The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the Image of Jews, and the Shaping of Ukrainian Historical Memory
Author(s): Zenon E. Kohut
Source: *Jewish History,* Vol. 17, No. 2, Gezeirot Ta"h: Jews, Cossacks, Poles and Peasants in 1648 Ukraine (2003), pp. 141–163
Published by: Springer
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20101495
Accessed: 01/06/2014 01:55

Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Jewish History.*

http://www.jstor.org

The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the image of Jews, and the shaping of Ukrainian historical memory

ZENON E. KOHUT
University of Alberta, Canada; E-mail: Zenon.Kohut@ualberta.ca

Abstract. This article traces how a stock image of the Jew developed in the early modern Ukrainian historical narrative. According to this image, the Jew was a rapacious, deliberate, and, at times, even independent exploiter of the Ukrainian people who lorded over them controlling and openly mocking the one true Orthodox faith. Elements of this image were present in the seventeenth century, but it solidified only in the late eighteenth, in the wake of a renewal of the Uniate problem, the continuing relevance of the Polish question, and, following the partitions of Poland, the emergence of a Jewish question. Since the same stock image was also present in Ukrainian folk culture, the article examines briefly this genre and its relationship to the written tradition. Finally, the article gives a few indications on how this early modern image entered into modern Ukrainian historical memory. Although, by the beginning of the twentieth century, leading Ukrainian intellectuals had rejected such a stereotype, its embodiment in Ukrainian historical memory would prove difficult to modify.

The Khmelnytsky Uprising is considered a great watershed, a defining moment, in a number of national historical narratives.[1] The Poles came to regard the uprising as a historical misunderstanding that led the Cossacks to rebel against the "civilizing mission" of Poland and eventually resulted in the loss of the easternmost territories of "Greater Poland." The Russians came to interpret the uprising as a major episode in the continuing "gathering" of "Russian" lands and in the transformation of Muscovy into a European power. Jews mourned the Khmelnytsky massacre as an unprecedented outburst of anti-Jewish violence, a precursor of the horrible pogroms of late imperial Russia, if not of the Holocaust. Finally, Ukrainians celebrated the uprising as a war of liberation from foreign oppression, a popular national movement resulting in the creation of the Cossack state and, in general, a defining moment in the shaping of the Ukrainian nation.[2]

The Ukrainian glorification of an event that in the Jewish tradition is perceived as the greatest horror of early modern times is indicative of the deep chasm between the historical memories of the two peoples. Such perceptions have led to stereotypes of Ukrainians as fundamental, if not "biological," anti-Semites ready to slaughter Jews at a

moment's notice, and of Jews as economic exploiters and willing tools
in the social, religious, and national oppression of the Ukrainian people.
Working within these traditions, Ukrainian historians have shown little
empathy for the tragedy that befell the Jewish community, imply-
ing that the Jewish massacres were understandable, if not justified,
in the wake of unbearable oppression. Jewish commentators, on the
other hand, frequently have presented the massacres as a uniquely
anti-Jewish phenomenon, paying little attention to the complex so-
cial, religious, and national context, and have mitigated or ignored the
violence perpetrated against non-Jewish Poles and Ukrainian Uniates.

How and when were such stereotypes created? It is the contention
of this paper that by the late eighteenth century a stock image of
the Jew became fully developed in Ukrainian historical consciousness.
According to this image, the Jew was a rapacious, deliberate, and,
at all times, even independent exploiter of the Ukrainian people who
lorded over them controlling and openly mocking the one true Orthodox
faith. This article traces the construction of this image in the early
modern Ukrainian narrative and offers a hypothesis on why it reached
its culmination 150 years *after* the Khmelnytsky Uprising. Since the
same stock image was also present in Ukrainian folk culture, it is also
necessary to examine briefly this genre and to consider its relationship
to the written tradition. Finally, the article suggests how this early
modern image entered into modern Ukrainian historical memory.

