, opoiasannye likhimi remniami i shtykami, pytalis’ sbit’ nadpis’, gliadiashchuiu s chernogo granita]. These inscriptions were later removed (in 1919 and 1924) and replaced by the simpler “Bogdan Khmel’nitskii, 1888.” Mikhail Bulgakov, *White Guard*. Trans. Marian Schwartz (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 265. Mikhail Bulgakov, *Sobranie sochinenii: v 5-ti tomakh*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1992), 391. For a discussion of the changes in inscription, see Vladimir Oliinyk, “Mify i pravda o ‘mednom Bogdane’” in *ZN, UA*, July 19, 2013, accessed June 11, 2014 [http://gazeta.zn.ua/history/mify-i-pravda-o-mednom-bogdane\\_.html](http://gazeta.zn.ua/history/mify-i-pravda-o-mednom-bogdane_.html).

6. Sysyn, “The Changing Image of the Hetman,” 532. On the controversy, Frank Sysyn cites Orest Levvyts’kyi, “Istoriia budovy pamiatnyka B. Khmel’nyts’komu u Kyivi,” in *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (1913), vol. 16 no. 6: 467–483.

7. Sysyn, “The Changing Image of the Hetman,” 532. On the controversy, Frank Sysyn cites Orest Levvyts’kyi, “Istoriia budovy pamiatnyka B. Khmel’nyts’komu u Kyivi” in *Literaturno-naukovyi vistnyk* (1913), vol. 16, no. 6: 467–483.

8. Valerii Smolii and Valerii Stepankov, *Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi* (Kyiv: Al’ternativy, 2003), 5.

9. For more on these archetypes, see Sysyn, “The Changing Image of the Hetman,” 532. Sysyn cites Janusz Kaczmarczyk, “Bohdan Chmielnicki—Szatan czy mesjasz?” in *Studia Historyczne* (1991), vol. 34, no. 3: 369–385; Stephan Welyczenko, “Malo znany portret Bohdana Chmielnickiego,” in *Studia Historyczne* (1981), vol. 24 no. 2: 303–308; and Liubomyr Vynar, *Problema zv’iazkiv Anhlії z Ukrainoiu za chasiv het’manuvannia Bohdana Khmel’nyts’koho 1648–1657: Istorychna studiiia* (London and Cleveland: Nakl. Ukrain’skoi vydavnychnoi spilky, 1960).

10. Shaul Stampfer has called into question the assumption that the massacres in 1648 were a result of a genocidal impulse among Ukrainians against Jews, and that early estimates of Jewish deaths, ranging from the tens to the hundreds of thousands, are historically inaccurate. He estimates that out of a population of about forty thousand Jews living in the region, the number of Jewish casualties could have been up to eighteen to twenty thousand. Shaul Stampfer, “What Actually Happened to the Jews of Ukraine in 1648?” *Jewish History* (Jan. 1, 2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 210, 221.

11. Bernard D. Weinryb, “The Hebrew Chronicles on Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi and the Cossack-Polish War,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (June 1, 1977), vol. 1, no. 2: 162. The Jewish chronicles of 1648–49 note instances where Jews fought alongside the Poles. For fictionalized portrayals of a brief collaboration at Tul’chyn, see Chap. 7 of this volume.

12. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012), 49; Yerushalmi cites J. Katz, “Bein TaTNU le-TaH ve-TaT [Between 1096 and 1648],” in *Sefer ha-yobel le-Yitshak Baer* (Jerusalem: Hahebrah hahistorit hayisraelit, 1961), 318–337.

13. There is, indeed, no reason to view Khmelnytsky as sympathetic to the Jews of his time. Hrushevsky notes that in Khmelnytsky’s letters, “the merciless extortion by the Jews was represented as particularly intolerable.” Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus’: The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*, ed. Frank E. Sysyn, trans. Marta Daria Olynyk, vol. 8 (Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Study Press, 2010), 319; Hrushevsky cites *Akty*,

*Otnosiashchiesia k Istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rossii, Sobrannye i Izdannye Arkheograficheskoi Komissiei*, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1863), 16.

14. For a good discussion of *The Great Crypt* as it pertains to nineteenth-century Ukrainian-Russian relations, see Myroslav Shkandrij, *Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times* (Montreal: McGill-Queens Press, 2001), 141–146.

15. Although this poem appears in complete scholarly Soviet editions of Shevchenko's work, several popular Soviet editions omit the poem. These include many one-volume Soviet editions of *Kobzar*, as well as the 1963 three-volume edition and the 1970 five-volume edition. For a discussion of varying interpretations of this line, see Yurii Barabash, "Sluchai Khmel'nitskogo (Shevchenko i Gogol', Fragment)," *Voprosy Literatury* (March–April 1996): 115. I thank Taras Koznarsky for sharing his bibliographic expertise.

16. Mykola Borovyk, "Prohulianky z Pam'iatnykamy," *Krytyka* (October 2012), vols. 9–10: 23, 26; Borovyk bases his study on Michael Frisch, *A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1990).

17. Serhii Plokhly, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 366. See also Serhii Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 18.

18. Both Kornblatt and Brian Boeck point out the Don Cossacks' importance to Russian literature. According to Boeck, "the Don Cossacks were a living embodiment of Russia's conflicted self-identity as both a nation and an empire." Judith Deutsch Kornblatt, *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), 4; Brian J. Boeck, *Imperial Boundaries: Cossack Communities and Empire-Building in the Age of Peter the Great* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 3.

19. For early examples of this, see Miłosz's discussion of Sarmatian epic poetry. Czesław Miłosz, *The History of Polish Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 140–145.

20. According to Bernard Weinryb, a few Jews numbered among the Cossacks in the early seventeenth century. Moreover, "Jewish names appear in the Cossack registers of 1649 and earlier, while converted Jews are also mentioned as Cossacks in rabbinical sources." Weinryb, "The Hebrew Chronicles on Bogdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossack-Polish War," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (1977), vol. 1: 153–177, 160.

21. Serhii Plokhly notes, moreover, that the term *Cossack* was most likely applied to Ruthenian populations in correspondences between the grand prince of Lithuania and the Crimean khan in 1492; Serhii Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 18.

22. The location of the main Zaporozhian Cossack stronghold changed several times.

23. Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 111.

24. Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 136.

25. For a good, brief discussion of the Zaporozhian Sich in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see *ibid.*, 32–38.

26. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 8: 367.

27. According to Hrushevsky, Khmelnytsky's father was Mykhailo Khmelnytsky, an officer in the Chyhyryn starosta district. *Ibid.*, vol. 8: 378.

28. *Ibid.*, vol. 8: 378–379.

29. Subtelny, *Ukraine*, 126.

30. According to Magocsi, the Poles suspected as much. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, 210.

31. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, 210.

32. *Ibid.*, 213.

33. Hrushevsky maintains that we have every reason to assume that Khmelnytsky conducted himself diplomatically and politely, although “he flared up easily and was carried away by strong emotions.” Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 8: 385–386.

34. Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*, 49.

35. The Crimean Tatars emerged as an ethnic group by the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries through the conversion of a variety of peoples, including Greeks, Italians, and Armenians already living in the region. Brian Glyn Williams describes the Crimean Tatars as “a heterogeneous ethnic group having its roots in the deepest Crimean antiquity and claiming descent from an array of earlier ethno-religious groups who occupied the diverse terrains of the peninsula since the time of the Scythians and Greeks.” Brian Glyn Williams, *The Crimean Tatars: The Diaspora Experience and the Forging of a Nation* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2001), 29. The ruling classes traced their lineage back to Jengiz Khan. See also Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, 177–187.

36. Alan W. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1978), 37. The Crimean Khanate, which maintained independent relations with the Polish and Russian governments, remained Ottoman until 1783, when Catherine II annexed the region, making it part of the Russian empire.

37. Gábor Ágoston, Bruce Alan Masters, *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Infobase, 2009), 150. The authors note, “In the ensuing civil war some Cossack factions accepted Ottoman suzerainty, which dragged the Ottomans into wars with Poland (1672–99) and Muscovy (1676–81).”

38. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, 233.

39. Magocsi has discussed the naming of the Cossack state. See *ibid.*, 245.

40. *Ibid.*, 227.

41. *Ibid.*, 231.

42. Weinryb, “The Hebrew Chronicles on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossack-Polish War,” 163.

43. Dov-Ber Kerler, *The Origins of Modern Literary Yiddish* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 180.

44. *Ibid.*, 34; Kerler cites Max Weinreich, *Bilder fun der yidisher literaturgeshikhte, fun di onheybn biz Mendele Moykher-Sforim* (Vilne: Tomor, 1928), 193–4; for Weinreich's critical edition of the poem, see 198–218; Kerler also mentions a shorter anonymous poem describing the events of 1656. Kerler, *The Origins of Modern Literary Yiddish*, 35; see Weinreich, *Bilder fun der yidisher literaturgeshikhte, fun di onheybn biz Mendele Moykher-Sforim*, 194–196 and 215–218; see also Weinreich's discussion of texts on 1648–49 in languages other

than Yiddish. Max Weinreich, *Shturemvint: Bilder fun der Yidisher geshikhte in zibtsntn yorhundert* (Wilne: Farlag "Tomor," 1927), 75–76.

45. Weinreich, *Bilder fun der yidisher literaturgeshikhte, fun di onheybn biz Mendele Moykher-Sforim*, 206.

46. For a good discussion of the Hebrew chronicles, see Weinryb, "The Hebrew Chronicles on Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi and the Cossack-Polish War."

47. For the best overview of sources on the Khmelnytsky era, see Hrushevsky. For an overview of texts written in the aftermath of the uprising, see Kohut. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus*, vol. 8: 670–681; Zenon E. Kohut, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory," *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17: 141–163.

48. Kohut notes that Sofonovych, who was the hegumen of St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery in Kyiv, "relied heavily on Polish writers, especially Maciej Strykowski." Kohut, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory," 143.

49. *Ibid.*, 145–146.

50. These include, for example, Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Stanisław Oświęcim, marshal of nobility in the court of the crown Hetman Stanisław Koniecpolski.

51. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 8: 672.

52. See Figure I.2, p. 10 in this volume. Hondius is believed to have fought in the Polish army under Janusz Radziwiłł beginning in 1651. See Irena Fabiani-Madeyska.

53. These include histories of the siege of Lviv by Kuszewicz and Czechowicz, a history of the siege of Zamość, and accounts of the Zboriv campaign. Among these histories are artistic accounts of the uprising, such as Samuel Twardowski's chronicle in verse *Wojna domowa z Kozaki i Tatory, Moskuu, potym Szwedami, i z Węgry* (The War of the Homeland with the Cossacks and Tatars, Muscovites, then the Swedes and Hungarians), which was translated into literary Ukrainian. Hrushevsky notes that prose adaptations appeared in Polish in Wrocław in 1840, and in Russian in 1846. Velychko based his history of Khmelnytsky on Twardowski's work, vol. 8: 674. Western-language accounts, including those by Pierre Chevalier, Linage de Vauciennes, Alberto Vimina, and Samuel Gradzki, appeared in Paris, Venice, and Pest. See Pierre Chevalier, *Histoire de la guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne, avec un discours de leur origine, païs, moeurs, gouvernement et religion, et un autre des Tartares Précopites* (A discourse of the original, country, manners, government and religion of the Cossacks: with another of the Precopian Tartars) (Paris: Barbin, 1663); Linage de Vauciennes, *L'origine veritable du soulèvement des Cosaques contre la Pologne* (The true origin of the uprising of the Cossacks against Poland) (Paris: Clousier et Aubouin, 1674); Alberto Vimina, *Historia delle guerre civili di Polonia* (History of the Polish Civil War) (Venice: G. P. Pinelli, 1671); and Samuel Grondski de Grondi (Gradzki), *Historia belli cosacco-polonici* (History of the Cossack-Polish wars) (Pest: Patzko, 1789).

54. The Velychko text, which comes down to us in manuscript form, is missing a few years from the Khmelnytsky period. Kohut notes that "the surviving part of [Velychko's] description of Khmelnytsky's revolt is heavily dependent on the account of the



Polish historian Samuel Twardowski, while the supposedly contemporary documents that Velychko quotes have been proven to be fictitious, some probably invented by Velychko himself.” Kohut, “The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory,” 147.

55. Isaac Bashevis Singer, *Der Sotn in Goray: a mayse fun fartsaytns*, *Globus*, 2, 7 (Jan. 1933), 17–31; 8 (Feb.), 1–22; 9 (Mar.), 54–75; 10 (Apr.), 29–49; 11 (May), 45–64; 12 (June), 1–21; 13 (July–Aug.), 27–47; 14 (Sept.), 26–32. Republished as a complete novel, Warsaw: Bibliotek fun Yidishn P.E.N. klub, 1935. Published in English translation as *Satan in Goray: A Novel*. Trans. Jacob Sloan. New York: Noonday Press, 1955.

56. Natalie Kononenko, *Ukrainian Minstrels: And the Blind Shall Sing* (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1998), 22.

57. According to Kohut, *Istoriia rusov* marks the increased prominence of Jews in narratives surrounding the Khmelnytsky uprising. See Kohut, “The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory,” 149–150.

58. Frank E. Sysyn, “Bohdan Chmel’nyč’kyj’s Image in Ukrainian Historiography Since Independence,” *Ukraine* (2000), vol. 42, no. 3/4: 188.

## Chapter 1. A Portrait in Ambivalence

1. 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* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1995).

2. On this, see the discussion in Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press 1996), 27–52.

3. See, e.g., Frank E. Sysyn, “The Jewish Massacres in the Historiography of the Khmel’nyts’kyi Uprising: A Review Article,” *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (1998), vol. 23, no. 1: 83–89.

4. On this body of literature, see Israel Zinberg, *A History of Jewish Literature*, vol. 6, trans. B. Martin (Cincinnati and New York: 1975), 121–131; Bernard Weinryb, “The Hebrew Chronicles on Bogdan Khmel’nyts’kyi and the Cossack-Polish War,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (1977), vol. 1: 153–177; Chava Turniansky, “Yiddish ‘Historical Songs’ as Sources for the History of the Jews in Pre-Partition Poland,” *Polin* (1989), vol. 4: 42–52.

5. Meir of Szczepbrzeszyn, *Tsok ha-’itim* (Cracow: 1650); Gavriel Schussberg, *Petah teshuvah* (Amsterdam: 1651).

6. Natan Neta Hanover, *Yeven metsulah* (Venice: 1653). For an English translation, see Hanover, *Abys of Despair (Yeven metsulah): The Famous 17th Century Chronicle Depicting Jewish Life in Russia and Poland During the Chmielnicki Massacres of 1648–1649*, trans. A. Mesch (New Brunswick and London: Transaction, 1983). The most comprehensive discussion of the book remains Yankev Shatzky, “An Historical-Critical Introduction to Natan Neta Hanover’s ‘Yeven metsulah,’” in *Gezeyres Ta”h* (Vilna: 1938), 9–159 [Yiddish].

7. Yisroel Izaelson, “Natan Note Hanover’s Life and Literary Activity,” *Historishe shriftn fun YIVO* (1926), vol. 1: 1–26 [Yiddish].

8. There were two more editions of Yiddish translations (or rather, reworkings) of the text before 1800. See Shatzky, “An Historical-Critical Introduction,” 93–100. As Shatzky

demonstrates, there is still a great deal of bibliographical confusion over the number and nature of the versions of the text. The longevity of the Hebrew text and the rather transient nature of the Yiddish translations suggest that the book was more widely known from the original Hebrew.

9. Gershon Bacon, “‘The House of Hannover’: Gezeirot Tah in Modern Jewish Historical Writing,” *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 179–206.

10. See Edward Fram, “Creating a Tale of Martyrdom in Tulczyn, 1648,” in Elisheva Carlebach, John M. Efron, and David N. Myers, eds., *Jewish History and Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi* (Hanover and London: Brandeis University Press, 1998), 89–112; Adam Teller, “The Jewish Literary Responses to the Events of 1648–1649 and the Creation of a Polish-Jewish Consciousness,” in Benjamin Nathans and Gabriella Safran, eds., *Culture Front: Eastern European Jews and Their Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 17–45.

11. Hanover’s debt to *Tsok ha-’itim* can be seen on a number of levels. In its retelling of the massacres, *Yeven metsulah* lifts stories directly from *Tsok ha-’itim*, such as the legend of the Jewish girl who drowned herself in Niemirów (Nemyriv) rather than marry a Cossack. In terms of its use of words and phraseology too, *Yeven metsulah* is clearly indebted to its predecessor. On this, see Fram, “Creating a Tale,” 90.

12. Natan Neta Hanover, *Yeven metsulah* (Venice: 1653), 1b; *Abyss of Despair*, 24–25.

13. Shabetai ha-Kohen, *Megilat ’efah*, in Shlomo Aben Verga, *Liber Schevet Jehuda* (Hebrew), ed. M. Wiener (Hannover: 1855), vol. 1: 139ff.

14. In *Tsok ha-’itim*, Khmelnytsky is first mentioned only in the fifth stanza after a description of the murderous Cossack, Tatar, and peasant forces. He is described simply as hetman (Heb. *sar ha-milhamah*), with no term of opprobrium. He appears just three times more in the text, always in his role as hetman and with no ascription of particular hatred toward Jews.

15. Scion of the Swedish Vasa dynasty and king of Poland from 1587 to 1632.

16. *Yeven metsulah*, 2a; *Abyss of Despair*, 27–33.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*

20. Joel Sirkes, *She’elot u-teshuvot ha-ba”h ha-yeshanot* (Frankfort a.M. 1697), 41a, no. 61.

21. The text is reprinted in Israel Halperin, ed., *Pinkas va’ad arba’ ha-aratsot* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1945), 497.

22. *Yeven metsulah*, 2b–3a; *Abyss of Despair*, 34–39. Perhaps the best reconstruction of these events, based on a wide range of sources (including *Yeven metsulah*), remains that of Mykhailo Hrushevsky. See Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus’*, vol. 8, *The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*, ed. Frank E. Sysyn (Edmonton, Ontario: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2002), 380–387.

23. The English translation tried to differentiate between the two by calling the first Zechariah Sobilenki and the second Jacob Sobilenski. This is not, however, borne out in the original text, in which both are called Sobilenki. See *Abyss of Despair*, 36–37.

24. *Yeven metsulah*, 2b–3a; *Abyss of Despair*, 36–38.

25. Ibid.

26. This refers to the meetings of early 1648, at which he entered into an agreement with them to mount a joint attack on the Commonwealth.

27. “Chmielnitzki autem regressus a Tataris, summo silentio et prudentia agere agenda non intermittit, nihilominus tamen ex aliorum gestis, Judaei, jurati Cosaccorum, prout et hi illorum, hostes . . . mox Dominis terrestribus, a quibus ferme omnes tabernas ardentorio modo obtinebant, coeperunt referre . . .” Carolus Koppi (ed.), *Historia belli Cosaco-Polonici authore Samuele Grondski de Grondi* (Pest: 1789), 52. On the author, see Adam Przybos, “Samuel Grądzki, ariański dziejopis wojny polsko-siedmiogrodzkiej 1657r.,” *Małopolskie Studia Historyczne* (1959) vol. 2: 3–22.

28. The Jews’ adherence to the Polish cause was noted by Polish groups on more than one occasion. See Aleksander Czołowski, “Relacja o oblężeniu Lwowa przez Bogdana Chmielnickiego,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (1892), 6: 543–50; *Akty izdawayemie Vilenskovo komisseyo dlia razbora drevnikh aktov*, vol. 5 (Vilna: 1871), 173–176.

29. *Yeven metsulah*, 5a; *Abyss of Despair*, 55–56.

30. This is seen most clearly, perhaps, in the description of the attack on Niemirów, the archetypal massacre described in *Yeven metsulah*, which Hanover states was motivated not by political or strategic goals but by Khmelnytsky’s hatred of the Jews and envy of their wealth. *Yeven metsulah*, 4b; *Abyss of Despair*, 50.

31. Thus, for example, the terms of the Zborów truce, presented by the Cossack forces to the Polish king in August 1649, included eighteen points. The Jews appear only in point 11, in these terms: “May the Jews not dare to be not only leaseholders, but even residents in the aforementioned towns [i.e., of Ukraine.—A.T.], unless they come temporarily for purposes of trade.” Hrushevsky, *The Cossack Age*, vol. 8: 589–590, n. 41. For a broad overview, see Frank E. Sysyn, “The Khmel’nyts’kyi Uprising: A Characterization of the Ukrainian revolt,” *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 115–139, esp. 131–135.

32. It was also recognized by Jewish contemporaries. In a testimony concerning the massacre at Tulczyn given in Lwów on Aug. 6, 1648, a Jewish witness retold how Duke Czetwerczyński did a deal with the Cossacks on Thursday (July 23) to hand Jews over as captives to be ransomed, but stated that the massacre itself did not start until the peasants arrived on the subsequent Saturday. See Avraham Ha-kohen Rapoport, *Sefer she’elot u-teshuvot Eitan ha-ezrahi*, no. 22 (Ostróg: 1796), 21a–b.

33. *Yeven metsulah*, 2b; *Abyss of Despair*, 34.

34. Ibid.

35. See, e.g., *Yeven metsulah*, 7a, 8b; *Abyss of Despair*, 74–75, 92.

36. The last of the Vasa dynasty to rule Poland, he was king from 1648 to 1668.

37. *Yeven metsulah*, 8b; *Abyss of Despair*, 92.

38. “When Khmelnytsky heard that the Poles had made war on him . . . he bided his time for about three months. In the interim he assembled all his troops and invited the Tatar King and army to join him.” *Yeven metsulah*, 9a; *Abyss of Despair*, 97.

39. *Yeven metsulah*, 2a; *Abyss of Despair*, 27. On *Zemah David*, see Mordechai Breuer’s introduction to his modern edition of the work: Mordechai Breuer (ed.), *Sefer Zemah David le-rabi David Ganz (Prag 352–1592)* (Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1983), 1–32 [Hebrew pagination].

40. Above, n. 11.
41. *Yeven metsulah*, 5b–6b; *Abyss of Despair*, 64–69.
42. *Yeven metsulah*, 8a; *Abyss of Despair*, 87–88.
43. Jan Pastorius, *Bellum Scythico-Cosacicum seu de conjuratione Tartarorum cosacorum et plebis Rusicae contra Regnum Poloniae* (Dantisci: 1652).
44. On Pastorius and his work, see K. Kubik, *Joachim Pastorius, gdański pedagog XVII w.* (Gdańsk: Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, 1970).
45. *Yeven metsulah*, 6a; *Abyss of Despair*, 65–66. It is not clear precisely to whom Hanover is referring here.
46. Natan Neta Hanover, *Ta'ame sukkah* (Amsterdam: 1652), 2b.
47. Though there is some doubt as to the Jews' level of literacy as far as reading and writing Polish and Ukrainian is concerned, there is no question that they were able to speak the language of their surroundings (an essential skill in order to do business). See Daniel Stone, "Knowledge of Foreign Languages Among Eighteenth-Century Polish Jews," *Polin* (1987), vol. 10: 73–94.
48. This is a development that Avraham Melamed has identified in the writing of history undertaken by Italian Jews in this period. See Avraham Melamed, "The Perception of Jewish History in Italian Jewish Thought of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Re-Examination," *Italia Judaica* (1986), vol. 2: 139–170.
49. One of the first Polish chronicles of the war—that of Joachim Pastorius—makes this point most clearly: "Dux ille et autor seditionis Bogdanus Chmelnicus erat, vetus militiae Cosacus et praeter usum armorum, quem bellis superioribus acquisiverat, literarum etiam, quod rarum in illa barbarie, non rudis" ["Bohdan Khmelnytsky was the leader and author of the insurrection—a Cossack with experience in the military and especially in the use of arms, which he had acquired in previous wars, (he was) even not unlettered, which was a rarity in this barbarous (company)]. Pastorius, *Bellum Scythico-Cosacicum*, 5. Hanover does not comment on Khmelnytsky's education, though he does describe him as writing letters on a number of occasions.
50. See Sysyn's comments, above, n. 31.
51. I am currently preparing a study to examine these connections in more detail. It is entitled "Wanda and the Jewish Maidens: Contacts Between Polish and Jewish Culture in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries."
52. On this, see Zenon E. Kohut, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory," *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 141–163.
53. Sholem Asch, *Kidesh hashem un andere ertselungen* (New York: 1919), 9–194. In English translation: Sholem Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648*, trans. Rufus Lears (Philadelphia: 1926). On Asch's treatment of Khmelnytsky and the uprising generally, see Amelia Glaser's chapter in this volume.

## Chapter 2. "A Man Worthy of the Name Hetman"

1. For developing and changing attitudes toward Khmelnytsky, see Frank Sysyn, "The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmelnytsky Uprising," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (1998), vol. 46: 531–545; and Frank Sysyn, "Bohdan

Chmel'nyč'kyj's Image in Ukrainian Historiography Since Independence," *Ukraine: Geographie, ethnische Struktur, Geschichte, Sprache und Literatur, Kultur, Politik, Bildung, Wirtschaft, Recht, Politik*, ed. Peter Jordan et al. (Vienna: Peter Lang, 2001), 179–188. For historiography on Khmelnytsky and the Khmelnytsky uprising, see Hrushevsky's bibliographic notes and the updates by Yaroslav Fedoruk and Frank Sysyn in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 8, *The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*, trans. Marta Daria Olynyk, ed. Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Myroslav Yurkevich (Edmonton-Toronto: CIUS Press, 2002), 690–718. For seventeenth- and eighteenth-century accounts of the revolt, including the Hrabianka chronicle, see 670–683. Almost all authors and works discussed in this chapter are contained in this note. This chapter will provide bibliographic information only for the most important general works and for the Hrabianka chronicle.

2. See Frank E. Sysyn, "Grappling with the Hero: Hrushevs'kyi Confronts Khmel'nyts'kyi," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (2000), 22: 589–609, and simultaneously as *Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe: Essays in Honour of Roman Szporluk*, ed. Zvi Gitelman et al. (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Research Institute, 2000).

3. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 9, book 2, *The Cossack Age 1654–1657*, pt. 2, trans. Marta Daria Olynyk, ed. Yaroslav Fedoruk and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Myroslav Yurkevich (Edmonton-Toronto: CIUS Press, 2010), 436.

4. *Ibid.*, 438.

5. *Ibid.*, 409.

6. For an English translation of this article, see "Some Reflections on Ukrainian Historiography in the XVIII Century," *The Eyewitness Chronicle* (Munich: Fink Verlag, 1972), 9–16. On the chancellorists, see Omelian Pritsak, "Doba viis'kovykh kantseliarystiv," *Kyivs'ka starovyna* (July–August, 1993) no. 4: 62–66.

7. On Ukrainian historiography, see Frank E. Sysyn, *History, Culture, and Nation: An Examination of Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian History Writing* (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Studies Fund, 1988).

8. On the *History of the Rus' People*, see Serhii Plokhly, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empires* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

9. See Frank E. Sysyn, "The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (December 1990), vol. 14, no. 3–4: 593–607.

10. In addition to the literature in Hrushevs'kyi's notes, see Dmytro Nalyvaiko, *Ochyma Zakhodu: Retseptsiia Ukraïny v Zakhidnii Ievropi XI–XVII st.* (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1998). For an English-language discussion of literature on this period, see V. Sichynsky, *Ukraine in Foreign Comments from the VIth to the XXth Century* (New York: Ukrainian Congress Committee, 1953). On material about Khmelnytsky in Ukrainian historical works, see Yaroslav Dzyra, "Ukraïns'ka istoriografii druhoï polovyny XVII–pochatku XVIII st. ta perekazy pro Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho," *Istoriografichni Doslidzhennia Ukraïns'koï RSR* (1968), vol. 1: 171–194.

11. The important Arabic manuscript depiction of Khmelnytsky by Paul of Aleppo became known only after its English translation in the 1830s and its later French and Russian translations.

12. On Twardowski's work as a historical source, see Inna Tarasenko, "Wojna Domowa,"

*pol's'koho khronista S. Tvardovs'koho iak istorychne dzherelo ta pam'iatka istorychnoi dumky*, *Litopysy ta khroniky 2* (Kyiv: Institut ukrains'koi arkheohrafiï ta dzhereloznavstva im. M. S. Hrushevs'koho NAN Ukrainy, 2011).

13. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 9, book 1, *The Cossack Age, 1650–1653*, trans. Bohdan Strumiński, ed. Serhii Plokhy and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Myroslav Yurkevich (Edmonton-Toronto: CIUS Press, 2005), 687.

14. V. Peretts, “K istorii Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii: Panegyriki i stikhi k B. Khmel'nits'komu, I. Podkove, i arkh. Lazariu Baranovichu,” *Cheniia v Istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora-Letopisetsa* (1900), vol. 14: 7–25.

15. On the culture of the Mazepan Age, see Giovanna Siedina, ed. *Mazepa e il suo tempo: Storia, cultura, società / Mazepa and His Time: History, Culture, Society* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2004). On the cult, see Serhii Plokhy, “The Symbol of Little Russia: The Pokrova Icon and Early Modern Ukrainian Political Ideology,” *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (1992), vol. 17, no. 1–2: 171–188.

16. George Grabowicz, “Mylost' Bozhii, Ukrainu . . . svobodovyshaia' . . . and Ukrainian Literature after (and before) Poltava: The Missing Link,” in Serhii Plokhy, ed., *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University, 2012), 535–553.

17. On Velychko's work, see Frank E. Sysyn, “The Nation of Cain: Poles in Samiilo Velychko's *Skazanye*,” in Serhii Plokhy and Frank E. Sysyn, ed., *Synopsis: A Collection of Essays in Honour of Zenon E. Kohut* (Edmonton-Toronto: CIUS Press, 2005), 443–455; idem., “Fatherland in Early Eighteenth-Century Political Culture,” Siedina, ed., *Mazepa e il suo tempo*, 39–53; and idem., “Recovering the Ancient and Recent Past: The Shaping of Memory and Identity in Early Modern Ukraine,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (2012), vol. 35, no. 1: 77–84.

18. The partial 1793 publication by Fedir Tumansky and the 1854 edition as well as a manuscript of the text are printed in offset form in *Hryhorii Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyckyj*, with an introduction by Yuri Lutsenko, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts 9 (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1990). The volume contains a full bibliography of text publications and secondary literature published up to 1990. It also includes photo-offset reprints of a manuscript of the long version and the short version. The Harvard volume does not reprint the passage on the dissatisfaction of Hetman Ivan Briukovets'kyi with Muscovy that was excluded by the censor and published only in 1894 by Oleksander Lazarevs'kyi: A. L. [Oleksander Lazarevs'kyi], “Opushchennaia v pečhati stranitsa iz Letopisi Grabianki,” *Kievskaiia starina* (1894), vol. 47, no. 11: 297–300. Since then a modern Ukrainian translation appeared by Raissa Ivanchenko, *Litopys hadiats'koho polkovnyka Hryhorii Hrabianky* (Kyiv: 1992). The short version was published by V. M. Moisiienko, *Hystoriia . . . H. Hrab'ianky-Litopys kratkii*, *Pam'iatky ukrains'koi movy XVIII st. Serii kozats'kykh litopysiv* (Zhytomyr: National'na akademiia nauk Ukrainy, Instytut ukrains'koi movy, 2001). The relation of the versions and the appearance of the chronicle in eighteenth-century manuscripts has been examined in Andrii Bovhuria, *Kozats'ke istoriopysannia v rukopysnii tradytsii XVIII st. Spysky ta redaktsii tvoriv* (Kyiv: National'na akademiia nauk Ukrainy, Instytut istorii Ukrainy, 2010). Citations will be to the 1854 edition in the Harvard reprint unless otherwise indicated.

19. The bibliography in the Harvard edition and Bovhyria's work, which questions Hrabianka's authorship, examine the literature, including general works on historiography. Of the older literature, Symon Narizhnyi, "*Diistviiia prezil'noi brany*. Litopys Hryhoriia Hrabianky," *Pratsi Istorychno-filolohichnoho tovarystva v Prazi* (1939), vol. 2: 149–182, is of special significance.

20. A fragment of Zerov's thesis has been published in Mykola Zerov, *Ukrains'ke pys'menstvo*, comp. Mykola Sulyma (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Solomii Pavlychko "Osnovy," 2003), 166–175.

21. Yuri Lutsenko, "Introduction," *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, xv–lxiv.

22. On the eighteenth-century manuscript book, see E. M. Apanovich (O. M. Apanovych), *Rukopisnaia svetskaia kniga XVIII v. na Ukraine: Istoricheskie sborniki* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1983).

23. On the treatment of Russia and Russians in the Hrabianka chronicle, see Frank E. Sysyn, "The Image of Russia in Early Eighteenth-Century Ukraine: Hryhori Hrabianka's *Diistvie*," Robert O. Crummey, Holm Sundhaussen, and Ricarda Vulpius, ed., *Russische und Ukrainische Geschichte vom 16.–18. Jahrhundert*, Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte 58 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 243–250.

24. See the discussion of his early life and reasons for beginning the revolt, *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, 31–41 (314–319). Initial page numbers refer to the 1854 edition, later numbers to the pages of the Harvard volume.

25. For a recent discussion of *ars historica*, see Anthony Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). On *ars historica* in Poland, see Barbara Otwinowska, "La *ars historica* en Pologne au XVIe et XVIIe Siècle," *Europa Orientalis* (1986), vol. 5: 49–63.

26. *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, 43 (320). The text to be related is in the third person; it is followed by a direct speech of Khmelnytsky to the "brothers and brave warriors of the Zaporozhian Host" calling them to take up arms. I wish to thank my friend and colleague Professor Michael Moser for his invaluable assistance in translating passages from Hrabianka's work.

27. Bovhyria, *Kozats'ke istoriopysannia v rukopysnii tradytsii XVIII st.*, 73.

28. *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, 135–144 (366–371).

29. *Ibid.*, i–iv (295–297).

30. *Ibid.*, unpaginated (297).

31. *Ibid.*, 141 (369).

32. *Ibid.*, iii–iv (296–297).

33. Like the "Word to the Reader," the panegyrics may be later additions.

34. *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*, unpaginated (298).

35. *Ibid.*, 149–153 (373–375).

36. *Ibid.*, 151–152 (374–375).

37. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 1, *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, trans. Marta Skorupsky, ed. Andrzej Poppe and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk (Edmonton-Toronto: CIUS Press, 1997), 349. For the comparison with Sviatoslav, see Zerov, *Ukrains'ke pys'menstvo*, 171.

38. Marko Antonovych, “Kharakterystyka B. Khmel’nyts’koho u Hrabianky i Liviiia (Zamitka),” *Ukrains’kyi istoryk* (1995), vol. 32: 165–166.

39. Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 21.4, *Books 21–25. The Second Punic War*, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb (London: Macmillan, 1883), 4–5.

40. The passage is not included in the Tumans’kyi edition of 1793, *Hryhorij Hrabjanka’s The Great War of Bohdan Xmel’nyc’kyj*, 387 (530), or in the manuscript copy reprinted in the volume, 145 (152).

### Chapter 3. A Reevaluation of the “Khmelnysky Factor”

1. After the Talmudic turn of phrase in, e.g., *bPes.118a*, San 98b.

2. See, e.g., Yehuda Even Shemuel, *Redemption Literature (Midreshey Ge’ulah)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1943), 15–55; Yosef Shapira, *Pathways to Redemption (Bi-Sheviely ha-Ge’ulah)* (Jerusalem: Levine-Epstein, 1947), 19–24; Aaron Zeev Aescoly, *Jewish Messianic Movements (Ha-Tenu’ot ha-Meshihiyot be-Yisra’el)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1956), passim; Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956), passim; Gershom Scholem, “Toward an Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism,” in id., *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971), 7–8, 10, 12–13; Abba Hillel Silver, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1978), ix–xi and passim; Raphael Patai, *The Messiah Texts* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988), xxi–liiii; Joseph Dan, *Apocalypse Then and Now (Apokalipsah Az ve-Akshav)* (Israel: Yedi’ot Aharonot Sifrey Hemed, 2000), 54, 63.

3. See Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi, The Mystical Messiah 1626–1676* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973). On Scholem’s thesis and its critics, see further below.

4. See, e.g., Richard H. Popkin, “Christian Interest and Concerns About Shabetai Zevi,” in *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Jewish Messianism in the Early Modern World*, ed. Matt Goldish and Richard H. Popkin (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2001), 91–106; Jacob Barnai, *Sabbatianism—Social Perspectives (Shabetai’ut—Hebetim Hevratyiyim)* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 2000), 39–51.

5. Simon Dubnow, *History of the Eternal People (Diverey Yemey Am Olam)*, vol. 7 (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1935), 29 (unless stated otherwise, all translations into English, here and below, are my own.—A.R.-A.).

6. For a comprehensive review and interpretation of the evidence on Shabetai Tsevi’s early life, see Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 103–157. Cf., however, the critical evaluation of this interpretation in Isaiah Tishby, “On Gershom Scholem’s Study of Sabbatianism” (Al Mishnato shel Gershom Shalom be-Heker ha-Shabetai’ut), in id., *Pathways of Faith and Heresy (Netivey Emunah u-Minut)* (Ramat Gan: Masadah, 1964), 262–275.

7. See on this the exhaustive summary of the evidence in Barnai, *Sabbatianism*, 54–57.

8. For a contemporary preacher’s word play linking Shabetai Tsevi’s name to the dates of the events in Poland, see Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 93, 592. For a range of contemporary associations between the year 1648 and the “pangs of the Messiah,” see *ibid.*, 91–92.

9. See *ibid.*, 88; Dubnow, *History*, vol. 7, 29.

10. See Scholem, *ibid.*, 138–139, although he argues (*ibid.*, 206–216) that in 1648 no one took notice of Shabetai’s messianic claims, and he was expelled from Smyrna as a madman.



According to Scholem, the messianic movement took off only many years later, in 1665, as a result of Shabetai's encounter with his prophet, Nathan of Gaza. See on this below, at n. 24.

11. Barukh of Arezzo's Hebrew chronicle "A Memorial for the Children of Israel" (*Zikaron li-Veney Yisra'el*), in Aron Freimann, *Concerning Sabbatai Tsevi (Inyeney Shabetai Tsevi)* (Berlin: Mekitsey Nirdamim, 1912), 53. (The emphases, here and below, are mine.—A.R.-A.)

12. The text of the letter has been preserved in the collection of documents and anti-Sabbatean diatribes by the ardent contemporary campaigner against the movement Jacob Sasportas. For this passage, see the critical edition of the Hebrew text in Isaiah Tishby, ed., *The Book of the Fading Flower of Tsevi by Jacob Sasportas (Sefer Tsitsat Novel Tsevi le-Rabi Ya'akov Sasportas)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1954), 10. The English version was published in Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 273.

13. This is certainly how it was understood by Sasportas, who, as a proud Sephardi, accuses the Ashkenazi Nathan of Gaza of privileging "the thousands of Ashkenazi and Polish victims" over those who had suffered numerous expulsions and decrees of religious persecution in Aragon, Castile, and Portugal as well as in England, where "their blood was shed like water." He speculates that Nathan's intention was "to attract and deceive the communities of Germany and Poland, to draw them to his lies" (Tishby, *The Fading Flower*, 10, in Sasportas's marginal note 28).

14. Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 592.

15. Gershom Scholem, "Sabbatian Documents About R. Nathan of Gaza from the Archive of R. Mahalalel Haleluyah in Ancona" (*Te'udot Shabetai'iyot al R. Natan ha-Azati mi-Ginzey R. Mahalalel Haleluyah be-Ancona*), in id., *Researches in Sabbateanism (Mehkery Shabetai'ut)* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1991), 61. For Nathan's encounter with the rabbi of Ancona, Mahalalel Halleluyah, see id., *Sabbatai Ševi*, 776–777.

16. See Tishby, *The Fading Flower*, 61, 89; Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 400.

17. Sasportas does not buy this argument, insisting that "it has never been heard or seen, either in the words of the true and just prophets or in the tradition of the Sages, that Messiah son of Ephraim would be slain in a war of the gentile nations among themselves; rather it was to be in the war of the Jews against them" (Tishby, *ibid.*, 89).

18. Leyb ben Ozer, *The Story of Sabbatai Tsevi (Sipur Ma'asey Shabetai Tsevi. Bashraybung fun Shabsay Tsvi)*, ed. and trans. [from Yiddish] into Hebrew by Zalman Shazar (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1978), 95–96, cited in English translation in Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 660.

19. For a full account of the evidence on this episode, see Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 662–668.

20. Tishby, *The Fading Flower*, 78, translated in Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 601.

21. Leyb ben Ozer, *The Story*, 81, cited in English in Scholem, *ibid.*, 623–624.

22. For a review of the evidence about her, see Scholem, *ibid.*, 191–198. See also Matt Goldish, *The Sabbatean Prophets* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 89–97; Ada Rapoport-Albert, *Women and the Messianic Heresy of Sabbatai Zevi, 1666–1816* (Oxford and Portland, OR: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2011), 175–177, 178 n.15; Alexander van der Haven, *From Lowly Metaphor to Divine Flesh: Sarah the Ashkenazi, Sabbatai Tsevi's Messianic Queen and the Sabbatian Movement* (Amsterdam: Menasseh ben Israel Instituut, 2012).

23. See on all this Rapoport-Albert, *The Messianic Heresy*, 175–236.
24. *Ibid.*, 192.
25. Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 1–2.
26. For Scholem's discussion of this, see *ibid.*, 125–152. In a chapter dedicated to the Sabbatian movement and its impact on Polish Jewry, Bernard Weinryb (*The Jews of Poland* [Philadelphia: Jewish Publications Society, 1973], 206–235) followed Scholem's evaluation of Shabetai Tsevi to such an extent that he barely mentions the beginning of Shabetai's messianic awakening in 1648, which coincided with the Khmelnytsky uprising in Poland. But Weinryb departs from Scholem's view when he insists that the Sabbatean movement as well as the kabbalistic tradition that underpinned it never gained a substantial foothold in Poland but were confined almost exclusively to the Sephardi world—an untenable view that must be relegated to the domain of Ashkenazi apologetics.
27. See Scholem, *ibid.*, 2–6.
28. *Ibid.*, 7.
29. See *ibid.*, 2–3, 8–93.
30. See Tishby, *Pathways*, 245–258. Tishby's critique originally appeared in *Tarbiz* 28 (1959) as a review of the Hebrew edition of Scholem's *Sabbatai Ševi*, published in 1957. For subsequent analyses of Shabetai Tsevi's distinctive contribution to the development of the Sabbatean doctrine, see Yehuda Liebes, *Studies in Jewish Myth and Jewish Messianism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 93–113; Avraham Elqayam, “Bury My Faith: A Letter by Sabbatai Tsevi from His Place of Exile” (Kivru Emunati. Igeret me'et Shabetai Tsevi mi-Mekom Galuto), *Pe'amim* 55 (1993), 4–37; *id.*, “The Holy Zohar of Sabbatai Tsevi” (Ha-Zohar ha-Kadosh shel Shabetai Tsevi), *Kabbalah. Journal for the Study of Jewish Mystical Texts* 3 (1998), 345–387.
31. Jacob Barnai, *Sabbatianism* (above, n. 5).
32. See Scholem, *Sabbatai Ševi*, 77–93, 591–602.
33. See Barnai, *Sabbatianism*, 51–61.
34. See Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah, New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 257–229; *id.*, “Particularism and Universalism in Kabbalah,” in *Essential Papers on Jewish Culture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy*, ed. David Ruderman (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 334–337; *id.*, “One from a Town, Two from a Clan: The Diffusion of Lurianic Kabbalah and Sabbatianism: A Re-Examination,” *Jewish History* (1993), vol. 7, no. 2: 79–104.
35. See Liebes, *Studies in Jewish Myth*, 93–106; *id.*, *Studies in the Zohar* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993), 1–84.
36. See Moshe Idel, *Messianic Mystics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 58–182.
37. Zeev Gries, *Conduct Literature (Sifrut ha-Hanhagot)* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1989), xv–xviii. See also *ibid.*, 82–83, 92, 101; *id.*, *The Book in the Jewish World* (Oxford and Portland, OR: 2007), 23–24 n. 9, 84.

#### Chapter 4. Apotheosis, Rejection, and Transference

1. Cf. my “Teoriia i istoriia: ‘horyzont spodivvan’ i rannia recepsiia novoi ukrainskoi literatury,” *Do istorii ukrainskoi literatury*, Kyiv, 2003, pp. 46–126 and *passim*.

2. Cf. my “Between Subversion and Self-Assertion: The Role of *Kotliarevshchyna* in Russian-Ukrainian Literary Relations,” *Culture, Nation and Identity*, Zenon E. Kohut et al., eds. (Edmonton: 2003), 215–228.

3. Cf. V. Sypovsky, *Ukraina v rosiis'komu pys'menstvi*, chastyna I, 1800–1850 (Kyiv: 1928).

4. That is, the unfinished novel by Fedor N. Glinka, *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 1816 and 1819; a sketch by Razumnik Gonorskii, “Kozaki i Bogdan Khmel'nits'kii,” 1818 (more historical than belletristic, as Sipovskii notes); Kondratii Ryleev's *duma* “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii” (1822), V. Liubich-Romanovich's poem “Skazanie o Khmelnytskom” (1829); the anonymous long poem *Bohdan Khmel'nytskyi*, usually attributed to Mykhilo Maksymovych (1833); P. Holota's historical novel in three parts *Khmel'nitskii ili prisoe-dinenie Malorossii* (1834); Ievhen Hrebinka's dramatic poem *Sseny iz zhizni Malorossiiskago Getmana Zinovia Khmel'nitskogo* (1843); and Oleksandr Kuz'mich's novel *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (1846), which, despite its length, only deals with the early part of his life, before the uprising itself.

5. Cf. Sypovsky, op. cit., 136–137.

6. This basically pedagogic and morale-building goal is clearly articulated in Niemcewicz's preface to the *Śpiewy historyczne*: “To remind the youth of the history of their ancestors, to let them learn of the most excellent eras of their nation's past, to ally love of country with the memory of first impressions—this is the sure method of inculcating in the nation a strong attachment to one's land; nothing can then erase these first impressions, these concepts; they grow with the years producing brave defenders for battle and virtuous men for counsel.” J. U. Niemcewicz, *Śpiewy historyczne* (Cracow: 1835), I. Here and in the subsequent discussion of Polish and Russian pre-Romanticism my discussion draws on my Ph.D. thesis, *The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature* (1975).

7. Cf. his *Dzieje panowania Zygmunta III*, his editing of the *Zbiór pamiętników-historycznych o dawnej Polsce*, and particularly his historical addendum to *Śpiewy historyczne*, where his comments on the Cossack war, though patriotic, are factual and objective and indeed sympathetic to the Cossacks.

8. Niemcewicz, like Zborowski, indeed speaks of “Cossacks,” not “Ukrainians” or “Rusini.” “Kozacki naród” is also the term used by Lelewel; cf. below.

9. An interesting model, indeed archetype, is being created here. Sieniawski prefigures Sienkiewicz's Skrzetuski from *Ogniem i mieczem*, who also debates, and bests Chmielnicki as he argues the Polish side of the conflict. Such a character, of course, has a clear narrative function: he enables the author to dramatize the issues of conflict without recourse to long descriptions of background. Sieniawski, anticipating Skrzetuski, also plays the role of a cultural foil, who in his chivalric nobility, his calls to reason and reconciliation with law and order, highlights the passion and hence “irrationality” of Bohdan Chmielnicki.

10. Interestingly, Joachim Lelewel's interpretation of this historical moment, in his lucid commentary “Śpiewy historyczne J.U. Niemcewicza pod względem historyi uważane,” which was appended to the 1835 Cracow edition, is much more severe:

The persecution did not cease and in consequence the persecuted renounced brotherhood and nationality and saw in their fellow countrymen enemies fiercer than the predators [i.e., the Tartars] themselves, and indeed in the latter they saw their saviours; enmity and wantonness did not cease,

nor did discord and disloyalty to the crown; the suffering lower classes, and among them the Cossacks, who in the reign of the great kings had been a most powerful defense from East and South, who had grown into a large people, and now being wronged by the *starosty* and the gentry, persecuted in their religion, outraged by the activity of the Jesuits, took to arms. *Half of the Commonwealth was filled with a murderous struggle between people of one blood, and from the state in which Poland then existed there was no other end in sight than either her total downfall or the extermination of the Cossack people.* (*Śpiewy historyczne Niemcewicza z uwagami Lelewela* [Cracow: 1835], 480; emphasis mine).

11. It first appeared in Tymon Zaborowski, *Pisma*.

12. Cf. Also *ibid.*, 333 and 362.

13. Cf. *Ibid.*, 334.

14. *Ibid.*, 334–335.

15. *Ibid.*, 343–344

16. *Ibid.*, 339.

17. *Bicz Boży* is indeed the title of a work by Kasper Twardowski that was adapted and reissued in 1649 as a direct response to the uprising.

18. In his *Przestrogi dla Polski*, in the section devoted to the magnates (“Do panów czyli możnowładców”), Stanisław Staszic speaks of the alienation of the Cossacks as one of the basic causes of Poland’s downfall; cf. his *Pisma filozoficzne i społeczne* (Cracow, 1954), vol. I, 225. Similarly, Kajetan Koźmian speaks of the Cossack uprisings as one of the tragic consequences of religious intolerance and persecution; cf. his *Pamiętniki* (Poznań: 1858), Pt. I, 26, cited in Wacław Kubacki, *Twórczość Feliksa Bernatowicza* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1964), 69. In his history of Poland Lelewel sees the Cossacks as the only element within the Polish body politic that refused to bow to enserfment. They transmitted their profound sense of freedom to the peasant masses, and the resulting wars depopulated Poland and prepared her collapse. As for Tymon Zaborowski, for Lelewel Bohdan Khmelnytsky was not a power-hungry adventurer: in his commitment to freedom he was a friend of the Commonwealth; cf. Marian Henryk Serejski, *Joachim Lelewel* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1953), 103–104.

19. Cf. Bohdan Galster, “O romantyzmie dekabrystowskim,” *Slawistyczne studia literaturoznawcze poświęcone VII międzynarodowemu kongresowi slawistów* (Warsaw: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1973), 13–14.

20. *Ibid.*, 11.

21. G. A. Gukovskii, *Pushkin i problemy realisticheskogo stilia* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoj literatury, 1957), 12–13. Cf. also <http://feb-web.ru/feb/pushkin/critics/gkv/gkv.htm>.

22. N. A. Bestuzhev, *Stat'i i pisma* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia obshchestva politicheskikh katorzhan i ssyl'noposelentsev, 1933), 39–40; cited in F. N. Glinka, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1957), 453.

23. F. N. Glinka, *Pisma k drugu* (St. Petersburg: V tipografii K. Kraia, 1816–1817), vol. III, 140.

24. Cf. *ibid.*, 164–165.

25. Cf. V. Bazanov, *Ocherki dekabristskoi literatury* (Poeziia) (Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1961), 139–164.

26. F. N. Glinka, *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (St. Petersburg: 1819), vol. II, 32.
27. Cf. I. Zaslavskii, *Ryleev i rosiis'ko-ukrains'ki literaturni vzaemyny* (Kiev: Derzhlitvydav Ukraïny, 1958).
28. See, for example, M. Berndt's *J. Niemcewicz und K. Ryleev* (Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin, 1961) or B. Galster's "Twórczość Rylejewa a literatura polska," *Kwartalnik Instytutu Polsko-Radzieckiego* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1956), no. 1, 201–226.
29. K. F. Ryleev, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1971), (subsequently cited as PSS), 105.
30. According to V. I. Maslov, more than a third of the *Dumy* (nine of the twenty-five) read like versified Karamzin; cf. his *Literaturnaia deiatel'nost' K.F. Ryleeva* (Kyiv: 1912), 182.
31. Cf. Galster, *Twórczość Ryleewa na tle prądów epoki*, 68–77.
32. Letter of May 25, 1825; see A. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963), vol. IX, 143 and 149.
33. It first appeared in *Sorevnovatel'*, vol. 6, 342 (the censor's permission is dated Apr. 1, 1822). K. F. Ryleev, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii* (Leningrad, 1971), 428. Zhukovskii's translation of "The Prisoner of Chillon" was begun on Sept. 4, 1821, and finished at the beginning of April 1822. Ryleev may have seen the translation before its publication.
34. Cf. PSS, 429.
35. Cf. A. G. Ceitlin, "Neosushchestvlennyi zamysel tragedii 'Khmel'nyts'kii,'" *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, op. cit., 57 and 67.
36. Cf., "Shil'onskii uznik, poema lorda Bairona. Perevel s angliiskogo V. Zh" (St. Petersburg, 1822), with the dedication "to Prince P. A. Viazemskii. From the translator."
37. Ryleev, PSS, 156.
38. Op. cit., lines 17–24, 143.
39. Cf. PSS, 442.
40. Cf. *ibid.*, 250–252.
41. Cf. my "The Jewish Theme in 19th and Early 20th Century Ukrainian Literature," *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988), 330–331. The "keys to the church" topos first occurs in the Hrabianka Chronicle (end of the seventeenth, beginning of the eighteenth century); cf. Zenon Kohut, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory," *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 141–163, 147.
42. Cf. *ibid.*, 330–334 and *passim*.
43. Although the traditional date for the inauguration of modern Ukrainian literature in the vernacular is often taken to be the publication of Ivan Kotliarev'skii's mock-heroic *Eneida* in 1798, the actual beginnings of modern Ukrainian literature date to about two decades later and only in the mid-1820s begin to exhibit critical mass. Twenty years after that, the literature has become a significant cultural presence, and by 1847 it was hit by the first of several political repressions.
44. Cf. my "'Mylost' Bozhiia, Ukrainu . . . svobodyvshaia . . .'" and Ukrainian Literature after (and before) Poltava: The Missing Link," in *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth*, ed. Serhii Plokhya (Harvard University Press, 2012).

45. In 1857 Maksymovych published only a fragment from the drama. A year later he published the whole in *Chtenia Moskovskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnosti* (1858), vol. I, Smes', 75–100; cf. *Sobranie sochinenii, M. A. Maksimovicha*, Tom 1, Otdel istoricheskii (Kyiv: 1876), 486–508. Maksymovych's conjecture that the work was authored by Feofan Prokopovych (cf. *ibid.*, 508–509) was soon disproved; cf. my “Mylost' Bozhii . . .,” *ibid.*, 1–3.