The developing image of Jews and the Khmelnytsky Uprising in early modern history writing

Until the great uprising, the Orthodox clergy maintained a virtual
monopoly on historical writing. The most influential post-Khmelnytsky
history text, the *Synopsis*, was also penned by a cleric. This work,
frequently described as the first history of the Eastern Slavs, has been
attributed to Innokentii Gizel, the archimandrite of the Kyiv Caves
Monastery, and first appeared in Kyiv between 1670 and 1674. In an
effort to enlist the protection and help of the Muscovite tsar, the author
attempted to connect Kyiv with Muscovy in several ways: through the
common dynasty, common faith, ethnic unity, and territory, which was
presented as a rightful patrimony of the dynasty. Paradoxically, this
work of a Ukrainian cleric became a springboard for Russian imperial
historiography and was adopted de facto as the first official textbook
of Russian history, and reprinted nineteen times by 1836. But the
Synopsis was arguably unfit to serve as the Cossack elite's version of

the past: it discussed in great detail Kyivan Rus' and the Riurykid dynasty, but it completely ignored the Cossacks until well after 1654. (In fact, the Cossacks first appear on the pages of the later editions of the *Synopsis* in the discussion of the Turkish invasions of 1677–1678, that is, in connection with events that took place after the first edition of the book appeared.)[3] Thus, this most popular indigenous history of the Eastern Slavs completely ignores the Cossack wars and Bohdan Khmelnytsky – and, consequently, the massacres of Jews in the mid-seventeenth century.

Another clerical history written in the 1670s (only a few copies of which have survived) was *A Chronicle Based on Ancient Chronicles* by Feodosii Sofonovych (1672–1673), the hegumen of St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery in Kyiv. In his description of early modern times, Sofonovych relied heavily on Polish writers, especially Maciej Stryjkowski. He does discuss the Cossacks and the Khmelnytsky Up-rising quite extensively, mentioning the massacre of the Jews – though without any comments on "Jewish exploitation" or any anti-Jewish religious statements – and introduces two stories that would be retold in subsequent Ukrainian historical writing. The first concerns the capture of the town of Polonne, where the Cossack colonel Maksym Kryvonis killed those Polish nobles who did not manage to escape from the town and "slaughtered a large number of Jews." The second is about the siege of Tulchyn by the troops of Colonel Ivan Hanzha (Handzha), who made truce with the Polish defenders of the town on condition that the latter pay a ransom and hand over all Jews. The Poles did so, and Hanzha "ordered that all the Jews be slaughtered, while taking all their property for himself."[4] Then another colonel, Ostap Ivansky, took the town again and killed all the Poles as well. These events are simply mentioned without any moralizing or explanation. They are inserted into the story of the killing of the Poles and do not constitute a separate plot in the narrative.

Clerical historiography, which began to wane in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, could not satisfy the interests of the Ukrainian secular political elite of the time – the Cossack officers and the Cos-sack administration. The historical tastes of the Cossack elite differed from those of the clergy. They were not interested in some general scheme of East European history, the mighty medieval Kyivan state, or the Riurykid dynasty. Their primary interest was Cossack Ukraine under Poland, the great liberator hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, and Ukrainian and Cossack rights and liberties under both Polish kings and Russian tsars. While not denying affinity with Muscovy/Russia in

religion, dynasty, high culture and even ethnos, the Cossack chronicles insisted on Ukraine's distinctiveness in the political and social order and at least autonomous (if not separate) historical development. The chronicles attempted to find a rightful place for Ukraine and its people among the Polish-Lithuanian, Muscovite-Russian and Tatar-Ottoman worlds.[5]

Jews and the description of anti-Jewish violence do not figure prominently in the narratives of the Cossack chroniclers; references to them are few – especially when compared to the attention paid to the Tatars, or to tracing Cossack rights under different monarchs, or to the smallest detail of every military engagement with the Poles. Moreover, the discussion of the Jews, their economic role, and their slaughter by the rebels does not constitute a separate subject (narrative line), but is always inserted here and there, seemingly mentioned only in passing. The treatment of the Jews is completely subordinated to the Polish problem. The Jews do not appear as actors on their own until late in the period under discussion, and even then they are introduced primarily to underscore the perfidy of the Poles.