46. Cf. V. M. Zhirmunskii, *Bairon i Pushkin* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1978), 244 and *passim*. He also repeatedly identifies the poem as written by Maksymovych—without making the case, however.

47. That is, *Sovremennik* in 1839 and 1840, *Literaturnaja gazeta* in 1840, and *Biblioteka dlia chteniia* in 1843; cf. Hrebinka, *Tvory v p'iaty tomakh* (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo khudozhnoji literatury, 1957), vol. I, 418–419.

48. Cf. Hrebinka, *Tvory*, *ibid.*, I, 200–203.

49. *Ibid.*, I, 211.

50. The frequently noted instance is his repeated distich (in Scene 4): “Indescribably beautiful/ There sits Barabash's wife” [Nevyrazimo khorosha/ Sidit zhena Barabasha]; *ibid.*, 219.

51. *Literaturnoe nasledie N. I. Kostomarova* (St. Petersburg, 1890), 239–258. Cf. also M. I. Kostomarov, *Tvory v dvokh tomakh* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1990), vol. 1, 275–290.

52. Cf. esp. vol. 1, chap. 6.

53. Cf. my *Shevchenkovi “Haidamaky.” Poema i krytyka* [Shevchenko's *Haidamaky*: The Poem and Its Critical Reception]. *Krytyka*, Kyiv, 2013.

## Chapter 5. Heroes and Villains in the Historical Imagination

1. See Kostomarov's testimony in Oksana Franko et al., eds., *Kyrylo-Mefodiiiv's'ke Tovarystvo*, 3 vols. (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1990), vol. 1: 300; for the text of “Zakon bozhyi” or “Knyha buttia ukrains'koho narodu,” see vol. 1: 152–167, 250–258.

2. *Ibidem*, 3: 165–166, 176.

3. Three notebooks of this work were later returned to Kostomarov, and he published his Khmelnytsky monograph in 1857, after his exile in Saratov.

4. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii: so vremen prisoedineniia onoi k rossiiskomu gosudarstvu pri Tsare Aleksee Mikhailoviche, s kratkim obozreniem pervobytnago sostoiianiia sego kraia*, 4 vols. (Moscow, 1822); see vol. 1, the illustration opposite the first page of chap. 1.

5. On *Istoriia rusov*, see Volodymyr Kravchenko, *Narysy z ukrains'koi istoriohrafii epokhy natsional'noho vidrodzhennia (druha polovyna XVIII–seredyna XIX st.)* (Kharkiv: Osnova, 1996). See also Serhii Plokhyy, *The Cossack Myth: History and Nationhood in the Age of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

6. In the first publication of this work, *Istoriia rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846), 49–142 (of the 257-page narrative) cover Khmelnytsky.

7. Such as in Hryhorii Hrabianka's popular chronicle “The Great War of Bohdan Khmelnytsky” (1710), in Samiilo Velychko's encyclopedic *Narrative of the Cossack Wars with the Poles Waged by Zinovii Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host* (1710s–1720s), in the school drama “God's Grace” (1728), and in Semen Divovych's “Conversation Between Great Russia and Little Russia” (1762).

8. *Istoriia rusov*, 58–59. Thus, Khmelnytsky's actions are presented as a legitimate and noble war (as opposed to a rebellion).

9. *Ibidem*, 84.

10. *Ibidem*, 65.

11. *Ibidem*, 122. This, of course, complements the conventional notion of the union between Muscovy and Little Russia as nearly the only saving option for the latter.

12. *Ibidem*, 85, 120.

13. *Ibidem*, 141.

14. *Ibidem*, 142.

15. *Ibidem*. This poetic inscription reads like a modernized reworking of “The Encomium to Khmelnytsky from the Little Russian People” in Hrabianka's chronicle.

16. See Plokyh, *The Cossack Myth*, 164–165.

17. *Ukrainskii vestnik*, Kharkiv (January 1816), vol. 1: 7–21; (April 1816), vol. 2: 3–19; unsigned. Attribution is based on the fact that this piece was included in his volume of collected prose works (1818), see Kravchenko, *Narysy*, 86.

18. Pointed out by Kravchenko in *Narysy*, 87. Schérer's work also served as source for the author of *Istoriia rusov*, see Plokyh, op. cit., 175–179. Schérer's general introductory paragraphs, set in quotations marks, are treated as translation, to which Honorsky appends his own comments. However, in the account of Khmelnytsky's political and military deeds that are supposedly from “ancient manuscripts,” Honorsky incorporates a fairly close translation from Schérer—without referring to his source. Honorsky's textual strategy of appropriation follows his overall goals: the directly quoted passages buttress the “objectivity” of the flattering pronouncements made by a European outsider, while the account of events does not require additional cultural authority, serving to complement the introductory section with purported local historical sources.

19. *Ukrainskii vestnik* (1816), vol. 1: 9–10.

20. *Ibidem*, 10–11.

21. *Ibidem*, 11.

22. *Ibidem*, 13–14.

23. Compare the notion of charisma assigned to collective bodies in the production of the national myth in Lars Esenius, “Symbolic Charisma and the Creation of Nations: The Case of Sami,” in *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* (2010), vol. 10, no. 3: 467–482.

24. This chapter is written as if continuing from where “Getman Khmel'nitskii” left off (and was not continued after the second installment); see *Ukrainskii vestnik* (April 1816), vol. 2, no. 4: 19–33; (June 1816), vol. 6: 263–297.

25. *Ukrainskii vestnik* (February 1816), vol. 1, no. 2: 156.

26. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), op. cit.

27. Feature of the first (1822) edition of the work.

28. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, op. cit., 1st ed., I (Moscow, 1822), xxvii.

29. *Ibidem*, xliii.

30. This chapter was Repnin's contribution.

31. *Ibidem*, 12.

32. *Ibidem*, 51.
33. See Kravchenko, 168–178.
34. The Ukrainian author of *The History of the Rus' People* advanced a historical paradigm that runs contrary to Karamzin's.
35. Polevoi's opinions about the Ukrainian people and Ukrainian history are stated in his remarkable review of the second edition of Bantysh-Kamenskii's *History of Little Russia* (Moscow, 1830) in *Moskovskii telegraf* (1830), nos. 17–18.
36. See, for example, Mikhail Pogodin's *Nachertanie russkoi istorii dlia gimnazii*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1837), 268–275.
37. Nikolai Ustrialov, *Russkaia istoriia*, 2nd ed., II (St. Petersburg, 1839): 209–210.
38. In addition to *The History of the Rus' People* (polemic in disguise), we have only circumstantial evidence or fragments of these now-lost works from the early nineteenth century by Oleksii Martos and Arkhyn Khudorba. Martos, who was fascinated by “Mazepa's revolution” and who positively compared Mazepa to Khmelnytsky, incorporated the cult of Khmelnytsky into his narrative, emphasizing the hetman's political and military genius. See Oleksandr Lazarevsky, “Prezhnie izyskateli malorusskoi stariny. Aleksei Ivanovich Martos,” in *Kievskaia starina* (1895), vol. 2: 175, 178, 194.
39. See Bernhard Giesen, “Performing Transcendence in Politics: Sovereignty, Deviance, and the Void of Meaning,” in *Sociological Theory* (September 2005), vol. 23, no. 3: 275–285.
40. Note, for example, that in Hrabianka's chronicle Khmelnytsky's powers were deemed comparable to those of a monarch (this passage did not get past the censors when the work was published in the nineteenth century); see Frank Sysyn in the current volume, 42. In Nikolai Sementovskii's popularizing *Starina malorossiiskaia, zaporozhskaia i donskaia* (St. Petersburg, 1846), the powers of the Cossack hetman were described thus: “The Cossack, superior over all other Cossacks, was titled the Illustrious Lord Hetman. His power and authority were those of a monarch, despite the fact that hetmanate was always under the rule of Lithuania, then Poland, and finally, Russia” (21).
41. This saying (“ot Bohdana do Ivana ne bulo u nas Hetmana”) likely emerged in the times of Mazepa, who was a subject of panegyric works. To my knowledge, it first appeared in print in a historical novel by Petr Golota, *Ivan Mazepa. Istoricheskii roman, vziatyi iz narodnykh predanii*, 4 vols. (Moscow: 1832–33), vol. 4: 3–4.
42. *Istoriia rusov*, 184, 200.
43. Many historians connect the emergence of this cult with the jeopardy the Cossack Hetmanate found itself in after the fateful decision of Hetman Mazepa to abandon his loyalty to Peter I and side with Charles XII of Sweden. See Serhii Plokhyy, *Tsars and Cossacks: A Study in Iconography* (Cambridge, MA: HURI, 2002), 13–17; Volodymyr Kravchenko, “Pereiaslavs'kyi kompleks v ukrainskii istoriografii,” in his recent collection of articles *Ukraina, imperiia, Rosiia. Vybrani statyi z modernoi istorii ta istoriografii* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2011), esp. 201–209. On the curse of Mazepa and various responses to it, including a zealous promotion of Khmelnytsky, see my article “Obsessions with Mazepa” in Serhii Plokhyy, ed., *Poltava 1709: The Battle and the Myth* (Cambridge, MA: HURI, 2012), 569–615.
44. Although not as expansive as the account of Khmelnytsky, Mazepa is given a remarkably sizable portion; see 182–217 of the 1846 edition (about 13 percent).



45. Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), vol. 1: xxvii–viii, xxxii–civ, 1–51.
46. *Ibidem* (1822), vol. 3: 1–138; vol. 4: 1–30.
47. Kravchenko, op. cit., 177–178.
48. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, 3 vols. (Moscow: 1830). Khmelnytsky's account is covered in vol. 1: 187–188, 218–335, 349–360; vol. 2: 1–22; Mazepa's in vol. 3: 1–104.
49. Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), vol. I: xxxii–iii. The “incidental” origin of the Cossack war of Khmelnytsky is mitigated in the second, expanded edition of this work, where Bantysh expands on the Polish oppression of Ukraine at the time of uprising.
50. *Istoriia rusov*, 50, 59.
51. Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), vol. 3: 7–8.
52. *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), vol. 3: 79; *Istoriia rusov*, 200.
53. *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (1822), vol. 3: 80; *Istoriia rusov*, 200.
54. On this aspect in Ukrainian culture, see a witty and insightful article by Solomiia Pavlychko, “Rozdumy pro vusa, naviiani odnym opovidanniam Oleksy Storozhenka,” in S. Pavlychko, *Teoriia literatury* (Kyiv: Osnovy, 2002), 463–473.
55. Defending Pushkin's “Poltava” from Nadezhdin's critique that ridiculed, among other things, the poet's use of the Mazepa “moustache episode” as simplistic and an unlikely explanation of Mazepa's treason, Mykhailo Maksymovych went to great lengths to prove the significance of moustaches to the honor of *szlachta*, thus providing a valid motive for the hetman's thirst for revenge. See *Pushkin v pryzhiznennoi kritike 1828–1830* (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Pushkinskii Teatral'nyi Tsentr, 2001), 183–185.
56. Bantysh-Kamenskii (1822), vol. 4: 6.
57. *Ibidem*, 25.
58. Compare the Khmelnytsky episode in *History of the Rus' People*, where the collective lament is quoted (see in the previous section: “our sun has grown dark . . .”).
59. Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1830), vol. 2: 10.
60. *Ibidem*, 15.
61. *Ibidem*, 125. In the second edition of *History of Little Russia*, Bantysh also eliminated the poem attributed to Mazepa that conveyed a lament over Ukraine's inner conflict and a call to national unity: perhaps its impact was too strong and contrary to the general message of the work and the official (required) treatment of Mazepa. Instead, Bantysh included samples of Mazepa's love letters to Motria Kochubei, written in a tender, gallant, and poetic (folkloric) register, perhaps suggesting that if Mazepa cannot be a charismatic patriotic hero, let him at least be a charismatic romantic hero. In either case, Mazepa still commands the reader's interest as a poet, a character of eloquence—a common attribute of charisma. The inclusion of these romantic letters can also be seen as Bantysh's response to Pushkin's *Poltava* (1829), where Mazepa, a lustful old man and the overall embodiment of malice, seduces his goddaughter and holds her in his palace. Bantysh's editorial comments may castigate Mazepa as a passion-ridden transgressor, but he still “corrects” Pushkin's version of events. One letter reveals Mazepa's romantic sorrow after he had to send the young woman (with whom he was madly in love) back to her parents out of concern for his and

her reputations and her honor and future. See Dmitrii Bantysh-Kamenskii, *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1830), vol. 2: 32 (appendices).

62. See, for example, Kravchenko on a passage he found in a manuscript version of *History of Little Russia* (whereby with the end of Hetman Skoropadsky, “all Little Russian liberties, gained by blood by the brave Kosinsky, Nalyvaiko [ . . . ] and finally, by the immortal Zinovii Khmelnytsky, were buried”) absent in the printed edition; Kravchenko, op. cit., 177.

63. With the current resurgence of interest in Mazepa, there is a growing literature on Mazepa’s cultural patronage and panegyric tradition dedicated to the hetman that was suppressed after 1709. Scholars probe the territorial conceptualizations and perceptions of power in the Cossack Hetmanate of the Mazepa era. See, for example, two collections of essays: Giovanna Siedina, ed., *Mazepa and His Time: History, Culture, Society* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2004); and Serhii Plokh, ed., *Poltava: 1709* (op. cit.); as well as a monograph by Rostyslav Radyshevs’kyi and Volodymyr Sverbyhuz, *Ivan Mazepa v sarmats’ko-roksolans’komu vymiri vysokoho baroko* (Kyiv: Prosvita, 2006).

64. In an attempt to break the spell (the curse of Mazepa), Illia Kvitka tried to refocus the “Ivan” of the saying onto Mazepa’s successor, Ivan Skoropadsky (who, in fact, harbored sympathies to the fallen hetman); see in his essay “O Maloi Rossii,” in *Ukrainskii vestnik* (February 1816), vol. 1, no. 2: 311. Kvitka doesn’t refer to the saying directly, yet his point is unmistakable: “[Skoropadsky] honorably completes the title [of Hetman], which Khmelnytsky initiated and decorated [with his deeds]. Hence, to the consolation of all who love their motherland, the two men, who carried the hetman’s *bulava*, represent true distinction and loyalty to the monarchs: Khmelnytsky and Skoropadsky!”

65. For example, in Bantysh-Kamenskii, Khmelnytsky secretly sighed about the fate of Ukraine, before he was pushed into open confrontation with the Polish authorities. Khmelnytsky by cunning [khitrym obrazom; I (1822): xxxiii] obtained documents that the Polish puppet-hetman Barabash hid from the Cossacks’ attention; and in *The History of the Rus’ People*, he “used great craft” [upotrebil velikoe iskusstvo, 59]. When Khmelnytsky broke his promise and suddenly attacked the retreating Poles, “he revealed his perfidy, according to Pastorius” [obnaruzhivaet svoe kovarstvo (1830), vol. 1: 235]—yet here, Bantysh referred to a Polish source to characterize the Cossack chief in a less-than-flattering light. Moreover, the historian’s reference to the Polish point of view only underscores the numerous instances of treachery by the Polish commanders when leaders of rebellious Cossacks were promised truce or pardon, only to be captured and brutally executed.

66. See Bantysh-Kamenskii (1830), vol. 1: 229 [neustrashimyvi vozhd’], 233 [blagorazumnyi vozhd’; stol’ zhe dal’novidnyi, kak i ostorozhnyi], 236 [muzh velichavyi], 241 [opytnyi vozhd’], 292 [izvorotlivyi Khmel’nitskii].

67. Ibidem, 256.

68. Ibidem, 306–337.

69. *The History of the Rus’ People*, 97.

70. See Bantysh-Kamenskii (1830), vol. 3: 6, 40, 42 *et passim*.

71. *The History of the Rus’ People*, 200: “vela ego izlishniaia otvaga i krainee ozhestochenii v neizmerimuiu propast’.” This remarkable wording, in fact, may implicitly (if consciously) encapsulate the curse of Mazepa cast upon Ukrainian elites: excessive bravery in

his act of breaking the alliance with Peter (gambling on the historical fortunes of Ukraine), the resultant extreme embitterment between Ukrainian elites and Russian authorities, and the immeasurable abyss of the curse and “oblivion.”

72. Bantysh-Kamenskii (1830), vol. 3: 49. Compare this with the treatment of Khmelnytsky’s political and military “glitches”!

73. *Ibidem*, 13.

74. *Ibidem*, 60, 90: “nenavidimy narodom i voiskom,” “malorossiiane ne liubili Mazepu.” Contrast this with Oleksii Martos’s positive comment made in his diary from the times of the Napoleonic wars, *Ruskii arkhiv* (1893), vol. 2: 345.

75. Bantysh-Kamenskii (1830), vol. 3: 7.

76. *The History of the Rus’ People*, 215. This section is contrasted with the brutal repressions of Ukrainians by Menshikov and by the Cossacks forced to kill their own (206–207, 212–213).

77. On this dichotomy, see Zenon Kohut, “The Question of Russo-Ukrainian Unity and Ukrainian Distinctiveness in Early Modern Ukrainian Thought and Culture,” in Andreas Kappeler, Zenon Kohut, et al., eds., *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945)* (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 2003), 57–86.

78. Petr Golota, *Khmel’nitskie ili prisoedinenie Malorossii. Istoricheskii roman XVII veka*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1834).

## Chapter 6. The Image of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Polish Romanticism

I would like to express my thanks to Boris Dralyuk of UCLA for his invaluable suggestions for improving this essay.

1. Juliusz Słowacki, *Dzieła wszystkie*, ed. Juliusz Kleiner, vol. 10 (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1957), 398.

2. Józef Reitzenheim, quoted by Kleiner in *ibid.*, 382.

3. For the most comprehensive treatment of the image of the Cossack in Polish romanticism, see George G. Grabowicz, “The History and Myth of the Cossack Ukraine in Polish and Russian Romantic Literature” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1975); and its condensed versions, e.g., “Between History and Myth: Perceptions of the Cossack Past in Polish, Russian and Ukrainian Romantic Literature,” in *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists. Kiev, September 1983*, vol. 2, *Literature, Poetics, History*, ed. Paul Debreczny (Columbus: Slavica, 1983), 173–88; and “Ukraina,” *Słownik literatury polskiej XIX wieku* (Wrocław, Warsaw, Cracow, Gdańsk: Ossolineum, 1991), s.v. See also Marek Kwapiszewski, “Kozak romantyczny. Dzieje motywu,” in his *Późny romantyzm i Ukraina. Z dziejów i życia literackiego* (Warsaw: IBL, 2006), 7–34.

4. In this connection, besides the studies noted above, see Maria Janion and Maria Żmigrodzka, *Romantyzm i historia* (Warsaw: PIW, 1978), 111–130.

5. Henry Krasinski, *The Cossacks of the Ukraine Comprising Biographical Notices of the Most Celebrated Cossack Chiefs and Atamans, Including Chmielnicki, Senko Razin, Mazeppa, Sava, Zeleznik, Gonta, Pugatchef*, [ . . . ] (London: Partridge and Oakey, 1848).

6. Indeed, to add insult to injury, Krasinski manages to sneak in an entire chapter devoted to Karol Różycki, a Polish military hero of the Russo-Polish War of 1830 whose only

connection to “the Cossacks of the Ukraine,” it seems, was the fact that his “detachment of light cavalry [was] mounted and armed according to the ancient Polish-Cossack fashion” (ibid., 142) and fought in the uprising’s Ukrainian Theater of Operations. (Różycki’s inclusion in the book is, of course, its émigré author’s effort at public relations on behalf of the Polish cause.)

7. Tadeusz Padalica [Zenon Fisz], *Opowiadania i krajobrazy. Szkice z wędrówek po Ukrainie* (Vilnius: Józef Zawadzki, 1856), vol. 1: 107, 101. By “Ukrainian” Fisz means Polish authors who traced their origins to Ukraine and/or used it as their subject matter, i.e., such writers as Słowacki, Józef Bohdan Zaleski, Seweryn Goszczyński, Michał Grabowski, Michał Czajkowski, Aleksander Groza, and Fisz himself.

8. This state of affairs is, in turn, reflected in the dearth, as well as rigor, of secondary literature devoted to the subject. See Mieczysław Inglot, “Bohdan Chmielnicki w oczach polskich romantyków,” *Ukrains’kyi kalendar 1969* (Warsaw: USKT, 1969), 263–266.

9. Niemcewicz’s drama remains in manuscript to this day (Biblioteka Polska w Paryżu). For a detailed paraphrase, with lengthy quotations, see Ignacy Chrzanowski, “Bohdan Chmielnicki, tragedia Niemcewicza,” *Pamiętnik Literacki* (1906), vol. 5: 437–59 (from which I take my citations). In addition, Niemcewicz’s *Śpiewy historyczne* (1816) include a *duma* about Jan Kazimierz and one about Stefan Potocki, both of which deal cursorily with Khmelnytsky. See *Śpiewy historyczne Niemcewicza z uwagami Lelewela* (Cracow: Józef Czech, 1835), 93–101. Zaborowski’s tragedy can be found in his *Pisma zebrane*, ed. Marta Danieliwickowa (Warsaw: Filologiczne Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawy, 1936), 317–362.

10. A[dam] P[ieńkiewicz], “Duma ludu ukraińskiego. O wyprawie Bohdana Chmielnickiego na Mołdawię,” *Bojan*, part 1 (Vilnius: Adam Pieńkiewicz, 1838), 108–111; Aleksander Groza, “Bohdan (Ułomek)” in his *Poezje* (Vilnius: Józef Zawadzki, 1843), 2:16.

11. “Mogily,” in ibid., vol. 1:101–132.

12. E. S., “Wesele czehryńskie,” *Biruta*, part 1 (N.p.: Józef Krzeczkowski, 1837), 125–140. Inglot (264) identifies the author as E. Sarkowicz.

13. \*\*\* [Karol Drzewiecki], *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki. Sceny dramatyczne z XVII wieku* (Leipzig: Księgarnia Zagraniczna, 1852).

14. Jan Czyński, *Le Kosak, roman historique*, 2 vols. (Paris: A. Leclaire, 1836). Page references to this and to the preceding seven texts are provided in the body of the text.

15. In the case of Drzewiecki, this was not lost on at least one of his contemporaries. The ostensible unskillfulness of *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki* so incensed the critic Aleksander Weryha Darowski that republication of the drama compelled him to republish his own devastating review of the first edition as a separate booklet. See his *Książkę Jeremi Wiśniowiecki* (Lviv: Ossolineum, n.d.).

16. Henry Krasinski, *Gonta: An Historical Drama in Five Acts* (London: Partridge and Oakey, 1848), xiv.

17. See, for instance, George G. Grabowicz, “Mit Ukrainy w ‘Śnie srebrnym Salomei,’” *Pamiętnik Literacki* (1987), vol. 78, no. 2: 23–60. For the notion of the “phantasmatic scenario” as a manifestation of myth, see Jacques Lacan, “The Neurotic’s Individual Myth,” *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* (1979), vol. 48: 414. I would like to thank Robert Romanchuk of Florida State University for drawing my attention to this essay.

18. The apparent need for some sort of closure to the Khmelnytsky saga is also evident in the visual medium; see, for instance, Jan Matejko's watercolor *Bohdan Khmelnytsky Pledging Allegiance at Zboriv* (1859) [fig. 6.1], in which the Ukrainian hetman is depicted prostrating himself before King Jan Kazimierz before (one assumes) drawing up an agreement that was by any measure extremely favorable to the Cossacks but in any case did not prevent a resumption of hostilities some twenty-two months later.

19. On the image of Khmelnytsky in Polish historiography, see Janusz Kaczmarczyk, "Bohdan Chmielnicki—szatan czy mesjasz," *Studia Historyczne* (1991), vol. 34, no. 3, esp. 369–374; and Andrzej Stępnik, "Mit Kozaczyzny w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku," in *Mity i stereotypy w dziejach Polski i Ukrainy w XIX i XX wieku*, ed. Andrzej Czyżewski et al. (Warsaw-Łódź: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2012), 379–380. On the sources available to Polish historiography of the period, see Mykhailo Hrushevsky, with Frank Sysyn and Ivan Fedoruk, "Notes," in Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 8, *The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*, trans. Marta Daria Olynyk, ed. Frank E. Sysyn (Edmonton & Toronto: CIUS, 2002), 670–678.

20. *Historia panowania Jana Kazimierza* [ . . . ], ed. Edward Raczyński, 2 vols. (Poznań: Władenty Stefański, 1840). Cf. Darowski, 15–16.

21. Cf. Kaczmarczyk, 371.

22. Twardowski, Kochowski, Pastorius, Rudawski, Shérer, and Salvandy, among others. Cf. Hrushevsky, *History*, 670–675.

23. Szajnocha (9) quotes Khmelnytsky as remarking in this connection, "Had Czaplínska, a virtuous Esther who has mercy on people perishing in vain, not come to my aid in that distress of imprisonment with her intercession and pleas, I don't know what would have happened to my head as a consequence of Czaplínski's hostile instigations."

24. See, for instance, Jerzy Samuel Bandtkie, *Dzieje Królestwa Polskiego*, vol. 2 (Wrocław: Bogumił Korn, 1820), 310–313; Joachim Lelewel, *Dzieje Polski potocznym sposobem opowiedział . . .*, 3d. ed. (Leipzig: n.p., 1837), 126; Jan Nepomucen Czarnowski, *Ukraina i Zaporozie czyli historia Kozaków od pojawienia się ich w dziejach do czasu ostatecznego przyłączenia do Rosji według najlepszych źródeł napisana . . .* (Warsaw: J. A. Breslauer, 1854), 177–183; Karol Szajnocha, *Dwa lata dziejów naszych. 1646. 1648. Opowiadania i źródła*, vol. 2, *Polska w r. 1648* (Lwów: Author, 1869), 3–19; and also Krasiński, *The Cossacks*, 28–30. For a modern historian's version of the events, see Hrushevsky, *History*, 381–392.

25. Cf. Adam Galkowski, *Polski patriota—obywatel Europy. Rzecz o Janie Czyńskim (1801–1867)* (Warsaw: Neriton, 2004), esp. 122–132.

26. See also Czyński's contribution to the 1835 European Historical Congress in Paris, in which he depicts the Cossacks as a force for freedom and democracy, pitted against "nobles and Jesuits." In this telling, Khmelnytsky's uprising was thus at once an act of vengeance for personal injuries and a struggle on behalf of all oppressed peoples of the Commonwealth. *Congrès historique européen, réuni à Paris au nom de l'Institut Historique* [ . . . ] (Paris: P. H. Krabbe, 1836), 133–140.

27. For the self-styled Polish-Ukrainian bard Tymko Padurra, however, Khmelnytsky was, bizarrely, nothing more and nothing less than the son of a tavern-keeping Jewish convert. See his "obrys historyczny" "Bogdan Chmielnicki," in his *Pysma* (Lviv: K. Wyld, 1874), 283–302.

28. See George G. Grabowicz, *The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko* (Cambridge, MA: HURI, 1982), who maintains that as mythical figures mediating between opposing categories (settled-nomadic, life-death, present-future, civilization-barbarity, Poland-Ukraine), Cossacks “assume a preternatural existence,” which “is amply reflected in various folkloric versions of Cossacks as sorcerers [ . . . ] who traffic with dark forces” but also in what he calls “literary-mythic” depictions of Cossacks in Polish as well as in Russian and Ukrainian literatures (118).

29. Franciszek Rawita Gawroński, *Bohdan Chmielnicki do elekcji Jana Kazimierza*, vol. 1 (Lviv: H. Altenberg, 1906), 146.

30. Henryk Sienkiewicz, *Ogniem i mieczem* (Warsaw: K. Bartoszewicz, 1884).

31. See Kalinowska and Kondratyuk, “Khmelnysky in Motion: The Case of Soviet, Polish, and Ukrainian Film” in this volume, 206.

32. For a discussion of Sienkiewicz’s take on Khmelnytsky, see, among others, Olgierd Górka, “‘Ogniem i mieczem’ a rzeczywistość historyczna” (1934), and Władysław Tomkiewicz, “Wartości historyczne ‘Ogniem i mieczem’” (1934), both in *Trylogia Henryka Sienkiewicza. Studia, szkice, polemiki*, ed. Tomasz Jodelka (Warsaw: PIW, 1962), 371–424.

33. Henryk Sienkiewicz, *Ogniem i mieczem*, vol. 5 of *Wybór pism* (Warsaw: PIW, 1954), 24.

34. On the notion of woman as object of exchange in fictional narrative, see Elizabeth Cowie, “Woman as Sign,” in *Feminism and Film*, ed. E. Ann Kaplan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 48–65.

## Chapter 7. The Heirs of Tul’chyn

1. Nikolai Minskii, *Osada Tul’china, Vokhod (1888)*, 1–2. Reprinted in Simon Markish, ed., *Rodnoi golos* (Dukh i litera, 2001), 129–210.

2. On the image of Jews as exploiters of Ukrainians in accounts of the Khmelnytsky uprising, see Zenon Kohut, “The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory,” *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17: 141–163. On Mikeshein’s monument to Khmelnytsky, see my introduction to the present volume, 1–3.

3. The translation was first published in 1878 in Odessa by Isakovich, and was reissued in Leipzig in 1882 and 1883. Natan Neta Hanover, *Bogdan Khmel’niiskii: Letopis’ evreia-sovremennika Natana Gannovera, o sobytiakh 1648–1653 godov v malorossii vooobshe i o sud’be svoikh edinoversev v osobennosti*, trans. Solomon Mandel’kern (Leipzig: V. Gerhard, 1883), 40–49.

4. Andrei Belyi, “Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo,” *Vesy* (1908), no. 10.

5. Chone Shmeruk offers a basic overview of Yiddish literature on Khmelnytsky. See Shmeruk, “Yiddish Literature and Collective Memory: The Case of the Chmielnicki Masacres,” *Polin* (1990), vol. 5: 187–197.

6. Nathan Nata Hannover [Natan Neta Hanover], *Abys of Despair: The Famous 17th Century Chronicle Depicting Jewish Life in Russia and Poland During the Chmielnicki Masacres of 1648–1649*, trans. Abraham J. Mesch (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1950), 55.

7. *Ibid.*, 57.

8. *Ibid.*, 58.

9. Edward Fram, “Creating a Tale of Martyrdom in Tulczyn, 1648,” in *Jewish History*

and *Jewish Memory: Essays in Honor of Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi*, ed. Elisheva Carlebach, John M. Efron, and David Myers (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1998), 89–112. Fram notes that Hanover's most significant borrowings came from Me'ir ben Samuel of Szczepienszyn's *Tsok ha-'itim* (Cry of the Times), published in Cracow in 1650; Rabbi Shabbetai ben Me'ir Katz's *Megillat 'efah* (Scroll of Terror), which appeared in Amsterdam in 1651; and Gavriel Schussberg's *Petaḥ teshuvah* (An Opening for Repentance), which also appeared in Amsterdam in 1651; 89–90, 96.

10. Adam Teller, "Jewish Literary Responses to the Events of 1648–1649 and the Creation of a Polish-Jewish Consciousness," in *Culture Front: Representing Jews in Eastern Europe*, ed. Benjamin Nathans and Gabriella Safran (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 32.

11. Susan Einbinder, in her discussion of Jewish literature and martyrdom in Medieval France, has observed that, "Inevitably, the *published* corpus [of Medieval Jewish laments] reflects Enlightenment and mid-twentieth century preoccupations with the place of persecution in the formation of modern Jewish identity." See Susan L. Einbinder, *Beautiful Death: Jewish Poetry and Martyrdom in Medieval France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 22.

12. Simon Dubnow, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* (Bergenfield, NJ: Avotaynu, 2000), 70–71; Heinrich Graetz and Philipp Bloch, *History of the Jews*, vol. 5 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1956), 8–9.

13. Many of Kostomarov's contemporaries questioned his emphasis on religion. They include Jerzy Milkowski, who wrote in his 1861 article in the Lviv journal *Dziennik Literacki*, "[T]he Khmelnytsky Uprising was a socioeconomic conflict, a struggle against the nobility." Cited in Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus': The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*, ed. Frank E. Sysyn, trans. Marta Daria Olynyk, vol. 8 (Edmonton, Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Study Press, 2010), 700.

14. Sholem Aleichem, "The Wedding That Came Without Its Band," in *Tevye the Dairyman and The Railroad Stories*, trans. Hillel Halkin (Schocken, 1996), 195.

15. Roger Ellis, "Introduction" to *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*, ed. Roger Ellis (Cambridge, UK: Brewer, 1989), 4. Cited in Naomi Seidman, *Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 31. Jacques Derrida makes this point in his discussion of French translations of a phrase from Portia's appeal to Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, "when mercy seasons justice": "She tries to convert him to Christianity by persuading him of the supposedly Christian interpretation that consists of interiorizing, spiritualizing, idealizing what among Jews . . . will remain physical, external, literal, devoted to a respect for the letter." Derrida, Jacques, "What Is a 'Relevant' Translation?," in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 439.

16. Naomi Seidman, *Faithful Renderings: Jewish-Christian Difference and the Politics of Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 30.

17. Robert Bird, "Imagination and Ideology in the New Religious Consciousness," in *A History of Russian Philosophy 1830–1930: Faith, Reason, and the Defense of Human Dignity*, ed. Gary M. Hamburg and Randall Allen Poole (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge

University Press, 2010), 280; Avril Pyman, *A History of Russian Symbolism* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 26. Meonism, according to Matich: “God . . . is not only unknowable, but it is inconceivable that He—the Perfect and Eternal—should co-exist with an imperfect and temporal world. God is dead—He sacrificed himself to bring the world into being, to give human beings life and freedom. To resurrect Him, mankind must make an answering sacrifice. Our assurance that this is so comes from our mystic awareness of ‘meons’ (from a Greek word meaning ‘that which does not exist’). We become aware of meons in moments of ‘ecstasy’, most often engendered by art” (25–26).

18. Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (A. K. Kirkor, 1870). See also George Grabowicz's treatment of Kostomarov in this volume, 85.

19. Myroslav Shkandrij has pointed out the problems with Kostomarov and others' uncritical use of folk sources in writing Ukraine's history: “Regrettably, the dumas are still often uncritically accepted as authentic and irrefutable eyewitness evidence.” See Shkandrij, *Jews in Ukrainian Literature: Representation and Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 17.

20. Shkandrij, *Jews in Ukrainian Literature: Representation and Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 33. *Knyhy byt'ia* was a founding text for the secret Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood of 1845–46.

21. By distilling the major antagonists from Hanover's chronicle into a few actors, Minskii exchanges the idea of collective suffering for the psychological drama of individual suffering, which is consistent with his 1890 philosophical dissertation *Pri svete sovesti* (In the Light of Consciousness), where Minskii “call[s] for greater manifestations of individualism.” Oleg A. Maslenikov, *The Frenzied Poets: Andrey Biely and the Russian Symbolists* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952), 12.

22. Ibid.

23. “A ia ego liubil, kak cheloveka / Greshno liubit': pochti bogotvoril!” Nikolai Minskii, “Osada Tul'china,” in *Rodnoi golos*, by Simon Markish (Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 2001), 142.

24. “On nastavliial menia v zavete predkov, / Izrailia rasskazoval sud'by.” Ibid., 143.

25. “I chasto, ne okonchivshi rasskaza, / Ko mne na grud' brosalsia dobryi Pedro, / I plakali my dolgo, i klialis' / Otdat' vsiu zhizn', vsiu serdtsa krov' za brat'ev.” Ibid.

26. Ibid.

27. Matich has discussed Minskii's involvement in Romantic triangulation with Zinaida Gippius and others. According to Matich, “Minskii viewed courtly love—typically unconsummated and antiprocreative—as the secular equivalent of Christian celibacy.” Olga Matich, *Erotic Utopia: The Decadent Imagination in Russia's Fin De Siècle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007), 229.

28. “Uvy, zabyl ia tikhiiu golos Pedro. / Privychka . . . styd . . . pridvornye zabavy . . . / Ia byl odin . . . Menia neslo techen'e . . . / I nakazal Gospod' menia.” Nikolai Minskii, “Osada Tul'china,” 144.

29. Isidore Singer and Cyrus Adler, *The Jewish Encyclopedia: A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls, 1907), 147.

30. Ismar Schorsch, “The Myth of Sephardic Supremacy,” *The Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* (Jan. 1, 1989), vol. 34, no. 1: 47–66.



31. *Ibid.*, 47.

32. *Ibid.*, 48. Schorsch writes, “[T]he Prague polymath David Gans in his historical chronicle *Zemah David* [The Shoot of David], of 1592, betrayed an unmistakable sense of Ashkenazic superiority by dryly juxtaposing the Sephardic tendency to convert in times of persecution with the alleged Ashkenazic resolve to embrace martyrdom.”

33. Moreover, Kastro is willing to commit adultery in hopes that if he offers himself to the duchess (who claims to have fallen in love with him) she will halt the Poles’ imminent betrayal of the Jews of Tul’chyn. (The duke arrives to find him propositioning his wife.)

34. “O, brat’ia! / Kuda vedet vas etot inozemets? / Sovetuet on ruki vam podniat’ / Na tridtsat’ znatnykh shliakhtichei s ikh strazhei. / Odumaites! Kol’ zamysel udastsia, / Sebia s det’mi spasete lish’ na vremia, / No chto togda zhdet v Pol’she nash narod?” Nikolai Minskii, “Osada Tul’china,” 188.

35. Hannover [Hanover], *Bogdan Khmel’nitskii*, 41–42.

36. Kostomarov does not discuss Rabbi Aaron’s warnings but rather gives the Jews the voice of prophecy: “esli vy nas pogubite, to sami propadete. Kazaki ne takoi narod . . . Vspomnite nashe slovo, da pozdno: oni i vas pereb’iut!” He goes on to say that the Jews continued to resist the Cossacks: “Eta voina prodolzhalas’ tri dnia, poka gaidamaki istrebili ikh ot malago do bol’shago.” Nikolai Ivanovich Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel’nitskii* (St. Petersburg: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa D. E. Kozhanchikova, 1859), 164.

37. “O, dokazhite raz khot’, chto vy—liudi! / Eshche ne pozdno. Mozhem zashchishchar’sia . . . / V poslednii raz vzyvaiu! Kto so mnoi, Pust’ tot, kak i ia, podnimet ruku k nebu.” Nikolai Minskii, “Osada Tul’china,” 190.

38. “Kto ot zhidovstva khochet ostupit’sia / I krest chestnoi na sheiu vozlozhit’, / Pust’ vyidet k nam i stanet pod khorugv’iu, i budet on svoboden i, kak brata, / Ego dobrom i khlebom nadelim.” *Ibid.*, 193.

39. “Neskol’ko tysiach chelovek dobrovol’no priniali smert’ za svoiu national’nuu tselost’, umerli ne menee muzhestvenno, chem Ostap, i, veroiatno, s tem zhe krikom na ustakh: ‘Bat’ko, gde ty? Slyshish’ li ty vse eto? No uvy!—Bat’ko, nebsenyi Bat’ko izbrannago naroda ne otvetil, podobno Tarasu: ‘slyshu.’” Nikolai Minskii, *Pri svete sovesti: Mysli i mechy o iseli zhizni*, 1890, 51.

40. For a more thorough discussion of Mikeshin’s design and monument, see my introduction to this volume.

41. Faith Hillis, “Ukrainophile Activism and Imperial Governance in Russia’s Southwestern Borderlands,” 315; Hillis cites Mikhail Mikeshin, “Mikeshin to Iuzefovich, 19 February 1869,” Feb. 19, 1869, f. 873, op. 1, d. 48, r. 30 ob., TsDIAK.

42. Maxim Shrayer, *An Anthology of Jewish-Russian Literature: 1801–1953* (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 2007), 83–84.

43. Nikolai M. Minskii, *Pri svete sovesti*, 51.

44. He continues, “Two peoples, strangers by all appearances, came together in what was sacred, not because this was advantageous to them, not due to other considerations, but due to the unity of their spiritual composition.” [“Dva naroda, chuzhdye vo vsem vneshnem, slilis’ v svoem zavetnom, ne potomu chto eto bylo im vygodno, ne vslედstvie raznykh soobrazhenii, a vslედstvie odinakovosti svoego dushevnago stroia.”] *Ibid.*, 51, 52.

45. In an 1884 article in the Kiev paper *Zaria*, he wrote that “a poet should not permit any utilitarian considerations to influence him, and that the public could demand of poetry only aesthetic pleasure.” Maslenikov, *The Frenzied Poets*, 10; Nikolai Leont’evich Brodskii, *Literaturnye manifesty ot simvolizma k Oktiabriu: sbornik materialov* (Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929), 3–5.

46. Hannover [Hanover], *Abyss of Despair*, 53.

47. Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), 51. Yerushalmi cites Yom Tob Lipmann Heller, who ordained that medieval *selihot* be recited for the victims of 1648, in commemoration of both the Khmelnytsky massacres and the victims of the Crusades. See Yerushalmi, 49–52. Yerushalmi cites A. M. Habermann, “Piyyutav ve-shirav shel Rabbi Yom Tob Lipmann Heller,” in *Lekhvod Yom Tov*, ed. Y. L. Hacoen Maimon (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1956), 125ff.

48. Gil Ribak briefly discusses “Der giber” in *Gentile New York: The Images of Non-Jews Among Jewish Immigrants* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012), 45.

49. Avrom Reisin mentions Asch in the context of literary gatherings in the early 1900s in his 1929 memoir, *Epizodn fun mayn lebn* (Episodes from my Life), 306–307. Kalman Weiser has written that “Tsevi Prylucki played host in his home on Długa Street in 1906 to literary ‘Friday evenings’ (‘fraytiktsunakhtsn’) attended regularly by Y. L. Peretz, Dr. Gershon Levin, Dr. Meshoyrer, H. D. Nomborg, Avrom Reisin, Sholem Asch, and other prominent Jewish writers and intellectuals. It was custom that authors present at the meal read aloud from their newest literary works—an occasion which often resulted in sharp critiques and arguments.” Weiser, *Jewish People, Yiddish Nation: Noah Prylucki and the Folkists in Poland* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2011), 58.

50. Sholem Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648* (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 168–169.

51. *Ibid.*, 169.

52. Sholem Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648* (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 175; Yiddish: Sholem Asch, “Kidesh hashem,” in *Gezamelte Shriftn*, vol. 12, 2nd ed. (New York: Sholem Ash Komitet, 1923), 185. Translation modified by author.

53. “O, got, hob rakhmones! . . . its ts veys ikh. Ikh hob dikh derkent. Du bist a heylige, du bist a getlikhe. Ikh hob dikh in tserkve gezen. Oyf n heyliken bild hob ikh dikh gezen. Ikh veys its t o, ikh zindiger mensh. Derbarem dikh, derbarem dikh!—hot der goy geshtamelt.” Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem*, 177. Translation modified by author. Yiddish: Asch, “Kidesh hashem,” 185.

54. The Hebrew poet Shaul Tchernichovski would later borrow the same episode for his 1924 poem “Daughter of the Rabbi” (Bat ha-Rav). Tchernichovski devotes much of the poem to the sexuality of the girl (in this case a rabbi’s daughter), and the Cossacks’ lust for her.

55. Sholem Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648* (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 183; Yiddish: Sholem Asch, “Kidesh hashem,” in *Gezamelte Shriftn*, vol. 12, 2nd ed. (New York: Sholem Ash Komitet, 1923), 195.

56. Here, Minskii seems to be borrowing from Kostomarov rather than from Hannover. In Kostomarov’s account, having reassured the Polish nobility that they are safe and can celebrate, the Cossacks eventually join Prince Chetvertynsky at his table. After much drink-

ing and arguing, a new group of Cossacks enter, and they “toporom otrubil emu golovu” (sawed off Chetvertynsky’s head). Kostomarov, *Sobranie sochinenii N. I. Kostomarova*, 166. Kostomarov further notes that Ostap did not merely take Chetvertynsky’s wife as bounty but married her, a story that Didytskii also reports in his contemporaneous Ukrainian account of the episode. Bohdan A. Didytskii, in his *Narodnaia Istoriia Rusi*, notes the craftiness (*khitrostiui*) with which Ganzha (Krivonos’s right-hand man) occupied the guarded fortress of Nestervar (Tul’chyn), adding that Ostap Pavliuka not only killed all of the nobility but married the duchess. Bogdan A. Didytskii, *Narodnaia istoriia Rusi: Ot nachala do noveishikh vremen: Poslia nailuchshikh istorikov*, vol. 3 (Stavropihiiskii, 1870), 41.

57. Plokhly notes that, particularly in the early stages of the uprising, it was not uncommon for the rebels to attack Orthodox nobles as well as Catholics. Religious distinctions would later become a more integrated part of the Cossacks’ political agenda. “It is quite clear that when robbery was involved, the insurgent peasants and burghers made little distinction between the possessions of the Catholic and Orthodox clergy. Evidence of this is to be found in Khmelnytsky’s proclamations intended to stop insurgent attacks on Orthodox monasteries.” Serhii Plokhly, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 180–181.

58. Kellman has commented on the parallels Asch may have been drawing between *Kiddush ha-Shem*, which he wrote as a relative newcomer to New York, and the danger of relying on a non-Jewish leadership American Jews faced as outsiders. Ellen Kellman, “Power, Powerlessness, and the Jewish Nation in Sholem Asch’s *Af Kidesh haShem*,” in *Sholem Asch Reconsidered*, ed. Nanette Stahl (New Haven, CT: Beinecke, 2004), 107.

59. Asch, *Kiddush ha-Shem*, 195.

60. Anita Norich, *Discovering Exile: Yiddish and Jewish American Culture During the Holocaust* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 92.

61. Matthew B. Hoffman, “Sholem Asch’s True Christians: The Jews as a People of Christs,” in *Sholem Asch Reconsidered*, ed. Nanette Stahl (New Haven, CT: Beinecke, 2004), 281.

## Chapter 8. Hanukkah Cossack Style

1. *Kovets ha-Shomer* (Tel Aviv: Labour Archives, 1938), xii–xiii.
2. Alexander Zaid, *Lifnot boker, pirke yoman* (At Dawn, Chapters from a Diary) (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1975 [Hebrew]), 18.
3. Ibid.
4. Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, *Zikhronot u-reshumot* (Essays and Reminiscences) (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, 1966 [Hebrew]), 27–28.
5. *Sefer Kalarash* (The Book of Kalarash) (Tel Aviv: Arieli Press, 1966 [Hebrew]), 128.
6. Shmuel Ettinger, “Reka ide’ologi la-sifrut ha-antisemit be-Rus’ya,” in id., *Ha-antisemi’yut ba-et ha-hadashah* (Modern Anti-Semitism) (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Po’alim, 1978 [Hebrew]), 99–144.
7. Moshe Mishkinsky, *Tyunim ba-sotsyalizm ha-yehudi* (Studies in Jewish Socialism), (Be’er Sheva: The Ben-Gurion Institute for the Study of Israel and Zionism, 2004 [Hebrew]), 1–23, 88–101, 204–255.

8. *Kovets ha-Shomer*, 425.
9. Zaid, *Lifnot boker*, 20.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*
12. Ben Zion Dinur, ed., *Sefer toldot ha-Haganah* (History of the Haganah), vol. 1, book 2 (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, IDF, 1965 [Hebrew]), 812–813.
13. Avraham Krinitzi, *Be-koakh ha-ma'ase* (In the Virtue of Action) (Tel Aviv: Masada, 1950 [Hebrew]), 26. See also 19–20.
14. On the restoration of Jewish heroes of antiquity in the Zionist mind, see Shmuel Almog, *Tsiyonut ve-historyah* (Zionism and History) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982 [Hebrew]), 78–86.
15. Yossi Ben-Artzi, *Ha-moshavah ha-'Ivrit be-nof Erets Yisra'el* (Jewish *Moshava* Settlements in Eretz-Israel 1882–1914) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1988 [Hebrew]), 180.
16. Yitzhak Nadav, *Zikhronot ish "Hashomer"* (Memoirs of a Hashomer Member) (Tel Aviv: Misrad ha-Bitahon, 1986 [Hebrew]), 23.
17. Mania and Israel Shochat, *Igrot ve-zikhronot* (Letters and Memories) (Kfar Gil'adi, 1971 [Hebrew]), 5.
18. Dinur, *Sefer toldot ha-Haganah*, 236.
19. Zaid, *Lifnot boker*, 62.
20. *Kovets ha-Shomer*, 436.
21. Rachel Yanait, *Bar Kokhba* (Jerusalem, 1909 [Hebrew]), 12.
22. *Ibid.*, 16.
23. *Id.*, *Anu 'olim* (We Ascend) (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1969 [Hebrew]), 149.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Kovets ha-Shomer*, 337.
26. Ben Zvi, *Zikhronot u-reshumot*, 154.
27. *Ibid.*, 315–338.
28. See, for example, Nadav, *Zikhronot*, 100. Michael Halperin even spoke of the Trans-Jordanian Bedouins as potential fathers of “a Jewish race similar to that of the Zaporozhian Cossacks”! He urged a group of his young followers in Palestine to travel across the Jordan and to marry there Bedouin girls (Krinitzi, *Be-koakh ha-ma'ase*, 19–20).
29. Yitzhak Epstein, “She'elah ne'elamah” (Hidden Question), *ha-Shiloah*, (1907–08), vol. 17: 193–205. For a detailed analysis of Epstein's article and its impact on the Zionist mind, see Anita Shapira, *Land and Power: The Zionist Resort to Force, 1881–1948* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 45–66.
30. Yiga'el, “Bi-yমে kibbush” (In Days of Conquest), *Kovets ha-Shomer*, 93–94.
31. Israel Bartal, “On Top of a Volcano: Jewish-Ukrainian Co-existence as Depicted in Modern East European Jewish Literature,” in Peter. J. Potichney and Howard Aster, eds., *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1988), 309–325.
32. Jonathan Frankel, “The ‘Yizkor’ Book of 1911—A Note on National Myths in the Second Aliya,” in Hedva Ben Israel et al., eds., *Religion, Ideology and Nationalism in Europe*

and America, *Essays Presented in Honor of Yehoshua Arieli* (Jerusalem, 1986), 355–384; Yosef Gorni, “Ha-yesod ha-romanti ba-ideolog’ya shel ha-aliyah ha-shni’ya” (The Romantic Element in the Ideology of the Second ‘Aliya), *Asupot* (1966), vol. 10: 55–74.

33. On pre-modern Jewish politics of survival in Eastern Europe, see Elli Lederhandler, *The Road to Modern Jewish Politics* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 21–35.

34. For a detailed analysis of the Second Aliyah immigrants’ attempt in “revolutionizing” their erotic experience, see David Biale, *Eros and the Jews: From Biblical Israel to Modern America* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1997), 182–200.

35. See, for example, Zvi Nadav’s memoirs (*Kovets ha-Shomer*, 501).

36. Israel Bartal, *Kozak u-Bedvi* (Cossack and Beduine) (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2007 [Hebrew]), 52–67.

37. See the Palestinian equestrian’s war games depicted by veteran *shomrim* (*Kovets ha-Shomer*, 438).

## Chapter 9. The Cult of Strength

1. Oleksandr Zaitsev, “Sakralizatsiia natsii: Dmytro Dontsov i OUN,” 228. In Oleksandr Zaitsev, Oleh Behen, and Vasyl Stefaniv, *Natsionalizm i religiiia: Hreko-Katolytska Tserkva ta ukrainskyi natsionalistychnyi rukh u Halychyni (1920–1930–ti roky)* (Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainkoho Katolytskoho Universytetu, 2011).

2. For a recent discussion of Ukrainian integral nationalism, see Oleksandr Zaitsev, “Ukrainian Integral Nationalism in Quest of a ‘Special Path’ (1920s–1930s),” *Russian Politics and Law* (2013), vol. 51, no. 5: 11–32.

3. Dmytro Dontsov, *Natsionalizm* (Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Nove Zhyttia, 1926), 29.

4. *Ibid.*, 33–34.

5. Mykhailo Ostroverkha, *Musolini* (Lviv: Vistnyk, 1934), 4.

6. Volodymyr Martynets, *Ukrainske pidpillia vid U.V.O. do O.U.N. Spohady i materialy do peredistorii ta istorii ukrainskoho orhanizovanoho natsionalizmu* (Winnipeg: Ukrainian National Federation, 1949), 286.

7. Daria Rebet, “Natsionalistychna molod I molodechyi natsionalizm,” 492. In Yurii Boiko, ed., *Ievhen Konovalets tai oho doba* (Munich: Vydannia fundatsii im. Ievhena Konvaltsia), 1974.

8. Yurii Lypa, “Selianskyi korol,” *Kurier Kryvbasu* (September 1997), 85–86: 114.

9. Ievhen Malaniuk, “Yurii Lypa—poet,” 622. In Mykola Ilnytskyi, ed., *Poety prazkoi shkoly: Sribni surmy: Antolohiia* (Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2009). (Orig. *Nashe zhyttia* 1947, 7.)

10. Yurii Lypa, *Kozaky v Moskovii: Roman iz XVII stolittia* (Warsaw: Narodnii stiah, 1934), 216.

11. Yurii Lypa, *Pryznachennia Ukrainy* (2 facsimile ed.) (New York: Hoverlia, 1953), 184. (Orig. Lviv: Nakaldom Vydavnychoi Kooperatyvy “Khortytsia,” 1938).

12. *Ibid.*, 300.

13. *Ibid.*, 125.

14. *Ibid.*, 294, 298.

15. *Ibid.*, 259.