Chronologically, the first of the Cossack chronicles is the so-called *Eyewitness Chronicle*, written most likely by Roman Rakushka-Romanovsky (1622–1703) between 1672 and 1702. Though the author actually witnessed many of the events he describes, he only heard about others. As far as the years of Bohdan Khmelnytsky's activity are concerned, the events related in the chronicle were written down a quarter of a century after they had occurred. The author begins his account of the war with a compilation of Polish misdeeds and oppression that caused the Cossack rebellion; later in the narrative, he turns to the Jews. The story of the Cossacks' mistreatment by their Polish regimental commanders is accompanied by a brief remark on the town Jews, whose control over the liquor monopoly prevented the Cossacks from keeping any drink at home. Then the author turns to the oppression of the peasants, blaming it mainly on the local castle chiefs and vice-gerents (*starosty* and *namisnyky*), as well as on Jewish leaseholders. The great Polish landlords, he presumes, knew nothing about the oppression of the peasants, since they did not live on their estates in Ukraine, or, even if they did, they were "blinded by gifts from the castle chiefs and the Jewish leaseholders." In the meantime, he continues, the Jews grew richer and richer by increasing rent payments in kind and money, and even by confiscating the debtors' land.

The Eyewitness's litany of Polish and Jewish misdeeds is worth quoting, since it provides the context and the hierarchy of complaints in which the first anti-Jewish accusations emerge.

> The origin and cause of the Khmelnytsky War is solely the Polish persecution of the Orthodox and oppression of the Cossacks. Then the latter's freedoms were taken away and they were forced to do *corvée* labor, to which they were unaccustomed, and turned into household servants at the castles of the castle chiefs, who also used them to groom horses, stoke fires in the stove, groom dogs, sweep the yards, and perform other unbearable tasks. Those who still remained on the Cossack register had Polish nobles sent to them by the Crown Hetman as colonels; they did not care about Cossack freedoms, but restricted Cossack privileges instead. The King and the Commonwealth established an annual payment of thirty złoty for every Cossack, but [the Polish colonels] would embezzle that money, sharing it with the captains, for the latter were not elected by the Cossacks, but appointed by the colonels at their own discretion; the subservient ones were favoured. The colonels also forced the Cossacks to perform all kinds of unaccustomed household tasks; should the Cossack seize a horse from a Tatar in the steppe, they were sure to take it away; they would send the unfortunate Cossack from Zaporizhia to the city by way of the wild steppes, carrying a falcon, eagle or greyhound as a gift for some lord, with no concern for the Cossack, who might easily be killed by the Tatars. Then again, should the Cossacks take a Tatar prisoner, the colonel would send him to the Crown Hetman with his favourite [Polish] soldier, thereby putting Cossack courage to scorn. In the towns, the Jews mistreated the Cossack, who was not allowed to keep any spirits at home – not just wine, vodka or beer, but even mash. Cossacks who went fishing beyond the [Dnieper] rapids had to give every tenth fish to the [royal] commissioner at Kodak; they also had to give [some fish] to the captains, to the aide-de-camp, and to the chancellor. Thus the Cossacks were impoverished. Besides, there were to be only six thousand [registered] Cossacks; even the son of a Cossack still had to perform *corvée* labor and pay taxes. That was what befell the Cossacks. The lot of the peasants was different. They were well off, with their fields, cattle, and apiaries. But new practices, not customary in Ukraine, were devised by the castle-chiefs, vice-regents, and Jews. The lords themselves did not reside in Ukraine, but merely held offices and therefore knew little of the oppression of the peasants. Even if they knew, they were so

blinded by gifts from the castle chiefs and the Jewish leaseholders
that they could not see that their own property was being used
to bribe them, that they were being given what had been taken
from their subjects. The subjects would not have complained so
bitterly about this, had the lord himself taken it freely. Meanwhile
the lazy scoundrel, the lazy Jew grew richer, riding a carriage drawn
by several pairs of horses and thinking up new taxes: the ox tax,
the handmill tax, the measuring tax, the marriage tax and others,
seizing [debtors'] estates – until [the Poles] encountered one man
whose apiary they seized, and that apiary was the source of trouble
for all of Poland...[6]