16. *Ibid.*, 278.
17. Dmytro Dontsov, “Vony i my,” *Vistnyk* (1936), vol. 5: 384.
18. *Ibid.*, 358.
19. Lypa, *Pryznachennia*, 197.
20. *Ibid.*, 21, 242.
21. *Ibid.*, 188.
22. *Ibid.*, 211.
23. *Ibid.*, 257–258.
24. Yurii Kosach, *Rubikon Khmel'nyts'koho: Povist'* (Cracow-Lviv: Ukrain's'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943), 4.
25. Yurii Sherekh [Shevelov], “Proshchannia z uchora (‘Koly zh pryde spravzhnii den?’),” 212, 220. In *Proza pro inshykh: Yurii Kosach: Teksty, interpretatsii, komentari*, ed. Vira Aheieva (Kyiv: Fakt, 2003), 209–253. (Orig. pub. 1952.)
26. Semen Ordivsky's novels are *Chorna ihumenia: Istorychna povist z XVII st.* (The Black Abbess: A Historical Novel of the XVII century, 1939), *Sribnyi cherep: Istorychna povist* (Silver Scull: A Historical Novel, 1938, 1942), and *Bahrianyi khrest: Istorychna povist iz 1657 roku* (Red Cross: A Historical Novel of 1657, 1941).
27. Semen Ordivsky, *Sribnyi cherep: Istorychna povist* (Winnipeg: Manitoba, 1942), 120. (Orig. pub. 1938.)
28. Panas Fedenko, *Homonila Ukraina . . . Epopeia z doby Bohdana Khmelnytskoho* (Ukraine was humming) (Prague: Vydavnytstvo Yurii Tyshchenka, 1942). This is an epic novel from the era of Bohdan Khmelnytsky.
29. In the novel, although Khmelnytsky wins the three key victories, it is Kryvonis who sacks towns and slaughters the Poles and Jews. Khmelnytsky says he does not believe in the *chern*, but only in a disciplined army that is ready to fight in winter and in summer. In the end, however, he forgives the insubordination of Kryvonis.
30. Ivan Le's book was published by the Polityvdav (Political Publishers) of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (bolshevik) of Ukraine, with permission to proceed granted on November 23, 1940. It not only contains bloodthirsty scenes (members of the Polish *szlachta* are decapitated and their heads displayed on stakes), but the popular uprising is portrayed as justified by the cruelty of Polish oppression, the role of Ukrainian priests is denounced, as are attempts to negotiate with the Poles.

## Chapter 10. Jews and Soviet Remythologization of the Ukrainian Hetman

1. Albert Seaton, *The Horsemen of the Steppes: The Story of the Cossacks* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1996), 234.
2. Fedor L. Sinitsyn, “Problema national'nogo i internacional'nogo v national'noi politike i propagande v SSSR v 1944–pervoi polovine 1945 goda,” *Rossiiskaia istoriia* (2009), vol. 6: 45. See also Nikolai A. Kirsanov, “Natsional'nye formirovaniia Krasnoi Armii v Velikoi otechestvennoi voine 1941–1945 godov,” *Otechestvennaia istoriia* (1995), vol. 4: 116–126.
3. Vladyslav Hrynevych, “Suspil'no-politychni nastroi naselennia Ukraïny v roky druhoi svitovoi viiny,” *Problemy Istorii Ukraïny* (2004), vol. 16, no. 1: 408.

4. Artashes L. Papikyan, "Do istoriï narodnoho komisariatu oborony Ukraïnskoï RSR (1944–1945)," *Ukraïns'ka national'na ideia* (2008), vol. 20: 110.
5. Vladyslav Hrynevych, "Do pitannia pro Ukraïnskyiadians'kyi kulturnytskyi nationalizm u roky nimetsko-radian'skoï viiny 1941–1945," *Problemy Istorii Ukraïny* (2004), vol. 12: 357.
6. V. A. Borisov and G. A. Kolesnikov, "Orden Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo," *Voprosy Istorii* (1981), vol. 5: 178.
7. See, e.g., Serhy Yekelchuk, *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 35–37.
8. Oleksii Honcharenko, "Pereiaslav okupatsiinyi: novi fakty ta naukovi interpretatsiï," *Naukovi Zapysky z Ukraïns'koï Istorii* (2008), vol. 21: 277.
9. Aleksandr Korneichuk [Oleksandr Korniiichuk], "Pereiaslav-Poltava," *Pravda*, Sept. 24, 1943, 2.
10. Andrew Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 93.
11. Andriy Moskalenko, *Khmelnytsky and the Treaty of Pereiaslav in Soviet Historiography* (New York: Research Program on the USSR; Mimeographed Series No. 73, 1955), 10–11.
12. Serhy Yekelchuk, "Stalinist Patriotism as Imperial Discourse: Reconciling the Ukrainian and Russian 'Heroic Pasts', 1939–45," *Kritica: Explorations in Russian and Euroasian History* (2000), vol. 3, no. 1: 52.
13. Jeffrey Veidlinger, *The Moscow State Yiddish Theater: Jewish Culture on the Soviet Stage* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 159–160.
14. Cf. Lowell Tillett, *The Great Friendship: Soviet Historians on the Non-Russian Nationalities* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1969), 51–52.
15. Moskalenko, *Khmelnytsky and the Treaty of Pereiaslav in Soviet Historiography*, 12; Sviatoslav L. Iusov and Natalia M. Iusova, "'Naimen'she zlo' chi vse zhe 'bezumovne blaho'? do problemy shchodo zminennia v 1930-kh rr. otsinky priednannia Ukraïny do Rossii," *Istoriografichni Doslidzhennia v Ukraïni* (2008), vol. 19: 399, 402.
16. Frank Sysyn, "The Changing Image of the Hetman: On the 350th Anniversary of the Khmelnytsky Uprising," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (1998), vol. 46, no. 4: 541; Stephen Velychenko, *Shaping Identity in Eastern Europe and Russia: Soviet-Russian and Polish Accounts of Ukrainian History, 1914–1991* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 193; Natalia M. Iusova and Sviatoslav L. Iusov, "Problema 'priednannia' Ukraïny do Rosii v otsynsi istoriykyv USSR kintsia 30-kh–pershoï polovyny 40-kh rr.," *Ukraïns'kyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal* (2004), vol. 5: 98–104.
17. Aleksandr Korneichuk and Natan Rybak, "Kiev—tsetushchaia stolitsa," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, Dec. 24, 1937, 2. Korniiichuk spoke about Khmelnytsky as a liberator also during the election campaign that made him a member of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; see I. Mar, "Otdam vse svoi sily delu Lenina-Stalina," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, Nov. 20, 1937, 1.
18. Andrew Colin Gow, *Hyphenated Histories: Articulations of Central European Bildung and Slavic Studies in the Contemporary Academy* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 189.
19. Yohanan Petrovsky-Shtern, "Ukrainian Literature," in Gershon D. Hundert, ed., *The YIVO Encyclopedia of Jews in Eastern Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 1939.

20. I. P., “Khronika. Istoricheskaia nauka v SSSR. Zashchita dissertatsii S. Ia. Borovym,” *Istoriĭ-marksist* (1940), vol. 9: 151–153; Alfred A. Greenbaum, “Jewish Historiography in Soviet Russia,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (1959), vol. 28: 72; Saul Borovoi, *Vospominaniia* (Moscow and Jerusalem: Evreiskii universitet v Moskve, 1993), 205–207; Vitalii M. Andreev and Nataliia M. Chermoshentseva, “Saul Borovoi: Zhittia zarady nauky,” *Ukraïns’kyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal* (2009), vol. 4: 151.

21. Henry Abramson, “The Scattering of Amalek: A Model for Understanding the Ukrainian-Jewish Conflict,” *East European Jewish Affairs* (1994), vol. 24, no. 1: 43–44.

22. Vasilii Tokarev, “Vozvrashchenie na p’edestal: istoricheskii kommentarii k fil’mu ‘Bogdan Khmel’nitskii’ (1941),” *Istoriografichni Doslidzhennia v Ukraïni* (2008), vol. 18: 427–455.

23. D. Branderberger and K. Petrone, “‘Vse cherty rasovogo natsionalizma . . .’: Internatsionalist zhaluetsia Stalinu,” *Voprosy Istorii* (2000), vol. 1: 128–133; Yurii V. Krivosheev and Roman A. Sokolov, “Periodicheskaia pechat’ o fil’me ‘Aleksandr Nevskii’ (1938–1939),” *Noveishaia Istoriiia* (2012), vol. 2: 125–126.

24. Borovoi, *Vospominaniia* (Moscow and Jerusalem: Gesharim, 1993), 200–216.

25. Sara Bender, *Jews of Bialystok During World War II and the Holocaust* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2008), 77.

26. Sinitsyn, “Problema national’nogo i internatsional’nogo v national’noi politike i propagande v SSSR v 1944–pervoi polovine 1945 goda,” 45.

27. Mikhail Romm, *Kak v kino: ustnye rasskazy* (Nizhnii Novgorod: Dekom, 2003), 120.

28. “Were a Majority of the Ukrainian Creative Intelligentsia Antisemitic? A Letter of the Head of the NKVD to Nikita Khrushchev in 1943,” introduced and annotated by Mordechai Altshuler, *Jews in Eastern Europe* (2000), vol. 2: 76–85.

29. Gershon Bacon, “‘The House of Hannover’: Gezeirot Tah in Modern Jewish Historical Writing,” *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 196.

30. Zishe Weinper, “Ven kozak oyfn ferd iz gekumen tsum Dnyepyr,” *Morgn-Frayhayt*, Nov. 6, 1943, 3, 1.

31. See Gennady Estraiĭkh, “Yidn un kozakn,” *Forverts*, May 18, 2007, 11.

32. Mendel Osherowitch, “A shtot in Ukraine oyfn nomen fun pogromshtik Bogdan Khmelnitski,” *Forverts*, Oct. 23, 1943, 2: 5; Oct. 25, 1943, 2: 6.

33. Mendel Osherowitch, “300 yor rusishe hershaft iber Ukraine,” *Forverts*, Jan. 30, 1954, 3.

34. YIVO. Papers of Mendel Osherowitch RG 725, box 19, folder 6.61. Salo W. Baron, whose 1929 appointment as professor at Columbia University became a landmark in studying Jewish history at the American academia, wrote in a short bibliographical note published in *Jewish Social Studies* that Vernadsky seemed “not to have taken into account the various contemporary sources relating to” the “Jew-baiting aspects” of “the Cossack upheaval.” “The half-dozen references to Jews in the book deal only with well-known generalities.” S. W. B., “George Vernadsky. Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine,” *Jewish Social Studies* (1942), vol. 4: 286.

35. “An entfער oyf a kritik un an entfער oyf an entfער,” *Forverts*, Sept. 20, 1942, 2: 5.



36. Mendel Osherowitch, "A shtot in Ukrayne oyfn nomen fun pogromshtik Bogdan Khmelnitski," *Forverts*, Oct. 23, 1943, 2: 5; Oct. 25, 1943, 2: 6.
37. Shaul Stampfer, "What Actually Happened to the Jews of Ukraine in 1648?" *Jewish History* (2003), vol. 17, no. 2: 222.
38. YIVO Archive, Papers of Mendel Osherowitch, RG 725, box 4, folder 1. 293.
39. *Ibid.*
40. "Soviet Renames Pereyaslav," *New York Times*, Oct. 13, 1943, 9.
41. "Khmelnitsky, the Hero," *New Republic*, Nov. 1, 1943, 605.
42. "A Cossack 'Hero,'" *Jewish Chronicle* (London), Nov. 5, 1943, 10. See also "The Chmielnitski Order," published in the same issue, 6.
43. *Birobidjan and the Jews in the Post War World* (New York: Ambijan, 1943), 18.
44. "A Cossack 'Hero.'"
45. Karel C. Berkhoff, *Motherland in Danger: Soviet Propaganda During World War II* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 267.
46. David Engel, *Facing a Holocaust: The Polish Government-in-Exile and the Jews, 1943–1945* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 103.
47. "A Cossack 'Hero.'"
48. See, e.g., Alexander Werth, *Russia at War, 1941–1945* (New York: Dutton, 1964), 743; Iakov Eidel'man, *Nezakonchennyye dialogi* (Moscow and Jerusalem: Geshtarim, 2000), 19.
49. Lazar Fagelman, "Di sovetishe yidn un di amerikaner yidn," *Forverts*, July 12, 1943, 4.
50. Iusova and Iusov, "Problema 'prednannia' Ukraïny do Rosiï v otsintsii istoriykiv USSR kintsia 30-kh–pershoï polovyny 40-kh rr.," 110.
51. Borisov and Kolesnikov, "Orden Bogdana Khmel' nits'kogo," 180; Semen Averbukh, *Nasytilis' my prezreniem . . .* (Kyiv: Glavnaia spetsializirovannaia redaktsiia literatury na iazykakh natsional'nykh men'shinstv, 2000), 442.
52. Boris Slutskii, *O druz'iaakh i o sebe* (Moscow: Vagrius, 2005), 120–122.
53. Gennady Estraiikh, "Jews as Cossacks: A Symbiosis in Literature and Life," in Harriet Murav and Gennady Estraiikh, eds., *Soviet Jews and World War II: Fighting, Witnessing, Remembering* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2014), 85–103.
54. Der Nister, *Regrowth: Seven Tales of Jewish Life Before, During, and After Nazi Occupation*. Translated from the Yiddish by Erik Butler (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2011), 148, 153.
55. Henry Sapoznik, *Klezmer! Jewish Music from Old World to Our World* (New York: Schirmer, 1999), 10.

## Chapter 11. On the Other Side of Despair

1. The highly contradictory and sometimes enigmatic biography of Yuri Kosach (1909–1990) has not yet been written. For some key details, see Bohdan Boychuk and Bohdan Rubchak, eds., *Koordynaty: antolohia suchasnoi ukrains'koi poezii na zakhodi*, 2 vols. (Munich: Suchasnist', 1969), 2: 87–92. Although several key works of Kosach appeared in print in pre–World War II Western Ukraine (then Poland) or after World War II in the Diaspora, some of his key works are still to be rediscovered and uncovered in the archives. On Kosach's attitude toward his manuscripts, see Marko Robert Stech, "Dmytro

Bortnians'kyi u nevidomii p'esi Yurii Kosacha," *Kur'er Kryvbasu*, nos. 1–2 (2012): 275, n. 2.

2. This vision of Kosach's itinerary is entirely my hypothesis, which still needs to be substantiated—hopefully, when Kosach's literary output is brought together and published and when solid works on his contribution appear. For some preliminary introductions to Kosach's writings, see Yurii Sherekh, *Druha cherba* (Munich: Suchasnist', 1978), 263–311. Recently Marko Robert Stech discovered a number of unknown, nearly forgotten and unpublished works of Kosach, published them with his prefaces, and wrote several important essays, which hopefully will lead to a major breakthrough in our understanding of this mysterious Ukrainian writer. See Marko Robert Stech, "Yurii Kosach i lehenda Khmel'nyts'koho," *Ukrains'kyi Zhurnal* (Praha, 2009), no. 2: 54; idem., "Yurii Kosach i 'chorna pani'," *Ukrains'kyi Zhurnal* (Praha, 2007), no. 2: 38; idem., "Na dni (pro Yurii Kosacha)," *Literatura Plius* (2003), no. 1 (44): 19.

3. The impact of Lypynsky on the new postwar mentality of the Ukrainians is an issue that has long been a scholarly desideratum. I suggested the preliminary approach to the dichotomy "Dontsov vs. Lypynsky" in Ukrainian thought in my essay "Reconceptualizing the Alien: Jews in Modern Ukrainian Thought," *Ab Imperio* (2003), no. 4: 519–580; see also "Jews in Ukrainian Thought: Between the 1940s and the 1990s," *Ukrainian Quarterly* (Fall–Winter 2004), vol. 60, nos. 3–4: 231–270.

4. See on this subject matter Serhii Plokhly, *Yalta: The Price of Peace* (New York: Penguin Books, 2011).

5. See Yurii Kosach, *Den' hniuvu: povist' pro 1648 rik. I-a chastyna* (Regensburg: Ukrains'ke slovo, 1947), 5–135, hereafter (1: page), both in the body text and in the notes; idem., *Den' hniuvu: povist' pro 1648 rik. II-a chastyna* (Regensburg: Ukrains'ke slovo, 1948), 3–253, hereafter (2: page). I am grateful to Marko R. Stech from the University of Toronto, who helped me obtain a copy of Kosach's novel and provided me with multiple references and rare publications by and on Yurii Kosach.

6. The Soviet treatment of the Ukrainian striving for independence had its definitive impact on the images of Muskovy and the Russians, who are repeatedly described as hypocrites playing a double game with the Polish Crown (see, e.g., 2: 62).

7. Ivan Le, *Khmelnytsky: istorychnyi roman v triokh knyhabkh* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1978). There is a discrepancy as far as the dating of the novel is concerned: at the end of vol. 1 it says "1946–1956," and after vol. 3 it says "1939–1964."

8. Le, *Khmelnytsky* (1978), vol. 1: 31–32, 67, 72, 118, 265, 282; vol. 2: 304.

9. *Ibid.*, vol. 1: 61, 124, 255.

10. *Ibid.*, vol. 1: 192–193, 196–197, 401, 412; vol. 2: 9, 42, 161, 215; vol. 3: 74.

11. *Ibid.*, vol. 1: 223–224, 270; vol. 2: 105, 271.

12. For the xenophobic, anti-Western and anti-Turkish stance of this novel, written in the early years of the Cold War, see Natan Rybak, *Tvory v p'iaty tomakh* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1981), vol. 1: 37–38 (Poles), vol. 1: 195–196 (Venetian Republic), vol. 1: 140–141, 165–169, 238–252 (Tartars and Ottoman Turks), and vol. 2: 553–558 (the West in general).

13. Yurii Kosach, *Sontse v Chyhyryni (povist' pro dekabrystiv na Ukraini)* (Lviv Ivan Tyktor, 1934), 23–24, 27 (anonymous Jewish messenger), 68–70 (Epelbaum), 92–99 (Ko-

zlynsky). On Maiboroda, see Patrick O'Meara, *The Decembrist Pavel Pestel: Russia's First Republican* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 34, 96, 144, 152–171; on Kozlinsky, see CAHJP, HM2/9479.1 (TsDIAU, f. 444, op. 1, spr. 8, “Po donosam otlichivshegosia v razoblachenii falshivomonetchikov kuptsa Sh[liomy] Kozlinskogo o kontrabandnoi torgovle evreiami m. Nemirov,” 1822–1828), 1–26, 52, 106.

14. See Yurii Kosach, “Hlukhivs'ka pani: istorychne opovidannia,” *Kur'er Kryvasu*, (2012), no. 9–10: 227–265; also see Marko Robert Stekh's preface to this publication, entitled “Yurii Kosach pro liudei staroi Ukrainy,” *ibid.*, 223–227.

15. See Yurii Kosach, “Diistvo pro Yuriiia-Peremozhtsia,” *Kur'er Kryvasu* (2012), no. 11–12: 171–226; see here also Marko Robert Stekh, “Y Poshukakh ‘Ukrains'koho Hamleta,” in *ibid.*, 156–158.

16. See Edward Fram, “Creating a Tale of Martyrdom in Tulczyn, 1648,” in Elisheva Carlebach, John Efron, and David N. Myers, eds., *Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Hanover, NH: New England University Press, 1998), 89–112; Gershon Bacon, “‘The House of Hannover’: *Gezeirot Tah* in modern Jewish historical writing,” *Jewish History* (2003), no. 17: 179–206; Adam Teller, “Jewish Literary Responses to the Events of 1648–1649 in the Creation of a Polish-Jewish Consciousness,” in Benjamin Nathans and Gabriella Safran, eds., *Culture Front: Representing Jews in Eastern Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 17–45.

17. Joel Sirkes, *She'elot u-teshuvot ha-Bayit hadash ha-yeshonot*, resp. 70.

18. A. Ia. Garkavi, “Evrei-kazaki v nachale XVII v.,” in *Kievskaia Starina* (1890), no. 5: 377–379. Kosach prefaces his reference to this publication by saying: “For the Jews—Ukrainian patriots in the 17th century, see among others (*khoch by i*) *Kievskaia Starina*, 1890, kn. 5, ‘Evrei-kazaki’. Tymofiiiv. ‘Zhydy i narodne hospodarstvo Ukrainy’. Akty lu[go] Z[apadnoi] R[ossii]. 1648.” For the first publication, see Yurii Kosach, *Diistvo pro Yuriiia-Peremozhtsia: trahediia* (Regensburg: Ukrains'ke slovo, 1947), 5. Reprinted in *Kur'er Kryvasu* (2012), nos. 11–12: 171–226, here 173.

19. Saul Borovyi, “Ievrei v Zaporozhs'kii Sichi,” in *Pratsi Instytutu ievreis'koi kultury VUAN* (Kyiv: Vseukrains'ka Akademiia Nauk, 1930); reprinted in translation with corrections in “Evrei v Zaporozhskoi Sechi (po materialam sechevogo arkhiva),” *Istoricheskii sbornik* (Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk, 1934), vol. 1: 141–190; reprinted in Saul Borovoi, ed., *Evreiskie khroniki XVII stoletia: (epokha “khemel'nichiny”)* (Moskva: Gesharim, 1997), 205–250; Borovoi quotes and criticizes Harkavy for journalistic sensationalism, see *ibid.*, 214.

20. See Rybak, *Tvory*, vol. 2: 354–355.

## Chapter 12. Khmelnytsky in Motion

1. Natalia Jakowenko, *Historia Ukrainy od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVII wieku* (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000), 217.

2. Volodymyr Kravchenko, “Czy Bohdan Chmielnicki był dobrym Ukraińcem?” In *Po co Sniekiewicz?* Tadeusz Bujnicki and Jerzy Axer, eds. (Warszawa: OBTA, 2007), 332.

3. Sergei Kapterev, “Some Notes on the War Cinema of Igor Savchenko” (forthcoming from kinokultura.org). The authors thank Dr. Kapterev for kindly sharing the text with them.

4. Evgenii Dobrenko refers to the biographical films as “the metagenre of Stalinist cinema.” Evgenii Dobrenko, *Stalinist Cinema and the Production of History: Museum of the Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 65.

5. Dobrenko, 66. The same author points out a curious blending of film fiction with real life: “There is not a single Soviet decoration, for which there was not a corresponding film. [ . . . ] The Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky was introduced . . . on the eve of the liberation of Ukraine (in the second half of 1943).” Dobrenko, 68.

6. Vasilii Tokarev, “‘Kara panam!’ Pol’skaia tema v predvoennom kino (1939–41 gg),” in Sergei Sekirinskii, ed., *Istoriia strany/Istoriia kino* (Moscow: Znak, 2004), 147–148.

7. Marci Shore, *Caviar and Ashes: A Warsaw Generation’s Life and Death in Marxism, 1918–1968* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 159.

8. Dobrenko, 69–70.

9. Many thanks to Marci Shore for sharing this information with us. She mentions the opera in “Czysto Babski: A Women’s Friendship in a Man’s Revolution,” *East European Politics and Societies* (Winter 2002), vol. 16, no. 3: 851.

10. Thanks to Judith Kornblatt for pointing out some of these discursive continuities in her comments to an earlier version of this chapter, presented at the Khmelnytsky symposium at UC San Diego in May 2012.

11. Nikolai Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel’nitskii* (St. Petersburg: Izd. D. E. Kozhanchikova, 1859).

12. *Ibid.*, vol. I, 60.

13. *Ibid.*, vol. I, 290.

14. *Ibid.*, vol. II, 206.

15. Janusz Kaczmarczyk, *Bogdan Chmielnicki* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988), 39.

16. We use the electronic edition of Jeremiah Curin’s translation when quoting Sienkiewicz. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/37027/37027-h/37027-h.htm>.

17. Elżbieta Ostrowska, “Desiring the Other: The Ambivalent Polish Self in Novel and Film,” *Slavic Review* (Fall 2011), vol. 70, no. 3: 503–523.

18. Both men were historical figures as well, but Sienkiewicz took greater liberties in filling their biographies with fictional detail.

19. We would like to thank prof. Piotr Wandycz for sharing his thoughts about Sienkiewicz’s Khmelnytsky in conversations with us.

20. Curin I.

21. Ewa Mazierska, *Polish Postcommunist Cinema: From Pavement Level* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007), 89.

22. *Ogniem i mieczem*, [film Polski.pl](http://film Polski.pl).

23. The first version of the script was cowritten by Hoffman and Jarosław Szymkiewicz. The film was based on the ninth, revised version written by the director himself.

24. Ewa Hauser, “Reconstruction of National Identity: Poles and Ukrainians Among Others in Jerzy Hoffman’s Film *With Fire and Sword*,” *Polish Review* (2000), vol. 45, no. 3: 308.

25. Yurii Andrukhovych, “Zabavi z vognem i mechem,” *Krytyka*, Rik III (1999), vol. 9, no. 23: 29–31.

26. Yurii Tarnawsky, "With Camera and Actors: Reflections of a Ukrainian on Jerzy Hoffman's "With Fire and Sword," *Polish Review* (2000), vol. 45, no. 3: 324.

27. Tarnawsky, 323.

28. Vitaliy Leshchinsky, "Kto daet den'gi na kino?" *Den'* (July 13, 2002), no. 124. <http://www.day.kiev.ua/290619?idsource=69206&mainlang=rus>.

29. Mariana Zakusilo, "Roksolany-2 uvidiat rossianie, ukrainci i turki," *Rabochaya gazeta* (Apr. 4, 2006), no. 50. <http://rg.kiev.ua/pages/article903/>.

30. Victor Girzhov, "Interview with Mykola Mashchenko," *Den'* (Sept. 24, 2009). <http://www.day.kiev.ua/258101/>. Oleksandr Bezruchko, "Interview with Mykola Mashchenko," *Kino-Teatr* (2005), no. 1. [http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show\\_content.php?id=376;](http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=376;) Nellie Protorskaya, "Interview with Yurii Il'enko," *Nezavisimaya gazeta* (Mar. 9, 2003). [http://www.ng.ru/culture/2003-05-29/6\\_poltava.html](http://www.ng.ru/culture/2003-05-29/6_poltava.html); Yanina Sokolovskaya, "Interview with Yurii Il'enko," *Izvestiya* (May 15, 2002). <http://izvestia.ru/news/261775#ixzz28LVgD8Zn>.

31. Responding to the film, the Russian Minister of Culture Mikhail Shvydkoy declared, "The Ministry of Culture consider(ed) the film to be anti-Russian and, in a certain sense, distorting the history of Russian and Ukrainian relations." See Andrey Malosolov, *RIA Novosti* (July 4, 2002). <http://ria.ru/politics/20020704/186331.html?id=04/07/2002>.

32. Ihor Hrabovich, "Simptomi Bohdana-Zinoviya Khmelnytskogo," *Suchasnist'*. <http://www.screenplay.com.ua/critics/?id=27>.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Oleksandr Bezruchko, "Mykola Mashchenko: poshuki vlasnoi temperaturi dushi," *Kino-Teatr* (2005), no. 1. [http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show\\_content.php?id=376](http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=376).

38. Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 102.

39. Olga Kungurtseva, "Interview with Nicholai Mashchenko," *Bul'var* (Dec. 7, 2004), no. 49: 476.

40. Oleksandr Bezruchko, "Mykola Mashchenko: poshuki vlasnoi temperaturi dushi," *Kino-Teatr* (2005), no. 1. [http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show\\_content.php?id=376](http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=376).

41. Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes Toward a Historical Poetics," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), 84.

42. Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as Socially Symbolic Act* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), 102.

43. Jameson, 104.

## Afterword

1. Judith Deutsch Kornblatt, *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), ix.

2. See the Introduction, 11.

3. See Chapter 5, 89–109.

4. Emphasis added. N. V. Gogol', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo

Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1937–1952), vol. II: 46 and 47. See Kornblatt, 43–46, for a discussion of “The Russification of Gogol’s Cossacks.”

5. See Chapter 8, 139–152.
6. See Chapter 6, 120.
7. See Chapter 10, 180.
8. See Chapter 1, 23–35.
9. See Chapter 12, 197–217.
10. See Chapter 4, 87.
11. See Chapter 9, 153–165.
12. See Chapter 3, 47–59.
13. See Chapter 2, 43, 46.
14. See Chapter 11, 183.
15. See Chapter 7, 127–138.
16. Gogol, II : 131–132.



## Bibliography of Source Texts on the Khmelnytsky Uprisings

This bibliography, compiled in collaboration with Professor Taras Koznarsky, details key works of literature, folklore, and early historiography featuring Bohdan Khmelnytsky. We have aimed to create a comprehensive list of primary works going beyond those explored in this volume. These works include chronicles written in a variety of languages in the immediate aftermath of the 1648 Cossack uprising, literary and folkloric accounts from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, early histories that include Khmelnytsky, important translations of early documents, and more recent literary texts about the uprising.

*Stories of Khmelnytsky* is an attempt to demonstrate the value of considering one charismatic and contentious figure across a variety of literary cultures and epochs. The number of works that take up the figure of Khmelnytsky is indeed vast, and this volume has only scratched the surface. Therefore, we have restricted this briefly annotated list to key literary and early historiographical texts, omitting recent scholarly discussions of the Khmelnytsky era. Our aim in providing this bibliography is to assist future scholars in further research into literary representations of the hetman.

Avraham ben Shmuel Ashkenazi. *Tsar bat rabim* (Sorrows of the many). In Hayyim Jonah Gurland, ed., *Le-Korot ha-gezerot 'al Yisra'el*. Vol. 2. Cracow, 1889. (Contemporaneous Hebrew chronicle.)

Agnon, Shmuel Yosef. *Ir u-meloah* (The city and the fullness thereof). Jerusalem: Schocken, 1973. (Novel about the Jews of the city of Buchach.)

Antonovych, Volodymyr, and Mykhailo Drahomanov, eds. *Istoriicheskie pesni malorusskogo naroda* (Historical songs of the Little Russian people). 2 vols. Kyiv: Tip. M. P. Fritsa, 1874–75.

Asch, Sholem. *Kidesh hashem: Naye ertseylungen* (Kiddush ha-Shem: New stories). Warsaw: Kultur-lige, 1924–1926. (Yiddish novel.)

———. *Kiddush ha-Shem: An Epic of 1648*. Trans. Rufus Lears. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1926. (English translation of *Kidesh hashem*.)



- Bakhrevskii, Vladislav. *Dolgi put' k sebe* (The long way to oneself). Moscow: Sovremennik, 1991. (Historical novel about Khmelnytsky.)
- Balaban, M. "Ha-milhamah ha-gedolah" (The Great War). In Israel Halperin, ed., *Bet Israel be Polin* (The Jews in Poland). Jerusalem: Youth Dept. of the Zionist Organisation. Vol. 1: 81–90, 1948. (Study in Hebrew, including a section on the 1648–1667 wars.)
- Bandtkie, Jerzy Samuel. *Dzieje Królestwa Polskiego* (History of the Polish Kingdom). Vol. 2. Wrocław: Bogumił Korn, 1820.
- Bantysh-Kamenskii, Dmitrii. *Istoriia Maloi Rossii* (History of Little Russia), 1st ed. Moscow: Tipografia Semena Selivanovskago, 1822; 2nd ed., 1830; 3rd ed., 1842.
- Benvenisti, Moshe ben Nisim. *Pnei Moshe* (The face of Moses). Vol. 2. Constantinople: A. Franko, 1671. (Hebrew book.)
- Ber of Bolechow. "Ber Bolekhovers zikhroynes" (The memoirs of Ber of Bolechow), ed. Mark Wischnitzer. Berlin: Klal-farlag, 1922. (Yiddish.)
- . *Divrey Bina*. (Word of reason.) N.p: n.p., n.d. (Eighteenth-century diaries of Ber Bolechow, compiled in 1800.)
- . "The Memoirs of Ber of Bolechow (1723–1805)," ed. Mark Wischnitzer. London and New York: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1922. (English translation of "Ber Bolekhovers zikhroynes.")
- . "Zikhronot R. Dov mi-Bolihov (483–565)," ed. Mark Wischnitzer. Berlin: Hotsa'at Kelal, 1922. (Hebrew. Published simultaneously as three books by M. Wischnitzer, in Hebrew, Yiddish, and English.)
- Bialik, Khaim Nakhman. "Masa' Nemirov" (The burden of Nemirov). *Hazeman: Measef lesifrut ulemad'a*, no. 3 (July–September 1904), 3–15. (This is the first published version of Bialik's famous poem *B'ir ha-haregah* [In the city of slaughter] about the 1903 Kishinev pogrom. The censors preferred that the poem evoke 1648 rather than the recent pogrom.)
- Bianchi, Michele (Alberto Vimina da Ceneda). *Historia delle guerre civili di Polonia* (History of the civil war of Poland). Venice: G. P. Pinelli, 1671. (Venetian envoy who describes Khmelnytsky.)
- Biletskyi-Nosenko, Pavlo. "Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii. Istoricheskaia kartina sobytii, nravov, i obychaev XVII veka v Malorossii" (Zinovii Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Historical picture of events, customs, and mores of the seventeenth century in Little Russia). 1810s–1829. N.p: n.p., n.d. (Historical novel, unpublished manuscript, Shevchenko Institute of Literature of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Manuscript Division.)
- Bissaccioni, Maiolino. *Historia delle guerre civili di questi ultimi tempi* (History of the civil wars of recent times). Venice: F. Storti, 1653. (Italian historical account.)
- Bogdan Khmel'nitskii. Poema v shesti pesniakh* (Bogdan Khmel'nitskii: A poem in six cantos). St. Petersburg, 1833. (Anonymous author, possibly Mykhailo Maksymovych; narrative poem.)
- Borovoi, S. Ia. *Vospominaniia* (Memoirs). Moscow-Jerusalem: Gesharim, Evreiskii Universitet v Moskve, 1993.
- Chevalier, Pierre. *A discourse of the original, country, manners, government and religion of the Cossacks: with another of the Precopian Tartars*. Trans. Edward Brown. London: Hobart Kemp, 1672. (English translation of *Histoire de la guerre*.)

- . *Histoire de la guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne, avec un discours de leur origine, païs, mœurs, gouvernement et religion, et un autre des Tartares Précopites*. Paris : Barbin, 1663. (Historical account.)
- Czarnowski, Jan Nepomucen. *Ukraina i Zaporozże czyli historia Kozaków od pojawienia się ich w dziejach do czasu ostatecznego przyłączenia do Rosji według najlepszych źródeł napisana . . .* (Ukraine and Zaporozhia or the history of the Cossacks from their emergence in history until their final association with Russia, written according to the best sources). Warsaw: J. A. Breslauer, 1854. (Polish historical narrative.)
- Czyński, Jan. *Le Kosak, roman historique* (The Cossack, a historical novel). 2 vols. Paris: A. Leclaire, 1836. (Polish historical novel in French.)
- Dan'kevych, Kostiantyn. *Bohdan Khmelnytsky: opera na chotyry dii* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky : an opera in four acts). Kyiv: Mystetstvo, 1954. (Opera, libretto by Wanda Wasilewska and Oleksandr Korniiuchuk.)
- Drzewiecki, Karol. *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki. Sceny dramatyczne z XVII wieku* (Jeremi Wiśniowiecki. Dramatic scenes from the seventeenth century). Leipzig: Księgarnia Zagraniczna, 1852.
- Dubnow, Simon. "Evrei v Pol'she v epokhu razdelov" (Jews in Poland in the era of the partitions). In *Evreiskaia Starina*, 1909.
- . *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*. Trans. Israel Friedlaender. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1916.
- E.S. "Wesele czehryńskie" (The Chyhyryn wedding). *Biruta, Part 1*. 125–140. Vilnius: Józef Krzczkowski, 1837. (Polish poem.)
- Eliezer Lipman of Postits. *Kine al gzeyres hakehiles deKaK Ukrayne* (Dirge about the calamity that befell the holy community of Ukraine). Prague, 1648; and Amsterdam, c. 1649.
- Elig, Aviezer of Lublin, and Sevi Hirsh (b. Jerahmiel Hotsh). "The Inheritance of Sevi" (The Yiddish Zohar). 1711. In Jerold Frakes, *Early Yiddish Texts 1100–1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Fedenko, Panas. *Homonila Ukraina . . . Epopeia z doby Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho* (Ukraine was humming. Epic novel from the era of Bohdan Khmelnytsky). Prague: Vydavnytstvo Yuriiia Tyshchenka, 1942.
- Feitel, Shmuel Feivel ben Natan of Vienna. *Tit ha-yaven* (The mire). Amsterdam: n.p., 1650.
- Franko, Ivan. "Khmel'nychchyna 1648–1649 rokiv v suchasnykh virshakh" (The Khmelnytsky war of 1648–1649 in contemporary poetry). *ZNTSh*. XXIII–XXIV, Vol. III–IV. Lviv: n.p., 1898, 1–114.
- . "Khmel'nyts'kyi i vorozhbyt" (Khmelnytsky and a sorcerer). *Literaturno-Naukovyi Visnyk*, vol. 1, 1901. (Short story.)
- . "Na Sviatoiurs'kii hori. Dnia 30 zhovtnia 1655" (On St. George's Hill. October 30, 1655). In Ivan Franko, *Iz dniv zhurby*. Lviv: nakladom avtora, 1900, 111–127. Republished in I. Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50-ty tomakh*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, vol. 3 (1976): 84–98. (Poem.)
- . "Studii nad ukraïniis'kymy narodnymy pisniamy" (Studies of Ukrainian folk songs) (Lviv, 1913). In Ivan Franko, *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50-ty tomakh*. Kyiv: Naukova

- dumka, vol. 43 (1986): 7–352. (Studies of Ukrainian folklore, including Cossack songs about Khmelnytsky.)
- Glinka, Fedor. *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii ili osvobozhdennaia Malorossia* (Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnytsky, or Little Russia liberated). In *Pis'ma k drugu* (Letters to a friend). Pt. 3. St. Petersburg: v Tipografii Karla Kraia, 1816–17. (Historical novel, unfinished.)
- Golota, Petr/Petro Holota. *Khmel'nitskie ili prisoedinenie Malorossii* (The Khmelnytskys or the reunion of Little Russia). 3 vols. Moscow: v tipografii Lazarevykh Instituta Vostochnykh iazykov, 1834. (Historical novel in Russian.)
- Groza, Aleksander. “Bohdan” (ułomek) (“Bohdan” [fragment]). *Poezje* 16, vol. 2. Vilnius: Józef Zawadzki, 1843. (Polish poem.)
- Grondski de Grondi (Gradzki), Samuel. *Historia belli cosacco-polonici* (History of the Cossack-Polish wars). Pest: Patzko, 1789. (Account by a Polish contemporary, written in the 1670s, published 1789.)
- Gudzenko, Panteleimon, ed. *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei: dokumenty i materialy* (Reunification of Ukraine with Russia: documents and materials). 3 vols. Moscow, Kyiv: Izd-vo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1953–1954. (Materials from 1620–1654.)
- ha-Kohen, Shabetai. *Megilat 'efah* (Scroll of gloom). Amsterdam: n.p., 1651. Appeared in *Liber Schevet Jehuda*, by S. Aben Verga, ed. M. Wiener, 1–139. Hannover: n.p., 1855. (Hebrew liturgical text describing the suffering of Jews under Khmelnytsky. Written in the aftermath of the uprising. Rabbi Shabtai Hakohen lived 1621–1663.)
- HaLevi, Aharon. *Seyder Tkhines*. Amsterdam: n.p., 1686. (Penitential prayers.)
- . *Seyder Tkhines: The Forgotten Book of Common Prayer for Jewish Women*. Trans. Devra Kay. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004. (English translation of *Seyder Tkhines*.)
- Hanover, Natan Neta. *Abyss of Despair: The Famous 17th Century Chronicle Depicting Jewish Life in Russia and Poland During the Chmielnicki Massacres of 1648–1649*. Trans. Abraham J. Mesch. New York: Bloch, 1950. (English translation of *Yeven metsulah*.)
- . *Gzeyroys TaH*. Trans. and ed. Joseph Shatzky. Vilnius: YIVO, 1938. (Yiddish translation of *Yeven metsulah*.)
- . *Letopis' Evreia souremennika o sobytiakh 1648–1658 godov v Malorossii*. Trans. S. Mandel'kern. Leipzig: n.p., 1883. (Russian translation of *Yeven metsulah*.)
- . *Yeven metsulah*. Venice: n.p., 1653.
- Heller, Yom Tov Lipmann ben Nathan ha-Levi ben Wallerstein. “Piyyutim ve-Shirav shel R. Yom Tov Lipmann Heller” (The piyyutim and poems of Rabbi Yom Tov Lipman Heller), ed. Abraham M. Haberman. In *Lekhvod Yom Tov* (In honor of Yom Tov). Ed. Y. L. Hacohen Maimon. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1955–1956, 125–145. (Hebrew texts. Heller was chief rabbi of Cracow from 1643–1654.)
- Hoffman, Jerzy, dir. *With Fire and Sword*. Warsaw: Zodiak Jerzy Hoffman Film Production, 1999. (Film.)
- Honors'ky, Rozumnyk. “Getman Khmel'nitskii” (Hetman Khmelnytsky). In *Ukrainskii vestnik* (Ukrainian Herald). Vol. 1 (January 1816): 7–21. Vol. 2 (April 1816): 3–19. (Essay.)
- Hrabianka, Hryhorii. *Diistviia prezil'noi i ot nachala poliakov krvaushoi nebyvaloi brani Bohdana Khmelnytskoho, hetmana Zaporozhskoho s poliaky . . .* (The events of the most

- bitter and the most bloody war since the origin of the Poles between Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the Zaporozhian Hetman, and the Poles . . . ) 1710. Kyiv: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1854. (Chronicle.)
- Hrebinka, Ievhen. *Bogdan. Ssteny iz zhizni malorossiiskogo getmana Zinoviia Khmel'nitskogo* (Bogdan. Scenes from the life of Little Russian Hetman Zinovii Khmelnitskii). St. Petersburg, *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, vol. LVI (1843), no. II, 149–206. (Dramatic scenes.)
- Hrushevs'ka, Kateryna. *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy* (Ukrainian popular *dumy*). 2 vols. Kyiv: Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1927 and 1931. (The most comprehensive publication of Ukrainian epic songs [*dumy*]; includes corpus of Khmelnytsky *dumy* with text criticism and history of publications.)
- Hrushevsky, Mykhailo. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Vol. 8, *The Cossack Age, 1626–1650*. Trans. Marta Olynyk, ed. Frank Sysyn (2002); Vol. 9, bk. 1, *The Cossack Age, 1650–1653*. Trans. Bohdan Strumiński, eds. Serhii Plokhy and Frank Sysyn (2005); Vol. 9, bk. 2, pt. 1, *The Cossack Age, 1654–1657*. Trans. Marta Olynyk, eds. Serhii Plokhy and Frank Sysyn (2008); Vol. 9, bk. 2, pt. 2, *The Cossack Age, 1654–1657*. Trans. Marta Olynyk, eds. Yaroslav Fedoruk and Frank Sysyn (2010). Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press. (English translation of *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi*.)
- . *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi* (History of Ukraine-Rus'). Vol. 8, pt. 1, Kyiv-Lviv, Drukarnia Naukovoho Tovarystva imeni Shevchenka, 1922; pts 2 and 3, Kyiv-Vienna: n.p., 1922 [vol. 8 covers years 1626–1650]; vol. 9, pt. 1, Kyiv: Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1928 [covers 1650–1653]; pt. 2, Kyiv: DVOU Derzhavne vydavnytstvo “Proletar,” 1931 [covers 1650–1657], vol 10, Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSR, 1936 [1657–8]. (The last three volumes of Hrushevsky's monumental history of Ukraine cover the years of the Khmelnytsky uprising.)
- . *Pro bat'ka kozats'koho Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho* (About the Cossack father, Bohdan Khmelnytsky). Kyiv: Populiarna biblioteka “Lan,” 1909. (Popular historical narrative.)
- Istoriia rusov* (History of the Rus' People). First decades of the 19th century. Moscow: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1846. (Political polemic tract shaped as a chronicle.)
- Ivanenko, Oksana. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Illustrated by Mykola Hlushchenko. Kyiv: Molod', 1954. (Historical novella for children.)
- Jehiel Michael ben Eliezer, of Nemirov. *Shivre luhot* (Fragments of the tablets). Warsaw: n.p., 1911. (Hebrew Torah commentary, written by a rabbi who died in the uprising. Rabbi Jehiel Michel's nephew added an introduction including Jewish accounts of the uprising.)
- Jemiołowski, Mikołaj. *Pamiętnik Mikołaja Jemiołowskiego* (The diary of Mikołaj Jemiołowski). Lviv: Zakładu Narodowego Ossolińskich, 1850. (A member of landed gentry in palatinate of Belz, whose memoir includes notes from 1648 to 1679.)
- Jerlicz, Joachim. *Latopisiec, albo, kroniczka Joachima Jerlicza* (The annals or brief chronicles of Joachim Jerlicz). Ed. Kazimierz Władysław Wójcicki. Vol. 2. Warsaw: Wienhoeber, 1853. (Polish manuscripts from 1620 to 1673 of an Orthodox Ukrainian Nobleman, writing in the Kyivan monasteries.)
- Joachim Pastorius ab Hirtenberg. *Bellum Scythico-Cossacicum, seu, De conjuratione Tartaro-*

- rum, Cossacorum et plebis Russicae contra Regnum Poloniae* (The Scythian-Cossack war or the conspiracy of the Tatars, Cossacks and the Ruthenian People against the Polish Kingdom). N.p: Dantisci, 1652.
- . *Relacya chwalebney ekspedyciey triumphalnego powodzenia, szczęśliwego uspokoienia z nieprzyjaciółmi, Naiasnieyszego y Niezwyyczajonego Monarchy Jana Kazimierza z Laski Bożey, Krola Polskiego y Szwedzkiego, etc., etc.* N.p: n.p., 1650. (Polish translation of *Relatio gloriosissimae*.)
- . *Relatio gloriosissimae expeditionis, victoriosissimi progressus [et] faustissimae pacificationis cum hostibus . . . Joannis Casimiri, Regis Poloniae et Sueciae* (Account of the glorious expedition, victorious progress [and] a successful peace with the enemy . . . Jan Kazimierz, King of Poland and Sweden). N.p: n.p., 1649. (Latin text published in 1649.)
- Kachura, Iakiv. "Ivan Bohun." In his *Vybrani tvory*. Kyiv: Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1947, 204–310. (Ukrainian historical tale originally published in 1940.)
- Kaczmarczyk, Janusz. *Bogdan Chmielnicki*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1988. (Monograph.)
- Karpov, Gennadii. *Nachalo istoricheskoi deiatel'nosti Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo* (The beginnings of the historic activities of Bohdan Khmelnytsky). Moscow: tipografia Gracheva, 1873. (Monograph.)
- Khmel'nitskii, Nikolai. *Zinovii Bogdanovich Khmel'nitskii, ili prisoedineniie Malorossii* (Zinovii Bogdanovich Khmelnytsky or the reunification of Little Russia). In *Sochineniia Nikolaia Khmel'nitskogo*. 3 vols. St. Petersburg: v tipografii Karla Kraiia, 3 (1849): 103–212. (Russian play.)
- Khmel'nyts'kyi, Bohdan. *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho: 1648–1657* (Documents of Bohdan Khmelnytsky: 1648–1657), ed. Ivan Kryp'iakievych and Ivan Butych. Kyiv: Akademia nauk Ukrain's'koi RSR, 1961.
- Khotkevych, Hnat. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Kharkiv: Rukh, 1929. (Ukrainian play.)
- Kojałowicz, Albert Wijuk. *De rebus anno 1648 et 1649 contra Zaporovios cosacos gestis* (Records of the affairs of 1648 and 1649 against the Zaporozhian Cossacks). Vilnius: Typis Academicis, 1651. (Latin chronicle.)
- Korniichuk, Oleksandr. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. In *Molodyi bil'shovyk* 10 (1938). (Ukrainian drama.)
- Kosach, Yurii. *Den' hnivu: Povist' pro 1648 rik* (The day of rage: A tale about the year 1648). 2 vols. Regensburg: Ukrain's'ke slovo, 1947–48. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- . *Diistvo pro Yuriiia-Peremozhtsia: Tragediia* (A play about the victorious Yurii: A tragedy). Regensburg: Ukrain's'ke slovo, 1947. (Ukrainian play.)
- . *Rubikon Khmel'nyts'koho: Povist'* (Khmelnysky's Rubicon: Tale). Krakow-Lviv: Ukrain's'ke vydavnytstvo, 1943. (Ukrainian historical tale.)
- Kostenko, Lina. *Berestechko*. Kyiv: Ukrain's'kyi pys'mennyk, 1999. (Historical novel in verse about the battle of Berestechko of 1651.)
- Kostomarov, Mykola/Nikolai Kostomarov. *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*. St. Petersburg: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa D.E. Kozhanchikova, 1857. (Monograph.)
- . "Istoriia Kazachestva v pamiatnikakh iuzhno-russkogo narodnogo pesennogo tvorchestva" (The History of Cossackdom in South-Russian folklore). In *Russkaia mysl'*, nos. 1–8. 1883. (Survey of folklore.)

- . “Narodnye pesni ob epokhe Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo” (Folk songs about the epoch of Bohdan Khmelnytsky). *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*. Vol. 3. St. Petersburg: Tip. A. K. Kirkora, 1870. (Discussion of folk songs on Khmelnytsky era.)
- . *Ukrainskie steny iz 1649 goda*. (Ukrainian scenes from 1649). 1840s. In *Literaturnoe nasledie . . . N.I. Kostomarova*. St. Petersburg, 1890, 239–258. (Drama.)
- Krasinski, Henry. *Gonta: An Historical Drama in Five Acts*. London: Partridge and Oakey, 1848.
- . *The Cossacks of the Ukraine Comprising Biographical Notices of the Most Celebrated Cossack Chiefs and Atamans, Including Chmielnicki, Stenko Razin, Mazeppa, Sava, Zelezniak, Gonta, Pugatchef, [ . . . ]*. London: Partridge and Oakey, 1848.
- Kraszewski, Józef Ignacy. *Boży gniew: Czasy Jana Kazimierza*. (God's wrath: The times of Jan Kazimir). Vol. 3. Warsaw: Spółka Wydawnicza Księgarzy, 1886. (Historical novel.)
- Kratkoe opisanie Malorossii* (A brief description of Little Russia). In Orest Levytsky, ed., *Letopis' Samovidtsa po novootkrytym spiskam*. Kyiv, 1878, 211–319. (Compiled between 1734 and 1740, based on the Hrabianka account.)
- Krupnytsky, Borys, ed. *V 300–littia Khmel'nychchyny (1648–1948)* (300 anniversary of Khmelnytsky era [1648–1948]). In *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka*, vol. 156. Munich: Zahrava, 1948. (Collection of articles on Khmelnytsky and his era by Borys Krupnytsky, Marvii Stakhiv, Omelian Pritsak and others, dedicated to the three-hundredth anniversary of the Khmelnytsky uprising.)
- Krypiakevych, Ivan. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Akademii nauk URSS, 1954. (Monograph.)
- Kulish, Panteleimon. *Khmel'nyschyna: istorychne opovidannia* (Khmelnysky era: Historical tale). St. Petersburg: Drukarnia P. A. Kulisha, 1861. (Popular historical narrative.)
- . *Mikhailo Charnyshenko ili Malorossiiia vosemdesiat let nazad* (Mikhailo Charnyshenko or Little Russia eighty years ago). 3 vols. Kyiv: v Universitetskoi tipografii, 1843. (Historical novel, in which the protagonist's father, *sotnyk* Charnysh, is obsessed with Khmelnytsky. He builds his house to imitate Khmelnytsky's residence in Subotiv.)
- . *Ukraina: Od pochatku Ukrainy do bat'ka Khmel'nyts'koho* (Ukraine. From the origins of Ukraine to father Khmelnytsky). Kyiv: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1843. (Ukrainian historical poem.)
- Kuz'mich, Aleksandr. *Zinovii-Bogdan Khmel'nitskii (epokha pervaiia, molodost' Zinoviia)* (Zinovii Bogdan Khmelnitskii [the first period: Zinovii's youth]). 5 vols. St. Peterburg: v tipografii Ekspeditsii Zagotovleniia Gosudarstvennykh bumag, 1846. (Historical novel.)
- Le, Ivan (pseud. Ivan Leontovych Moisia). *Khmel'nyts'kyi*. Vol. 1. Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1957; Vols. 1–3. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1965. (Ukrainian historical novel in three volumes.)
- . *Nalyvaiko*. Kyiv: Polityvdav pry TsK KP(b)U, 1940. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- Lelewel, Joachim. *Dzieje Polski potocznyim sposobem opowiedzial . . .* (The history of Poland told in the language of everyman). Warsaw: Drukarnia J. Węckiego, 1829. (Popular history in Polish.)
- Letopis' samovidtsa o voinakh Bohdana Khmel'nitskogo i o mezhdususobiiakh, byvshikh v Maloi Rossii po ego smerti* (Eyewitness chronicle about the wars of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and

- the internal conflicts in Little Russia after his death). Moscow: v Universitetskoi tipografii, 1846. (Written in the last decades of the seventeenth century.)
- Linage de Vauciennes. *L'origine véritable du soulèvement des Cosaques contre la Pologne* (The true origin of the uprising of the Cossacks against Poland). Paris: Clousier et Aubouin, 1674.
- Lypa, Yurii. *Kozaky v Moskovii: Roman z XVII-ho stolittia* (Cossacks in Muscovy: a novel from the 17th century). Warsaw: Narodnii stiah, 1934. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- Lypyn's'kyi, Viacheslav. *Ukraina na perelomi 1657–1659. Zamitky do istorii ukrains'koho derzhavnogo budivnytstva v XVII stolittiu* (Ukraine at a watershed 1657–1659. Notes toward the history of Ukrainian state building in the 17th century). Vienna: n.p., 1920. (Monograph.)
- Maklakov, Nikolai. *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii. Beseda*, vol. VIII., 5–145. Moscow, 1871. (Russian drama.)
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo, comp.. *Sbornik narodnykh ukrainskikh pesen* (A collection of Ukrainian folksongs). Kyiv: tipografia Teofila Gliksberga, 1849. (Includes five *dumy* on Khmelnytsky and his era.)
- , ed. and comp. *Ukrainskie narodnye pesni* (Ukrainian folk songs). Moscow: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1834. (Includes three *dumy* about Khmelnytsky.)
- Markevych, Mykola/Nikolai Markevich. *Istoriia Malorossii*. (History of Little Russia). 5 vols. Moscow: Izd. O.I. Khrustaleva, 1840–1843. (Historical narrative, vols. 1–2; documents, vols. 3–5; Khmelnytsky features prominently in both.)
- Mashchenko, Mykola, dir. *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnytsky*. Ukraine: Dovzhenko Studios, 2007. (Film.)
- Meir ben Shmuel of Szczepbrzeszyn. *Tsok ha-'itim* (In terrible times). Cracow: n.p., 1650.
- Minskii, Nikolai. *Di belagerung fun Tultshin*. Trans. A. Reisin. Minsk: Verlag Kultur, 1905. (Translation of *Osada Tul'china* into Yiddish.)
- . *Osada Tul'china* (The siege of Tul'chyn). *Voskhod*, 1–2 (1888). Republished in *Rodnoi golos: Sranitsy russko-evreiskoi literatury kontsa XIX–nachala XX v.* Ed. Simon Markish. Kyiv: Dukh i litera, 2001, 129–210. (Russian-language historical drama in five acts.)
- Mintz, M. *The Responsa of Rabbi M. Mintz*. Salonica: n.p., 1802. In I. Yuval, *Scholars in Their Time: The Religious Leadership of German Jewry in the Late Middle Ages*. Jerusalem: Hotsa'at sefarim 'a. sh. Y. L. Magnes, ha-Universitah ha-'Ivrit, 1988. (Hebrew.)
- “Mylost' Bozhia, od neudob nosymykh obyd liad's'kykh chrez Bohdana Zinovii Khmel'nytsk'oho, preslavnoho voisk zaporozkykh hetmana, svobodyshaia” (God's Grace, from the inconvenience of inflicted Polish injuries liberated, by Bohdan Zinovii Khmelnytsky, of the Glorious Zaporozhian host). 1728. In Osyp Bodiansky, ed., *Cheniia v obschestve istorii i drevnosti rossiiskikh*, 1858, no. 1, 79–100. (School drama.)
- Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn. *Śpiewy historyczne Niemcewicza z uwagami Lelewela* (Historical songs by Niemcewicz with Lelewel's commentary). Cracow: Józef Czech, 1835.
- . *Bohdan Chmielnicki: Tragedia w 5 aktach* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky: A tragedy in 5 acts). Unfinished drama, 1817. Fragments published by Ignacy Chrzanowski in *Pamiętnik Literacki*, no. 5 (1906), 437–459. (Drama.)