Subsequently the author returns to the question of the oppression of
the Orthodox Church and schools by the Poles, noting in passing that
the latter respected the vilest Jew more than the most upstanding
Christian Ruthenian.[7]

Social processes in the Ukrainian lands during the uprising the
author describes summarily, not in the style of the chronicle, but as
generalizations about mass enrolment in the Cossack army, the escape
of the Polish nobility to Poland proper, and the appointment of new
administrators throughout Ukraine. The rebels "killed the noblemen,
castle servants, Jews, and town officials wherever they found them,
without sparing even their wives and children." All the property of the
victims, including specifically mentioned "Jewish estates," was confis-
cated. The author goes on to say that the Polish nobles surrendered
Jews with all their possessions to the rebels in order to save their
own lives, but the rebels typically slaughtered the nobles once they
surrendered. Many Jews converted to Christianity to save their lives,
but later escaped to Poland and renounced their new religion. Finally,
"no Jews remained in Ukraine," while "the greatest number of Jews
perished in Nemyriv and Tul'chyn – an uncountable number."[8]

It is worth noting that the author seems generally to disapprove
of the wartime violence and looting. While describing the killings and
plunder of Polish and Jewish estates, he notes that "at that time, there
was much trouble for prominent people of every estate, mostly from
the knaves." Later, he adds that the Cossacks and their Tatar allies in
Volhynia killed "not only Jews and nobles, but the common people of
that land suffered the same fate."[9]

The next two Cossack chronicles, both very popular and influen-
tial, were written by the subsequent generation of the Ukrainian Cos-
sack elite. Both Samiilo Velychko (1670–1728) and Hryhorii Hrabianka
(1686–1737/38) relied heavily in their description of the Khmelnytsky

period on Polish historians, although they also relied on hearsay, and contemporary Ukrainian diaries or documents (often apocryphal, especially in the case with Velychko). Hrabianka's work, *The Events of the Most Bitter and Most Bloody War since the Origin of the Poles between Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the Zaporozhian Hetman, and the Poles...* (1710), came first chronologically. It is in Hrabianka's work that the accusation of Jews leasing Orthodox churches first appears in Ukrainian history writing some sixty years after the uprising. We are dealing, in fact, with just one sentence in five-page list of Polish misdeeds in Ukraine, the list itself clearly recapitulating the Eyewitness's lengthy enumeration of complaints. The insert on the churches reads: "Also [the Poles] sold the Lord's churches to the Jews, and infants were baptized with the Jews' permission, and various religious customs of pious [Christians] were at the mercy of Jewish leaseholders."[10] In the subsequent narrative, Hrabianka mentions the Jewish invention of new tributes and takeover of debtors' estates, and the great landowners "inflicting upon us" the Jewish tribe, which was constantly devising new tributes and extortions (in the text of the letter supposedly sent by Khmelnytsky to Warsaw).[11] He retells the story of the *szlachta* surrendering the Jews to Hanzha at Nestervar (Tulchyn), adding a significant detail: the Jews defended themselves for three days.[12] When Kryvonis took Bar, all the Poles there were slaughtered, and so were the Jews, "of whom alone more than fifteen thousand were killed in Bar."[13]

Velychko's monumental, if too often fictional, work of the 1720s has not been preserved in full. Moreover, the surviving part of his 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. Parts of Velychko's first book have been lost, and the discussion of the Jews promised by the author in his general description of the first book may well have been among the missing parts.[14] In any case, it is unlikely to have been a detailed discussion: according to Velychko's outline, at the end of the first book he intended to discuss "how Khmelnytsky returned to Pereiaslav and the Little Russians greeted him; about various ambassadors to Khmelnytsky and how they were sent back; about the Poles' conduct in various places and about the Jews; about Shumeiko's march on Kodak and its failure."[15] The first surviving mention of the Jews comes from an apocryphal appeal by Bohdan Khmelnytsky to the Ukrainian people, dated May 28, 1648: "We shall not describe here

comprehensively all the insults, oppression, and devastation inflicted upon us Little Russians by the Poles and their leaseholders and beloved factors, the Jews..."[16] Velychko mentions the massacre of Nestervar (Tulchyn) in expressions almost identical to those of Hrabianka (instead of "defended themselves for three days," he writes that the Jews "defended themselves relentlessly").[17] Velychko does not mention the killing of the Jews of Bar at all. Rather, he says that "fourteen thousand German settlers, nobles who sought refuge there with their treasures, their servants, and others" perished.[18] As Valerii Shevchuk has shown, all these details were taken from the widely read Polish historical poem *Wojna domowa* by Samuel Twardowski, published in 1681.[19]