- Oświęcim, Stanisław. *Dyariusz 1643–1651* (Diaries, 1643–1651). Cracow: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności, 1907. (Marshal of nobility in the court of Stanisław Koniecpolski.)
- Ordivsky, Semen [Hryhorii Luzhnyts'kyi]. *Babrianyi khrest: Istorychna povist' iz 1657 roku* (Crimson cross: Historical tale from 1657). Saskatoon: Novyi shliakh, 1941.
- . *Chorna ihumenia: Istorychna povist' z XVII st.* (Black Prioress: historical tale from 1657). Lviv: Ivan Tyktor, 1939.
- . *Sribnyi cherep: Istorychna povist'* (Silver skull: historical tale). Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1942. (Ukrainian historical novella, originally published in 1938.)
- Padalica, Tadeusz [Zenon Fisz]. *Opowiadania i krajobrazy. Szkice z wędrówek po Ukrainie* (Tales and scenes: Sketches from travels in Ukraine). Vol. 1. Vilnius: Józef Zawadzki, 1856.
- Padurra, Tymko. *Pyśma* (Writings). Lviv: K. Wyld, 1874.
- Panch, Petro. *Homonila Ukraina* (Ukraine was humming). Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1954. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- Pieńkiewicz, Adam. “Duma ludu ukraińskiego. O wyprawie Bohdana Chmielnickiego na Mołdawię” (A song of the Ukrainian people: On Bohdan Khmelnytsky's campaign in Moldova). *Bojan, Part 1*, 108–III. Wilno: Adam Pienkiewicz, 1838.
- Pogodin, Mikhail Petrovich. “Po povodu pamiatnika Bogdanu Khmel'nitskomu, prednachertannogo G. Mikeshinym” (About the monument to Bohdan Khmelnytsky, designed by Mr. Mikeshin). *Zaria* (St. Petersburg, 1870), no 1.
- Raba, Joel. *Ben zikaron le-hakhhashah: gezerot 408 ve-409 bi-reshimot bene ha-zeman uve-re'i ha-ketivah ha-historit*. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, 1994. (Hebrew study and collection of early chronicles.)
- . *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: Columbia University Press, 1995. (English translation of *Ben zikaron le-hakhhashah*.)
- Rabinovitz, Alexander Siskind. *Bi-yeme Hmelnitski: tsiyurim historiym* (In the Days of Khmelnytsky: Historical portrayals). Cracow: Moriyah, 1906–1907.
- Raczyński, Edward, ed. *Historia panowania Jana Kazimierza [ . . . ]* (History of the reign of Jan Kazimierz). 2 vols. Poznań: Walenty Stefański, 1840.
- Radziwiłł, Albrycht Stanisław. “Memoriale rerum gestarum in Polonia, 1632–1655” (Memoires of affairs in Poland, 1632–1656). Ed. Adam Przyboś and Roman Żelewski. Vol. 1. Wrocław, 1968. (Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, memoirs in Latin.)
- . “Pamiętniki ks. Albrychta Stanisława Radziwiłła, kanclerza w. Litewskiego, wydane z rękopisu.” Poznań: Raczyńskiego, 1839. 2 vols. (Polish translation of “Memoriale rerum.”)
- Rawita-Gawroński, Franciszek. *Bohdan Chmielnicki*. 2 vols. Lviv: H. Altenburg, 1906–1909. (Monograph in Polish.)
- . *Hetman kozacki Bohdan Chmielnicki: szkic historyczny jego życia i walk* (Cossack Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky: A historical survey of his life and wars). Lviv: Wydawn. Tow. Im. Piotra Skargi, 1914. (Polish monograph.)
- . *Ostatni Chmielniczenko: zarys monograficzny, 1640–1679* (The last offspring of



- Khmelnysky: monograph, 1640–1679). Poznań: Nakładem “Ostoji” Spółki Wydawniczej, 1919. (A study in Polish of Khmelnysky's son Yuri, who became hetman after Bohdan's death.)
- Rigelman, Oleksandr. *Letopisnoe povestvovanie o Maloi Rossii* (Chronicle about Little Russia). 1785–86. Moscow: v universitetskoï tipografii, 1847.
- Ruszel, Paweł. *Fawor Niebieski Podczas Szczęśliwey Elekcyey, na Krolestwo Polskie Pana naszego miłościwego Iana Kazimierza Krola Szwedzkiego* (Heaven's favor at the time of the happy election of our gracious lord King Jan Kazimierz to the Polish throne). Lublin: Jan Wiczkowicz, 1649. (Discusses Cossack rebellion.)
- Rybak, Natan. *Pereiaslav'ska rada* (Pereiaslav Council). Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1948. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- Ryleev, Kondratii. “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii.” In Kondratii Ryleev, *Dumy. Stikhotvoreniia K. Ryleeva*. Moscow: v tipografii Selivanovskogo, 1825. (Poem written in 1821, from the cycle *Dumy*.)
- . “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii. Prolog” (1825). Beginning of a historical tragedy, “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii,” that Ryleev planned to write. In Kondratii Ryleev, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvoreniï*. St. Petersburg/Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1971, 247–252.
- Słowacki, Juliusz. “Jan Kazimierz.” In his *Dzieła wszystkie*, ed. Juliusz Kleiner. Vol. 10, 377–402. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1957. (Polish drama.)
- Savchenko, Igor, dir. *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*. Script, Oleksandr Korniiuchuk. Soviet Union: 1941. (Film.)
- Schorr, Naftali Mendel. *Har haMor: sheloshah sipurim mi-divre ha-yamim* (Mountain of Myrrh: Three stories from medieval Jewish history). Vol. 1., *Daniel V' Navorre*. Lviv: E. Miniarz, 1855; Vol. 2., *Khmelnysky*. Lviv: C. Budweiser, 1875; Vol. 3., *Sermbabel*. Lviv: n.p., 1876. (Three historical novellas in Hebrew.)
- Schussberg, Gavriel. *Petaḥ teshuvah* (Gate of repentance). Amsterdam: n.p., 1651. (Hebrew chronicle.)
- Shevchenko, Taras. “Chyhyryne, Chyhyryne.” *Vechornytsi*, no. 11 (Lviv, 1863), 81–82. (Poem of 1844. Chyhyryn is the town where Khmelnysky's administration was located.)
- . “Iakby to ty, Bohdane pianyi” (If you only, drunken Bohdan . . .). In *Kobzar z dodatkom spomynok pro Shevchenka Kostomarova i Mykeshyna*, Prague, 1876. (1859 poem.)
- . “Rozryta mohyla” (Plundered grave). 1843. In *Novye stikhotvoreniia Pushkina i Shevchenki*, Leipzig, 1859. (1843 poem.)
- . “Velykyi l'okh. Misteriia” (The great crypt: A mystery). In Taras Shevchenko, *Zibnannia tvoriv u shesty tomakh*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2003, 1: 314–328. (1845 cycle.)
- . “Za shcho my liubymo Bohdana” (Why do we love Bohdan). *Stara Ukraïna*, nos. 3–4 (1925): 59. (Lviv, 1845–46 poem.)
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk. *Ogniem i mieczem* (With Fire and Sword). Warsaw: K. Bartoszewicz, 1884. (Polish novel, first part of a trilogy.)
- . *With Fire and Sword*. Trans. W. S. Kuniczak. New York: Hippocrene Books, 1991.
- Singer, Isaac Bashevis. *Der knekht*. New York: Tsiko, 1967. (Yiddish novel, placed just after the Khmelnysky uprising.)
- . *Der Sotn in Goray: a mayse fun fartsaytns*. *Globus*, 2, 7 (Jan. 1933), 17–31; 8 (Feb.),

- 1–22; 9 (Mar.), 54–75; 10 (Apr.), 29–49; 11 (May), 45–64; 12 (June), 1–21; 13 (July–Aug.), 27–47; 14 (Sept.), 26–32. Republished as a complete novel. Warsaw: Bibliotek fun Yidishn P.E.N. klub, 1935. (Yiddish novel, dealing with Sabbatean movement in the aftermath of the Khmelnytsky uprising.)
- . *Satan in Goray: A Novel*. Trans. Jacob Sloan. New York: Noonday Press, 1955. (English translation of *Der Sotn in Goray*.)
- . *The Slave*. Trans. Cecil Hemley. New York: Avon, 1962. (English translation of *Der knekht*.)
- Smolii, Valerii, and Valerii Stepankov. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi: khronika zhyttia ta diial'nosti* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky: Chronicle of his life and activities). Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1994.
- . *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi: sotsial'no-politychnyi portret* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky: A social and political portrait). Kyiv: “Lybid,” 1993. (Ukrainian monograph.)
- Sofonovych, Feodosii. *Khronika z litopysstiv starodavnikh* (Chronicle compiled from ancient record-keepers). Eds. Yurii Mytsyk and Volodymyr Kravchenko. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1992. (Ukrainian chronicle from 1672–1673.)
- Sreznevsky, Izmail, ed. and comp. *Zaporozhskaia starina* (Zaporozhian antiquity). 2 vols., 6 issues. Kharkiv: V Universitetskoi tip., 1833–1838. (Vol. 2 includes songs and historiographic materials on Khmelnytsky.)
- Staryts'kyi, Mykhailo. *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi*. In M. Staryts'kyi, *Tvory u vos'my tomakh*. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1963–1965. Vol. 5 (1965), parts 1–3. Pt. 1: *Pered burei* (Before the storm). *Moskovskii listok* 3–362 (1895). Pt. 2: *Buria* (The storm). *Moskovskii listok* (1896). Pt. 3: *U pristani* (In the harbor). *Moskovskii listok* 72–362 (1897). (Russian-language historical trilogy.)
- . *Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. Kievskaia starina* 4: 78–123, 5: 208–298 (1897). (Play.)
- . “Osada Bushi. Epizod iz vremen Khmel'nitskogo” (The siege of Busha: Episode from Khmelnytsky era). *Moskovskii listok* 330–363 (1891). (Historical novella.)
- Stow, Kenneth, and Adam Teller, eds. *Gezeirot Ta'h: Jews, Cossacks, Poles and Peasants in 1648 Ukraine*. In *Jewish History* 17, no. 2 (2003): 105–255.
- Symonovsky, Petro. *Kratkoe opisanie o kazatskom malorossiiskom narode* (A short account of the Little Russian Cossack people). 1765. Moscow: v universitetskoi tipografii, 1847.
- Szajnoch, Karol. *Dwa lata dziejów naszych. 1646. 1648*. (Two years of our history: 1646, 1648). *Opowiadania i źródła*. Vol. 2. Polska w r. 1648. Lwów: author, 1869. (Polish historical narrative.)
- Tchernichovski, Saul. “Bat harav” (Daughter of the rabbi). In *Kol shirei Shaul Tchernichovski* (Complete poems of Shaul Tchernichovski). Jerusalem: Schocken, 1937. (Hebrew poem written in 1924, which recalls a section of Hanover's Nemirov chronicle.)
- Temberski, Stanisław. *Roczniki 1647–1654* (Chronicle, 1647–1656). Ed. Wiktor Czermak. Cracow: Akademia Umiejętności, 1897.
- Tsertelev, Mykola, comp. *Opyt sobraniia starinnykh malorossiiskikh pesnei* (An undertaking of a collection of ancient Little Russian songs). St. Petersburg: V tip. Karla Kraiia, 1819. (Of ten epic songs [*dumy*], three focus on Khmelnytsky: Khmelnytsky and Barabash, Khmelnytsky's Moldovan Campaign, and the death of Khmelnytsky.)

- Tumansky, Fedir. Anonymous text published in "Letopisets Malyia Rossii." In *Rossiiskii magazin*. Vol. 2 (15–97, 209–288, 366–388), Vol. 3 (54–73, 125–154, 205–236, 280–311), 1793.
- Twardowski, Samuel, from Skrzypna. *Woyna domowa z Kozaki i Tatary, Moskwą, potym Szwedami, i z Węgry* (The war of the homeland with the Cossacks and Tatars, Muscovites, then the Swedes and Hungarians). Kalisz: Calissiensis Soc. Iesv, 1681. (Versified history in Polish, written in 1650s.)
- Velychko, Samiilo. *Skazanie o voine kozatskoi s poliakami chrez Zinoviia Bohdana Khmelnitskogo, Hetmana voisk Zaporozhskikh* (A narrative about the Cossack war with the Poles led by Zinovii Bohdan Khmelnytsky, hetman of the Zaporozhian host). 1710s–1728. Kyiv, 4 vols., 1848–1864.
- Vernadsky, George. *Bohdan, Hetman of Ukraine*. New Haven: Yale University Press; and London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1941. (Monograph.)
- Vimina, Alberto. *Historia delle guerre civili di Polonia* (History of the Polish civil war). Venice: G. P. Pinelli, 1671.
- Zaborowski, Tymon. *Bohdan Chmielnicki: Tragedia oryginalna w 5 aktach* (Bohdan Khmelnytsky: Tragedy in 5 acts). In his *Pisma zebrane*, ed. Marja Danieliwiczowa. Warsaw: Filologiczne Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawy, 1936, 317–362. (Play written in 1823.)
- Zahrebel'nyi, Pavlo. *Ia, Bohdan* (I, Bohdan). Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk, 1983. (Ukrainian historical novel.)
- Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. T. Shevchenka*, vols. XXIII–XXIV, nos. III–IV. Lviv, 1898. (This issue is dedicated to the 250th anniversary of the Khmelnytsky uprising and includes articles and publications on Khmelnytsky by Mykhailo Hrushevsky, Ivan Franko, Stepan Tomashivsky, and others.)

## Contributors

**ISRAEL BARTAL** is Avraham Harman Professor of Jewish History at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

**GENNADY ESTRAIKH** is associate professor of Yiddish studies at the Skirball Department of Hebrew University at New York University.

**AMELIA M. GLASER** is associate professor of Russian and comparative literature at the University of California, San Diego.

**GEORGE G. GRABOWICZ** is Dmytro Čyževs'kyj Professor of Ukrainian Literature at Harvard University.

**IZABELA KALINOWSKA** is associate professor in the Department of Cultural Analysis and Theory at Stony Brook University.

**MARTA KONDRATYUK** is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Cultural Analysis and Theory at Stony Brook University.

**JUDITH DEUTSCH KORNBLATT** is professor emerita and former chair of Slavic languages and literature at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

**ROMAN KOROPECKYJ** is professor of Slavic languages and literatures at the University of California, Los Angeles.

**TARAS KOZNARSKY** is an associate professor in the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Toronto.

**YOHANAN PETROVSKY-SHTERN** is the Crown Family Professor in the History Department at Northwestern University.

**ADA RAPOPORT-ALBERT** is professor emerita of Hebrew and Jewish studies and former head of the Department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies at University College London.

**MYROSLAV SHKANDRIJ** is professor of Slavic studies at the University of Manitoba.

**FRANK E. SYSYN** is director of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and professor in the Department of History and Classics, University of Alberta.

**ADAM TELLER** is associate professor of history and Judaic studies at Brown University.

# Index

Note: “BK” in subentries refers to Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Page numbers in italic type refer to illustrations.

- Abazopulo, Volodymyr, 213  
Abramovitsh, Sholem Yankev (Mendele Moykher-Sforim), 173  
Abramson, Henry, 173  
Aleichem, Sholem, 129, 176  
Aleksi Mikhailovich, Tsar, 9, 41, 97, 170  
Alexander II, 1, 17  
Alexander III, 133–34  
Alexander the Great, 223  
Aliyah: First, 149, 151; Second (*see* Zionism)  
Andrew, Saint, 158  
Andrukhovych, Yurii, 209  
Antisemitism, 130, 175  
Apostol, Danylo, 78  
Asch, Sholem, 257*n*49; “In a Karnaval Nakht,” 137; *Kiddush ha-Shem*, 17, 34–35, 128, 135–38, 175, 258*n*58  
Ashkenazim: and Sabbatean movement, 241*n*26; Sephardim compared to, 131–32; Zionist critique of, 139–40, 144, 147, 150–51  
Bakhtin, Mikhail, 214  
Bandtkie, Jerzy Samuel, 116  
Bantysh-Kamenskii, Dmitrii, 248*n*61; *Istoriia Maloi Rossii*, 79, 82, 90, 91, 95–107, 249*n*64  
Bar Giora, Simon, 145, 148  
Bar Kokhba, Simon, 145, 147–48, 172  
Barnai, Jacob, 58  
Baron, Salo W., 263*n*34  
Bartal, Israel, 6, 17, 221  
Barukhyah. *See* Russo, Barukhyah  
Battle of Poltava, 41, 99  
Bazhan, Mykola, 190  
Bedouins, 140, 141, 145–46, 149–52, 259*n*28  
Beker, Zvi, 148  
Belyi, Andrei, 127  
Ben Shmuel Ashkenazi, Avraham, *Tsar bat rabim*, 12  
Ben-Zvi, Itzhak, 142–43, 148  
Bestuzhev, N., 72  
Bialik, Khaim Nakhman, 173  
Bissaccioni, Maiolino, 39  
Blum, Vladimir, 174  
*Bogdan Khmel'nitskii: poema v shesti pesniakh* (anonymous poem), 78–81, 85, 86

- Bohdan Khmelnytsky* (opera), 204
- Borochovian Marxism, 141
- Borovoi, Saul, 173–74, 192
- Borovyk, Mykola, 5
- Bortko, Vladimir, *Taras Bul'ba*, 204
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord, “The Prisoner of Chillon,” 74
- Catholicism, 6, 54, 136, 138, 202, 214
- Charles X Gustav, 104
- Charles XII, 77, 99, 101–2, 104
- Chervony (Red) Cossacks, 169
- Chetvertynsky family, 136–37
- Chmelnitzky, Melech, 171
- Christianity: conversion from Judaism to, 129–30, 133, 138; idea of sacrifice in, 135, 137; Judaism in relation to, 129–30, 137–38; millenarianism, 48; socialism and, 160; and universality, 129, 138
- Chubynsky, Pavlo, 5
- Chyhyryn Cossacks, 7
- Circassians, 145–46
- Classicism: in Polish literature, 68; in Russian literature, 72, 73. *See also* Neoclassicism
- Cohen, Nehemiah, 52
- Conversion, 4, 128–33, 138
- Cossacks: chronicles of, 36–46; Chyhyryn, 7; cultural meanings of, 94–95, 108, 221, 252n28; Don, 6, 169, 229m11; freedom associated with, 143–44; Hetmanate of, 10; impact and legacy of, 5–6; Kuban, 169; as model for Zionists, 17, 140–52; in Napoleonic era, 94; origins of, 158; in Polish literature, 110–11; relationship of Jews to, 173–74, 176–79, 181, 192–95; relationship of Poland to, 6, 65; relationship of Tatars to, 43; in Soviet Union, 169; Tul’chyn massacre perpetrated by, 128–29; Ukrainian, 169–70; in Ukrainian twentieth-century literature, 154, 157, 160, 182–96; Zaporozhian, 6, 8–9, 140, 145
- Cossack uprising (1648). *See* Khmelnytsky uprising (1648)
- Cossacophilism, 69, 70
- Crimean Khanate, 9, 230n36
- Crimean Peninsula, 9, 222
- Crimean Tatars, 8–9, 42–43, 222, 230n35
- Cromwell, Oliver, 4, 186
- Cyrilo-Methodian Brotherhood, 77, 89
- Czajkowski, Michał, 69, 70, 87, 251n7; *Hetman Ukrainy*, 70; *Wernyhora*, 111
- Czapliński affair, 7–8, 72, 74, 101–2, 112, 113, 115–21, 204–5, 212, 215
- Czarnowski, Jan Nepomucen, 116
- Czyński, Jan, 69, 252m26; *Le Kosak*, 112, 113, 114, 116, 118–21
- Darowski, Aleksander Weryha, 251n15
- Day of Pokrova (Day of Ukrainian Cossacks), 170
- Decadents, 130
- Decembrists, 70–76
- Der Nister (pseudonym of Pinchus Kahanovich), “Flora,” 181
- Derrida, Jacques, 254m15
- Dilo* (newspaper), 154
- Divovych, Semen, *Razhovor Velikorossii s Malorossiei*, 78
- Dobrenko, Evgenii, 202
- Don Cossacks, 6, 169, 229m11
- Dontsov, Dmytro, 18, 153–56, 158–62, 164, 182–83; *Natsionalizm*, 154–56, 159; *Patriotyzm*, 156
- Dovzhenko, Oleksandr, 169, 170, 175; *Osvobozhdenie Zapadnoi Ukrainy*, 200; “Peremoha,” 169–70
- Druze, 149–50
- Drzewiecki, Karol, *Jeremi Wiśniowiecki*, 112–15, 119–21, 251m15
- Dubnow, Simon, 48–49, 129, 173, 175
- Dumy* (epic poems), 15, 130, 255m19; Niemcewicz’s *dumy* about Jan Kazimierz and Stefan Potocki, 251m9; Pieńkiewicz’s “Duma ludu ukraińskiego,” 113, 251m10;

- Ryleev's *duma* "Bogdan Khmel'nitskii," 70, 75, 242n4
- Eisenstein, Sergei, Aleksandr Nevsky, 199, 201
- Ellis, Roger, 129
- Enlightenment, 68–69, 71, 86
- Epstein, Yitzhak, 149
- Estraikh, Gennady, 18, 222
- Exile, 132, 140, 149
- Expressionism, 155–56
- Eynikayt* (newspaper), 175
- Fagelman, Lazar, 179–80
- Fallah*, 140
- Fascism, 156
- Fedenko, Panas, 18; *Homonila Ukraina*, 164, 261n29
- Fefer, Itsik, 178–79
- Feivel ben Natan, Shmuel, of Vienna, *Tit ha-yaven*, 12
- Feliński, Alojzy, *Barbara Radziwiłłówna*, 68
- Femininity, 203. *See also* Women
- Feyvish, Rabbi, of Kraków, 27
- Films, BK in, 198–217
- First Aliyah. *See* Aliyah, First
- First Tadeusz Kosciuszko Infantry Division, 169
- Fisz, Zenon, 111, 251n7
- Forverts* (newspaper), 176
- Fram, Edward, 128
- Frank, Jacob, 53–54
- Franko, Ivan, 13, 41
- Freedom, 3–4, 67–69, 72–73, 75, 143–44
- Frenkel, Zalman Abramovich, 180
- Frontier, 149–50
- Futurism, 155, 165
- Galicja, 153, 156
- Galster, Bohdan, 71
- Gippius, Zinaida, 130, 255n27
- Gisel, Inokentii, 158
- Glaser, Amelia, 17, 223, 235n53
- Glinka, Fedor N., 16; *Zinovii Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 70–73
- Gogol, Nikolai, 16, 63, 71, 75, 221; *Taras Bul'ba*, 79, 133, 204, 209, 221, 224
- Golota, Petr, *Khmel'nitskie ili prisoedinenie Malorossii*, 109
- Gonorskii, Razumnik, 71
- Gonta, Ivan, 16, 87
- Goszczyński, Seweryn, 251n7; *Zamek kaniowski*, 87
- Grądzki, Samuel, 29
- Grabowicz, George G., 15, 223, 253n28
- Grabowski, Michał, 87, 251n7
- Graetz, Heinrich, 129
- Greenberg, Zacaria, 174
- Gries, Ze'ev, 59
- Gromada Humań, 87
- Groza, Aleksander, 251n7; "Bohdan," 113, 114, 118–19; "Mogily," 112, 113
- Gukovskii, G. A., 71
- Haidamak uprisings, 65, 70, 111–13, 122; Taras Shevchenko's poem on, 88, 245n53
- Ha-Kohen, Shabetai, *Megilat 'efah*, 12
- Ha-Levi, David (known as TaZ), 52
- Halkin, Shmuel, 174
- Halperin, Michael, 144–45, 259n28
- Haman, 4
- Hannibal, 46, 223
- Hanover, Natan Neta (Nathan Nata Hannover): as a fictional character in Kosach's *Day of Rage*, 190–95; *Yeven metsulah*, 12–13, 17, 24–35, 38, 127–33, 135–36, 138, 191, 233n11, 233n23, 234n30, 253n3, 255n21
- Hanukkah, 148–49
- Harkavy, Avraam (Abram Garkavi), 192
- Ha-Shiloah* (periodical), 148, 149
- Hashomer, 140–43, 142, 146–52
- Hasidism, 191
- Haskalah, 139
- Hasmonaean revolt, 148