There is no further development of the Jewish theme until 1770, in a chronicle compiled by Stefan Lukomsky, the *Historical Collection,* which ends chronologically in the late sixteenth century, long before the Khmelnytsky Uprising, although the author includes as a postscript a diatribe against Uniates, Poles and Jews.[20]

The compilative *Historical Collection* by Stefan Lukomsky exemplifies an increasing tendency in Ukrainian historical writing toward more religiously based accusations and increasing justification of anti-Jewish violence. It further develops the topic of the leasing of Orthodox churches by the Jews:

> Here this Historical Collection ends. What follows is [a description of] various developments in Russia, Ukraine, Poland, and Lithuania from 1606 to 1648, of the wars among different peoples, of how the damnable Union with Rome commenced in all the lands held by Poland and in Lithuania (this has already been discussed above), who was responsible for it, and how it was strengthened, of the persecutions experienced by the faithful Ruthenians and Cossacks who did not accept the Union, how the blameless exarch of the patriarch of Constantinople was exiled by the Uniates to Malbork and died there, and how the Orthodox would yet suffer because of the Union. Also told is how the Poles included in the Cossack register only 6,000 of the 50,000 Cossacks who fought against the Turks under Hetman Sahaidachny, how [the Poles] abolished the hetman's office and cruelly executed many hetmans, and enserfed the remaining 44,000 Cossacks either by force or by deceit, and imposed the heaviest taxes on the Ukrainian peasants. Finally, [the Poles] leased divine churches to the Jews, to the great grief of the Orthodox, so that the Jews kept the keys to the churches, and should there be a need to celebrate a Christian rite, baptism, wedding, or anything else, [the Jews] charged the Orthodox a special tax, and

would also curse, insult and beat the priests, tearing out their hair and beards. In other words, the Poles treated the Ruthenians just as they pleased with no fear of God or Judgement Day, and the following stories will display their crimes in detail.[21]

By the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Jewish factor had come to occupy a prominent place in the narratives of the Khmelnytsky Uprising (in particular, its causes). This change is exemplified by *Istoriia Rusov* (The History of the Rus' People), a late eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century historico-political treatise, which was the apogee of the historical thought of the Ukrainian Cossack elite and a springboard for the Ukrainian national revival of the nineteenth century. The theme of leasing Orthodox churches to Jews precedes any discussion of economic exploitation; it is developed vividly and in great detail, with the Jews characterized as "relentless enemies of Christianity" who take pleasure in this opportunity to diminish the Christian faith.[22] Overall, the theme of economic oppression is clearly subjugated in *Istoriia Rusov* to the religious motive: the Jews curse the Orthodox faith in their synagogues, which pleases the Poles, who afford the Jews even more economic opportunities to oppress the Ukrainians.[23] The list of complaints goes on to incorporate the "keys to the church" argument:

> The churches of those parishioners who did not accept the Union [with Rome] were leased to the Jews, and for each service a fee of one to five talers was set, and for christenings and funerals a fee of one to four złoty. The Jews, relentless enemies of Christianity, universal wanderers and outcasts, eagerly took to this vile source of gain and immediately removed the church keys and bell ropes to their taverns. For every Christian need, the cantor was obliged to go to the Jew, haggle with him, and, depending on the importance of the service, pay for it and beg for the keys. And the Jew, meanwhile, having laughed to his heart's content at the Christian service, and having reviled all that Christians hold dear, calling it pagan, or, in their language, goyish, would order the cantor to return the keys with an oath that no services that were not paid for had been celebrated.[24]