- Hauser, Ewa, 209
- Heine, Heinrich, 132
- Helena (love interest of BK), 7–8, 66–67, 119–23, 203–6, 212, 215–16. *See also* Rozanda
- Hemingway, Ernest, 165
- Heritage cinema, 199, 207, 210, 211
- Hetman (role of), 6, 8, 247n40
- Hetmanate, 9, 10, 15, 36–42, 44, 92, 104, 247n40, 247n43, 249n63
- Hitler, Adolf, 4, 158, 176
- Hitler-Stalin pact, 164, 200
- Hoffer, Jay C., 177
- Hoffman, Jerzy, *With Fire and Sword*, 19, 198–99, 205–10, 208, 217
- Hoffman, Matthew, 137
- Holocaust, 23, 35, 179
- Holocaust denial, 23
- Holota, P., 71
- Hondius, Willem, 13; *Portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, 13, 14, 231n52
- Honorsky, Rozumnyk, „Getman Khmel'nitskii,” 94–95
- Hrabianka, Hryhorii, 13, 40
- Hrabianka chronicle, 13, 15, 40–46, 247n40
- Hrabovich, Ihor, 212
- Hrebinka, Ievhen, *Bogdan*, 63, 71, 81–84, 85, 86
- Hrushevsky, Mykhailo, 6–7, 36–37
- Hrybovsky, M., 95
- Hulak, Mykola, 89
- Idel, Moshe, 58–59
- Identity: collective formation of, 219–24; Ukrainian national, 17–18, 77, 97–105, 109, 159–60, 210, 216, 221; Zionism and Jewish, 139–41
- Il'enko, Yurii, *Molitva za Hetmana Mazepu*, 210–11
- International Workers Order, 176
- Islam, 9, 52, 54–56
- Islam Giray III, 9
- Israel. *See* Zionism
- Istoriia rusov*, 15, 38, 76, 78, 79, 82, 92, 99–102, 194
- Ivasiuk, Mykola, *Bohdan Khmelnytsky Entering Kyiv*, 155
- Jakovenko, Natalia, *Historia Ukrainy*, 197
- Jameson, Fredric, 213, 217
- Japheth, 158
- Jesus, 133, 137; Christ figures, 138
- Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee, 175
- Jewish Chronicle* (newspaper), 178–79
- Jewish literature, 12, 17
- Jews and Judaism: Christianity in relation to, 129–30, 137–38; conversion of, 4, 128–33; expulsion of, from Spain, 57–59; in Kosach's works, 189–95; perceptions of BK among, 4, 12–13, 25–35, 175–81; relationship of Cossacks to, 173–74, 176–79, 181, 192–95; relationship of Orthodox Christianity to, 4; relationship of peasants to, 26–27, 143–44, 173–74; relationship of Poland to, 4, 29; relationship of Russia to, 134; relationship of Slavs to, 192; relationship of Ukraine to, 18; role of, in Khmelnytsky uprising, 24–35; role of, in Ukrainian colonization, 26–27, 33. *See also* Massacres; Pogroms
- John of Giscala, 148
- Judaism. *See* Jews and Judaism
- Kabbalah: Lurianic, 47–49, 56–59; medieval, 57, 58; Safed, 57
- Kachura, Yakiv, 18; *Ivan Bohun*, 164
- Kaczmarczyk, Janusz, 204–5
- Kaganovich, Lazar, 172
- Kahanovich, Pinchus. *See* Der Nister
- Kalinowska, Izabela, 18–19, 120, 223
- Kaplanski, Shlomo, 140–41
- Kaplun, Yosif, 180
- Kapterev, Sergei, 198
- Karamzin, Nikolay, 97
- Kazimierz, Jan, 8, 30, 234n36

- Kharkiv University, 94
- Khmelnitski, Aleksandr, 171
- Khmelnysky, Bohdan: ambivalent or ambiguous portrayals of, 5, 26, 29, 33, 67, 69, 88, 96–97, 118–19, 160–62, 198, 213–16; artistic depictions of, 1, 2, 3, 13, 14, 17, 90, 91, 115, 127, 133–34, 155, 227*nm*–5, 252*m*8; birth and early life of, 7; burial site of, 94; characterizations of, 30, 33, 67, 93, 96, 121, 161, 197; charisma of, 103, 105–7; deathbed speech of, 66, 96; death of, 44–45, 92, 98, 113; education of, 235*n*49; impact and legacy of, 3–9, 220–24; imprisonment of, 7, 28; literary accounts of, 11–19; marriages of, 7, 204–5; Mazepa compared to, 99–109; negative portrayals of, 25–26, 29, 32–35, 86, 87, 96, 171–73, 176–78; political relationships of, 8–9; positive portrayals of, 5, 39–46, 69, 72, 77, 80–81, 92–97, 143, 170–81, 197–99; roles of, in Ukrainian nineteenth-century discourse, 89–91, 97–105; secrecy of, 106–7
- Khmelnysky, Tymotej (Tymofii, Tymosh), 65–66, 113, 119, 204, 212, 216
- Khmelnysky, Yurii, 45, 189–90
- Khmelnysky uprising (1648): causes of, 26, 116; impact of, 9; influence of, on Sabbatean movement, 15 48–59; Jews' role in, 24–35; literary treatments of, 12–13, 15; overview of, 8; religious targets of, 258*n*57
- Khrushchev, Nikita, 9, 170, 173
- Khudorba, Arkhyp, 247*n*38
- Kipling, Rudyard, 165
- Kniaznin, Franciszek, 71
- Kochowski, Wespazjan, 38; *Annales*, 67, *Climacteres*, 114
- Koliushchyna* (peasant revolt, 1768), 65, 87, 111–13
- Kondratyuk, Marta, 18–19, 120, 223
- Konicpolski, Alexander, 7, 28, 30
- Kononenko, Natalie, 15
- Kornblatt, Judith, 5
- Korniichuk, Oleksandr, 171, 173, 179, 198, 200, 203, 204, 262*n*17; *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, 174
- Koropeckyj, Roman, 16, 222
- Kosach, Yurii, 160–63, 223; *Den' hnyvu*, 18, 182–96; *Diistvo pro Iuriiia-Peremozhtsia*, 189; *Hlukhivs'ka pani*, 189; *Rubikon Khmelnytskoho*, 160–62; *Sonise v Chyhyryni*, 189
- Koslinsky, Shlomo, 189
- Kostenko, Lina, 18
- Kostomarov, Mykola (Nikolai), 63, 65, 84–85, 87, 89–90, 109, 129, 194, 204, 254*n*13; *Bogdan Khmel'niiskii*, 17, 85, 130, 136, 257–58*n*56; *Knyhy byt'ia ukrains'koho narodu*, 130; “Pereiaslavs'ka nich,” 84; “Ukrainskie sceny iz 1649 goda,” 84–85, 90; “Zakon bozhyi,” 89–90
- Kotliar, Leontii, 180
- Kovets ha-Shomer*, 140
- Koźmian, Kajetan, 69, 243*m*8
- Koznarsky, Taras, 16, 221
- Krasinski, Henry, 111, 112, 250*m*6
- Kravchenko, Volodymyr, 197
- Kreizer, Yakov, 180
- Krinitzi, Abraham, 145
- Krylov, Ivan, *A Swan, a Pike and a Crawfish*, 216
- Kryvonis (Krivonos), Maksym, 12; literary portrayals of, 128, 130, 133, 135–37, 164, 193, 261*n*29
- Kuban Cossacks, 169
- Kuechelbecker, Wilhelm, 71
- Kulish, Panteleimon, 63, 65, 86, 87, 89
- Kuperman, Osip. *See* Osipov, K.
- Kuz'mich, Oleksandr, 71
- Kvitka, Ilia, 95
- Kyivan Academy, 39–40
- Kyivan Rus', 9, 154, 159
- Labor Zionism, 17

- Lawrence, D. H., 165
- Le, Ivan (pseudonym of Ivan Leontiovych Moisia), 18; *Khmelnysky*, 187–88; *Severyn Nalyvaiko*, 164, 261n30
- Lelewel, Joachim, 16, 69, 116, 242m10, 243m8
- Levin, Gershon, 257n49
- Liebes, Yehuda, 58
- Lipman, Yoysel ben Eliezer, of Postits, *Kine al gzezyes hakehiles deKaK Ukraine*, 12
- Little Russia, 3, 40–41, 78, 81, 90, 92, 95–96, 99–100
- Liubchenko, Arkadii, 165
- Liubich-Romanovich, V., 71
- Livy, 45–46
- Logos, 163
- London, Jack, 165
- Lurianic Kabbalism, 47–48, 56–59
- Lutsenko, Yuri, 41
- Luzhnytsky, Hryhorii. *See* Ordivsky, Semen
- Lvov-Rogachevsky, Vasily, 134
- Lypa, Yurii, 18, 156–60; *Kozaky v Moskovii*, 156–58, 160; *Pryznachennia Ukrainy*, 158–59; *Ukrainska doba*, 159
- Lypynsky, Viacheslav, 36, 182, 192
- Maccabis, 145, 148, 172
- Magocsi, Paul, 9, 183
- Maiboroda, A. I., 189
- Maidan demonstrations (2013–14), 6
- Maksymovych, Mykhailo, 71, 77, 78, 248n55
- Malaniuk, Yevhen, 157, 159, 160
- Mandel'kern, Solomon, 17, 127–28
- Marranos, 131–32
- Martos, Oleksii, 247n38
- Marxism, 141, 143, 144, 148, 194
- Masculinity, 151, 165
- Mashchenko, Mykola, *Bohdan-Zinovii Khmelnysky*, 19, 198–99, 210–17
- Massacres: BK's role in, 28–29, 33–34, 174, 177–78; Hanover's *Yeven metsulah* on, 25; modernist literary treatment of, 127–38; numbers of dead in, 228m10; Sabbatean movement in relation to, 48–53; Tul'chyn, 17, 29, 127–38. *See also* Pogroms
- Matejko, Jan, *Bohdan Khmelnysky Pledging Allegiance at Zboriv*, 115, 252m8
- Matones, 175
- Mayakovsky, Vladimir, 109
- May Laws, 127
- Mazepa, Ivan, 16, 39, 41, 65, 73, 75, 77–78, 92, 98–109, 221, 248n61
- Mazepan Baroque, 39
- Mazierska, Ewa, 207
- Megilat 'efah* (popular chronicle), 26
- Meir of Szczepreszyn, *Tsok ha-'itim*, 12, 24, 25, 31, 233n14
- Melodrama, 112
- Meonism, 130, 255n17
- Merezhkovsky, Dmitry, 130
- Meshoyrer (doctor), 257n49
- Messiah son of Joseph, 51–52
- Messianism: birth pangs of the Messiah, 49–50; Christian, 48; Lurianic Kabbalism and, 48–49, 56–59; messianic precursor, 51–52; Sabbatean movement, 48–59; 1648 as significant date in, 49–50; women's role in, 53–54
- Metulla, Palestine, 149–50
- Mickiewicz, Adam: “Księgi narodu polskiego i pielgrzymstwa polskiego,” 89; *Poezje*, 68
- Mikeshin, Mikhail: model for memorial to BK, 1, 2, 3, 127, 134; monument to BK, 1, 3, 17, 127, 133–34, 227nm1–5
- Mikhoels, Solomon, 178–79
- Minskii, Nikolai Maksimovich (pseudonym of N. M. Vilenkin), 255n27; *Osada Tul'china*, 17, 127–38; *Pri svete sovesti*, 130, 133, 134
- Modernism, Tul'chyn massacre in literature of, 127–38
- Moisia, Ivan Leontiovych. *See* Le, Ivan

- Mokrski, Andrzej Humel, 7
- Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, 164, 200
- Moses, 3, 39, 43, 69, 90, 223
- Muscovy, BK's allegiance to, 5, 9, 42, 86, 93, 98, 104, 170–72
- Mussolini, Benito, 156, 158
- Mustache theme, 101, 102, 248<sup>n55</sup>
- Mylost' Bozhiia Ukrainu . . . svobodyushaia* (school drama), 15, 40, 77–78, 90, 244<sup>n44</sup>, 245<sup>n45</sup>
- Nadav, Yitzhak, 146
- Nadav, Zvi, 146–47
- Nalyvaiko, Severyn, 92
- Nathan of Gaza, 50–51, 55, 57, 240<sup>n13</sup>
- Nationalism: characteristics of, 154; Polish, 206; Russian, 202–3; types of, 153–54, 156; Ukrainian, 154–65, 182–83, 185–86, 199, 210–16. *See also* Zionism
- Nazi Germany, 158, 171
- Neoclassicism: in Polish literature, 64, 112, 113; in Russian literature, 63–64; in Ukrainian literature, 63–64. *See also* Classicism
- New Christians, 48
- New Jews, 17, 139–52
- New Republic* (journal), 177–78
- New York Times* (newspaper), 177
- Nicholas I, 81
- Niemcewicz, Julian Ursyn, 16: *Bohdan Chmielnicki*, 16, 64–66, 68, 72, 111–14, 117–20, 242<sup>n9</sup>; *Śpiewy historyczne*, 73, 242<sup>n6</sup>
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, 130, 160
- Nisanov, Yehezkel, 147
- Nomberg, H. D., 257<sup>n49</sup>
- Northern Society, 73
- Nusinov, Isaac, 174
- Olzhych, Oleh, 159
- Order of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 11, 18, 170, 170, 175, 177–81, 180, 267<sup>n5</sup>
- Ordivsky, Semen (pseudonym of Hryhorii Luzhnytsky), 18, 163; *Sribnyi cherep*, 163–64
- Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), 153–54, 156
- Orthodox Christianity: Catholicism in relation to, 6, 136, 138, 202; Cossacks and, 8–9, 202–3; discrimination against, 26; relationship of Jews to, 4
- Osherowitch, Mendel, 176–77
- Osipov, K. (pseudonym of Osip Kuperman), *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii*, 172
- Ostroverkha, Mykhailo, 156
- Ostrowska, Elżbieta, 205
- Ottoman Empire, 8–9
- Padurra, Tymko, 252<sup>n27</sup>
- Palestine. *See* Zionism
- Pastorius, Jan, *Bellum Scythico-Cossacicum*, 31, 235<sup>n49</sup>
- Peasants: anti-Jewish violence of, 30; as model for Zionists, 141–44, 147, 150; relationship of Jews to, 26–27, 143–44, 173–74; status of, 26–27; warrior-peasant model, 141–42, 144–48
- Pereiaslav-Khmelnytsky, 18, 170–71, 175–78
- Pereiaslav Treaty (1654), 5, 9, 16, 18, 84, 86, 98, 170–73, 176, 187, 214, 222, 224
- Peretz, Y. L., 257<sup>n49</sup>
- Pestel, Pavel, 189
- Peter I, 73, 77–78, 101–2, 107
- Peter II, 78
- Petrov, Vladimir, *Kutuzov*, 199
- Petrovsky-Shtern, Yohanan, 18, 223
- Picheta, Vladimir, 173
- Plokhly, Serhii, 5, 229<sup>n21</sup>, 258<sup>n57</sup>
- Po'ale Tsiyon, 144, 145, 148
- Pogroms, 17, 34, 127, 129, 131–2, 134–5, 137, 175. *See also* Massacres
- Pokrovsky, Mikhail, 171–72
- Poland: nationalism in, 206; perceptions of BK in, 4; relationship of Cossacks to, 6, 65; relationship of Jews to, 4, 29; relationship of Soviet Union to, 200

- Polevoi, Nikolai, 97
- Polish film, BK in, 205–10
- Polish literature, 16; BK in, 64–70, 87, 110–23; classicism in, 68; Cossacks in, 110–11; neoclassicism in, 64, 112, 113; pre-Romanticism in, 65; Romanticism in, 64, 68–70, 110; Ukrainian literature in relation to, 64
- Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 3, 8–9, 13, 16, 33, 48, 68, 85, 89, 96, 105, 114, 116–118, 121–2, 183, 234*n*26, 243*n*10, 243*n*18, 252*n*26
- Polubotok, Pavlo, 92
- Portugali, Mendl, 143, 148
- Postup* (journal), 163
- Potocki, Valentin, 131
- Pre-Romanticism, 63–65, 70–76
- Primary Chronicle, 45
- Prokopovych, Teofan, *Epinikion*, 77
- Protestants, 9
- Prylucki, Tsevi, 257*n*49
- Pudovkin, Vsevolod: *Admiral Nakhimov*, 199; *Minin and Pozharskii*, 200; *Suvorov*, 200
- Pushkin, Alexander, 73, 74, 75, 79, 219; *Poltava*, 248*n*55, 248*n*61
- Raba, Yo'el, *Between Remembrance and Denial*, 23
- Race, 86, 158, 177, 188
- Raczyński, Edward, 114
- Rákóczi, Ferenc, II, 104
- Rakushka-Romanovsky, Roman, *EyeWitness Chronicle*, 13, 38, 39, 40
- Rapoport-Albert, Ada, 15, 223
- Rawita-Gawroński, Franciszek, 86, 119, 122
- Reisin, Avrom, 17, 128, 135–37, 257*n*49
- Religious-Philosophical Society, 127, 130
- Repnin, Nikolai, 96
- Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, 164, 200
- Roksolana* (TV series), 210
- Romanticism: national instances of, 63–64; in Polish literature, 64, 68–70, 110; in Russian literature, 63–64; in Ukrainian literature, 63–64
- Romm, Mikhail, 175
- Różycki, Karol, 250*n*6
- Rozanda (aka Helena), 66, 113
- Rozumovsky, Kirill, 92
- Rus', 17, 37, 133–34, 157–59. *See also Istoriia rusov*; Kyivan Rus'
- Russia: nationalism in, 202–3; perceptions of BK in, 3–5; relationship of Jews to, 134; relationship of Ukraine to, 5, 72; reunification of, 3–4, 81, 93, 96, 97, 172–73. *See also* Soviet Union
- Russian literature: BK in, 64–65, 86–88; classicism in, 72, 73; neoclassicism in, 63–64; pre-Romanticism in, 70–76; Romanticism in, 63–64; Ukrainian literature in relation to, 63–64; Ukrainian theme in, 71, 73–75, 87
- Russo, Barukhyah, 53
- Rybak, Natan, 18, 173, 175, 192; *Pereiaslav'ska rada*, 173, 188
- Ryleev, Kondratii, 16, 71, 73–76; “Bogdan Khmel'nitskii,” 70, 73–76, 82; *Dumy*, 73–75; “Petr velikii v Ostrogozhskoe,” 73; *Voinarovskii*, 73, 75
- Rzewuski, Henryk, 70, 87
- Sabbatean movement, 15, 47–59
- Safed Kabbalism, 57
- Sasportas, Jacob, 240*n*12, 240*n*13
- Savchenko, Igor, *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, 19, 198–204, 217
- Schérer, Jean-Benoit, *Annales de la Petite-Russie*, 92, 94, 246*n*8
- Schiller, Friedrich, 72
- Scholem, Gershom, 15, 47, 55–59
- Schorsch, Ismar, 131–32
- Schussberg, Gavriel, *Petaḥ teshuvah*, 12, 24
- Second Aliyah. *See* Zionism
- Seidman, Naomi, 129
- Self-defense, 140–41, 144–47
- Self-labor, 140–41

- Sementovskii, Nikolai, 247n40
- Sephardim: Ashkenazim compared to, 131–32; and Sabbatean movement, 241n26
- “Shche ne vmerla Ukraina” (national anthem), 5
- Sherekh, Yurii, 163
- Shevchenko, Taras, 5, 16, 63, 64, 77, 85–89, 97, 172; *Haidamaky*, 88; “Velykyi l’okh,” 85–86
- Shevchuk, Vasyl, 18
- Shkandrij, Myroslav, 18, 130, 223
- Shochat, Israel, 146
- Shochat, Manya, 146
- Shomrim*. See Hashomer
- Shore, Marci, 200
- Shtern, Sholem, 176
- Shvarts, Aleksandr, 174
- Sidor-Gibelinda, Oleh, 212
- Sienkiewicz, Henryk, 39, 86; *Ogniem i mieczem*, 16, 65–66, 110, 120–23, 198–99, 205–10, 242n9
- Singer, Isaac Bashevis, *Der Sotm in Goray*, 15
- Sipovskii, V., 64, 70
- Sirkes, Joel, 27, 192
- 1648 uprising. See Khmelnytsky uprising (1648)
- Skoropadsky, Ivan, 249n64
- Skovoroda, Hryhorii, 36
- Słowacki, Juliusz, 70, 251n7; *Jan Kazimierz*, 110; *Sen srebrny Salomei*, 87
- Slavophilism, 65–66, 68–69
- Slavs, relationship of Jews to, 192
- Slutskii, Boris, 181
- Snyder, Timothy, 182
- Sobilenki, Jacob, 28
- Sobilenki, Zechariah, 28
- Socialism, 140–41, 143, 151, 160, 169, 172, 176
- Sofonovych, Feodosii (Teodosii), 13, 38
- Somkivna, Hanna, 7
- Soviet literature, 164–65; Ukrainian, 187
- Soviet Union: antisemitism in, 175; Cossacks in, 169; ethnicity in, 169, 172, 174–75; perceptions of BK in, 5, 18, 170, 199–204; relationship of Poland to, 200. See also Russia
- Stalin, Josef, 170, 173, 174, 203
- Stampfer, Shaul, 228n10
- Staszic, Stanisław, 69, 243n18
- Stupka, Bohdan, 207, 208, 210
- Subtel’nyi, Orest, 183
- Sviatoslav, Prince, 45
- Symbolism, 127–28
- Synopsis* (Ruthenian history), 37
- Sysyn, Frank, 3, 13, 15, 19, 223
- Szajnocha, Karol, 116, 117
- Tarnawsky, Yuriy, 210
- Tatars. See Crimean Tatars
- TaZ. See Ha-Levi, David
- Tchernichovski, Shaul, “Daughter of the Rabbi,” 257n54
- Teliha, Olena, 159, 160
- Teller, Adam, 12–13, 129, 222
- Temnik, Abram, 181
- Tishby, Isaiah, 57
- Tokarev, Vasilii, 200
- Tsevi, Shabetai, 15, 47–58; conversion of, to Islam, 52, 54–56; desecration of Sabbath by, 51; imprisonment of, 52; life of, 47; original messianic claims of, 48–50, 57–58, 239n10; persistence of belief in, 56; Scholem’s evaluation of, 55–57; third wife of, 53, 54. See also Sabbatean movement
- Tul’chyn massacre, 17, 29, 127–38
- Twardowski, Samuel, *Wojna domowa*, 13, 38, 40, 67
- Ukraine: civil war in, 135, 137; ethnicity in, 182–89, 192; national identity of, 17–18, 77, 97–105, 109, 159–60, 210, 216, 221; nationalism in, 153–65, 182–83, 185–86, 199, 210–16; peasant culture of, 142–43; perceptions of BK in, 3–5; relationship

- of Jews to, 18; relationship of Russia to, 5, 72; unification of, with Russia, 3–4, 81, 93, 96, 97, 172–73
- Ukrainian Cossacks, 169–70
- Ukrainian film, BK in, 210–17
- Ukrainian Insurgent Army, 170
- Ukrainian literature, 13, 15–16; BK in, 64–65, 69, 76–88, 154–65, 182–96; history writing, 37; modern, 244*n*43; neoclassicism in, 63–64; Polish literature in relation to, 64; Romanticism in, 63–64; Russian literature in relation to, 63–64
- Ukrainian National Democratic Association (UNDO), 154
- Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers Party (USDRP), 164
- Ukrainian Socialist Party, 164
- Ukrainka, Lesia, 18
- Ukrainskii vestnik* (journal), 94–95
- United Nations, 183
- Ussishkin, Menachem, 145
- Ustrialov, Nikolai, 97
- Vainrub, Matvei, 181
- Velychko, Samiilo, 13, 40, 41, 231*n*54
- Vernadsky, George, 176–77, 263*n*34
- Vilenkin, N. M. *See* Minskii, Nikolai Maksimovich
- “Vilnius” panegyric, 39
- Vistnyk* (journal), 153, 159–60, 162–63
- Vlyzko, Oleksa, 165
- Volodymyr (Kyivan prince), 39
- Vyhovsky, Ivan, 39
- Warrior-peasant model, 141–42, 144–48
- Washington, George, 3
- Wasilewska, Wanda, 204
- Weinper, Zishe, 176
- Weinryb, Bernard, 241*n*26
- “Wesele czehryńskie” (ballad), 112, 113, 116, 119
- Williams, Brian Glynn, 230*n*35
- Władysław IV, 7, 92, 116
- Women: femininity, 203; and messianic movements, 53–54; and Zionism, 151
- World War II, 169–76; and German-Soviet war (1942), 162
- Yanait, Rachel, 144, 147–48; Bar Kokhba, 147
- Yanovskii, Yurii, 165
- Yekelchik, Serhy, 172
- Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim, 4, 137
- Yiga’el, Mordechai, 149–50
- Yosef, Raphael, 50–51
- Yuditsky, Abram, 174
- Zaborowski, Tymon, “Bohdan Chmielnicki,” 16, 64, 68–69, 72, 111–14, 119
- Zahrebel’nyi, Pavlo, 18
- Zaid, Alexander, 142, 144–48
- Zaitsev, Oleksandr, 153
- Zaleski, Bohdan Józef, 70, 251*n*7
- Zalizniak, Maksym, 16, 87
- Zalman, Abraham, 51–52
- Zaporozhian Cossacks, 6, 8, 140, 145
- Zaporozhian Host, 9
- Zaseyev-Rudenko, Mykola, *Chorna Rada*, 210
- Zboriv (Zborów) Treaty (1649), 8, 9, 96, 115, 123, 214, 234*n*31, 252*n*18
- Zemah David* (chronicle), 31
- Zerov, Mykola, 13, 41
- Zhirmunskii, V. M., 79
- Zhukovskii, Vasily, 74
- Zionism, 17, 139–52; agricultural component of, 141, 144–47, 150; Cossacks as model for, 140–52; Halperin’s influence on, 144; and Jewish identity, 139–41; self-defense as component of, 140–41, 144–47; and surrounding populations, 145, 149
- Zohar*, 49–50, 58
- Zorka, Samuel, 40
- Zygmunt III, 25, 26

"This is a pioneering collective work examining the diversity of representations of the dramatic events of 1648–1649 in historiography, literature, and film. This collection can serve as a model of a multicultural approach to a complex and controversial subject and will undoubtedly appeal to a wide range of readers."

—MIKHAIL KRUTIKOV, University of Michigan

"What we have here is a finely structured series of approaches to the topic, from the interested cultures, but also in a variety of genres—legend, myth, historiography, literature, politics, film, and visual arts. This is one of the most cohesive collective volumes I have ever read."

—DAVID FRICK, University of California, Berkeley

In the middle of the seventeenth century, Bohdan Khmelnytsky was the legendary Cossack general who organized a rebellion that liberated Eastern Ukraine from Polish rule. Consequently, he has been memorialized in Ukraine as a God-given nation builder, cut in the model of George Washington. But in this campaign, the massacre of thousands of Jews perceived as Polish intermediaries was the collateral damage. Moreover, in order to secure the tentative independence, Khmelnytsky signed a treaty with Moscow, ultimately ceding the territory to the Russian tsar. So, was he a liberator or a villain?

This volume examines drastically different narratives, from Ukrainian, Jewish, Russian, and Polish literature, that have sought to animate, deify, and vilify the seventeenth-century Cossack leader. Khmelnytsky's legacy, either as nation builder or as antagonist, has inhibited interethnic and political rapprochement at key moments throughout history and, as we see in recent conflicts, continues to affect Ukrainian, Jewish, Polish, and Russian national identity.

AMELIA M. GLASER is Associate Professor of Russian and Comparative Literature at the University of California, San Diego.

STANFORD STUDIES ON CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

[www.sup.org](http://www.sup.org)

Cover illustration: Unknown artist. Portrait of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, 18th-century copy of a 17th-century original. Courtesy of the State Historical Museum, Moscow, Russia.

ISBN-13: 978-0-8047-9382-7



9 780804 793827