The Jews are described as "Polish advisors and spies who, with their Talmud...also were not forgotten [by the Cossacks during the rebellion of 1630–1631] and were fully requited for their collection of taxes;" the Jews were killed mercilessly by the thousands.[25] When the Khmelnytsky Uprising broke out, the hetman "cleared the Jews from the part

of Little Russia up to Kyiv and Kaniv." Some "good" Jews, however, were able to purchase their survival and escape to Poland: "The Jews recognized by the people as behaving well and being useful rather than harmful to the community bought their freedom with silver and valuables that the army needed, and they were allowed to go abroad without hostility."[26]

In the subsequent detailed narration of the war, the author occasionally reminds us that one of the aims of the Cossack units was to clear Ukraine of Poles and Jews wherever they were to be found, although no concrete examples are provided.[27] The author of *Istoriia Rusov* reproduces the text of Khmelnytsky's fictional manifesto from Velychko (the one that mentions oppression at the hands of "the Poles and their leaseholders and beloved factors, the Jews").[28] The story of the Bar massacre is given in much more detail than in the previous chronicles, although most of the new details concern the particulars of the siege and military tactics. The author repeats the story of the fifteen thousand Jews killed in Bar.[29] He also makes a point of stressing rather minor military reports that have some remote connection with the Jews; in some cases, he seems to be relying on contemporary documents or diaries of the Cossack staff officers: "On June 13, Khmelnytsky received a report from the quartermaster-general, Rodak, from the Siversk land, [informing the hetman] that he had cleared Chernihiv and the vicinity, as well as the Starodub region, including the town of Starodub, of Poles and Jews, and that his corps was advancing rapidly to Novhorod-Siverskyi."[30] According to *Istoriia Rusov*, Khmelnytsky continued to drive Poles and Jews out of the territories that he was taking, although "useful" Poles and Jews "who did not lord over the Ruthenian people" were supposedly allowed to stay, paying a contribution in kind. In particular, this allegedly took place in Brody and Zamość.[31]

The author goes so far as to claim that the absence of Jewish leaseholding in the Ottoman Empire was a factor to be considered in concluding a treaty with that empire rather than with Muscovy in 1654. He claims, moreover, that some "young officials and Cossacks" brought this consideration to the attention of the council at Pereiaslav.[32] The final mention of the Jews in *Istoriia Rusov* is a telling one: certain "anti-patriots" of Polish and Jewish background are supposedly concealing the original texts of the Cossack treaties with Muscovy that provided for a free and equal union between the Hetmanate and the empire.[33] Thus, not only have Poles and Jews oppressed Ukrainians in the past, but they are also suppressing the truth about the past.

The sources of anti-Jewish imagination

As we have seen, in the earlier Cossack chronicles, the Jewish motif is completely subordinated to the Polish theme. The chronicles list two fundamental grievances against the Poles: the violation of the rights and liberties of the Cossack estate and the violation of the rights of the Orthodox Church. As the authors proceeded to a detailed description of Polish misdeeds, the Jews enter the picture as the agents of the Poles. As the leaseholders and stewards of the absentee lords, the Jews are taking advantage of the Cossacks and peasants through the mechanisms of economic exploitation, the liquor monopoly, the collection of various taxes, etc. At the same time, Jews could legally punish peasants on estates in the name of the lord. Thus, Jews had been involved (or so the Ukrainian writers understood) not only in violating the rights of the Cossacks, not only in economic exploitation, but also in the physical control and oppression of the Ukrainian people. In a sense, this representation is still a part of the Polish problem, as the chronicles attempt to stress the depravity of the Christian king and lords, who have given such power to infidel Jews over the Christian Orthodox people. At the same time, in the chroniclers' accounts, the violation of corporate rights, economic exploitation and religious oppression are beginning to fuse. The final step is the "keys to the church" argument: it shows the utter depravity of the Polish ruling bodies, which allow the infidel Jew not only to violate the rights of the Cossacks, exploit the population through lease holding and tax farming, and secure physical control over the peasant, but even to establish spiritual power over the Orthodox by controlling their access to the church where divine grace itself, in form of the sacraments essential to their salvation, could be dispensed. That argument also resonated in contemporary minds as the ultimate profanation of Christianity and the Orthodox Church. And, while the "keys to the church" motif was part of the general argument about Polish perfidy, it was the Jews who emerged as the fundamental exploiters – economic, legal and even spiritual.

Where does this image come from and why was it developed? Apparently, the "keys to the church" argument comes from Polish literature. As Polish historians began looking for the causes of the great uprising, which had precipitated a whole series of tragedies for Poland, they first focused on the magnates and particularly on their stewards, the Jews. In a sense this was an attempt, conscious or subconscious, to admit some responsibility for the uprising, while simultaneously minimizing that blame by identifying Jewish profiteering as the primary cause. In Polish writings, the pre-war exploitation of the Cossacks and the peas-

ants by the Jews is described in most strident terms. Among contemporary Polish authors, Samuel Grondski (Grądzki) in his *Historia belli Cosacco-Polonici* (early 1670s) and Wespazjan Kochowski, who wrote in the 1680s, developed the topic of Jewish exploitation of the Ukrainians most prominently.[34] Grondski, for instance, lists seventeen causes of the uprising, with Jewish lease holding, judicial powers and control of Orthodox religious ceremonies (including payments demanded for the baptismal ceremony) prominent among them.[35] Kochowski provides a similar enumeration of wrongdoings, especially Jewish ones, and his list, as Mykhailo Hrushevsky has shown, was appropriated by the Ukrainian chronicler Hrabianka.[36]

The story of the "keys to the church" also appears to come from Polish writings. This story was first cited in 1649, long before the Cossack chroniclers commenced their work, by a Polish Catholic priest from Lublin, Fr. PawełRuszel. In his booklet *Heaven's Favour*, Ruszel portrays Polish tolerance of Jewish exploitation as one of the sins for which the state was punished by the Cossack rebellion. In this context, he reports that he has it on good authority that both Catholics and Orthodox are forced to pay Jewish leaseholders before using churches for sacramental purposes.[37] As noted earlier, the motif of payment for religious ceremonies reappears in Grondski. It is also present in the anonymous Polish memoirs of the seventeenth century studied by Hrushevsky and in the chronicle of a Polish cleric from Lviv, Tomasz Jan Józefowicz, dating from the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century.[38]

Given its strong presence in Polish literature and the subsequent increasing preoccupation of Ukrainian writers with this topic, one should at least briefly address the factual basis (if any) of the "keys to the church" theme. Mykhailo Hrushevsky considered the question of Jewish church leaseholding in volume eight of his monumental *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and concluded that no documentary evidence of such a practice had been discovered, and that the accusation itself had appeared in the Ukrainian written tradition quite late.[39] The Russian Jewish historian Ilia Galant similarly argued that, although the motif of Jewish leaseholding of churches was present in Polish and Ukrainian historical works and in Ukrainian folk tradition, there was no documentary proof of its existence.[40] It is not my aim, of course, to resolve the question of whether the Jews actually leased Orthodox churches in Ukraine. What interests me in this paper is the dynamic of the Jewish question's appearance in Ukrainian historical tradition.

It is my contention that the development of the stereotypical image of the Jew as exploiter – the economic, social, religious, and, to some extent, proto-national oppressor of Ukrainians – that emerges in early modern Ukrainian historiography is closely tied to the re-emergence of the Uniate question, the Polish question and, by the nineteenth century, a new "Jewish question." Although the chroniclers were writing twenty, seventy, and even 150 years after the Khmelnytsky Uprising, similar issues that had sparked the uprising continued to simmer. While the chroniclers were writing in the autonomous Hetmanate (under Russian authority) on the Left Bank of the Dnieper, another part of their fatherland, Right-Bank Ukraine, had been completely devastated by warfare – decried by the chronicles – and only after 1714 did the Polish authorities manage firmly to reassert their control over the region. Through renewed colonization, the Poles reestablished the institution of large estates owned by Polish magnates, worked by Ukrainian peasants, and run by stewards. The latter were now rarely Jewish, recruited instead from the minor Polish nobility. Yet Jews returned this time as well in the capacity of tax-farmers and tavern-keepers.[41] At the same time, the Orthodox Church was being liquidated, and most Ukrainians were at least nominally Uniate. In Right-Bank Ukraine, the eighteenth century saw a series of virtually continuous uprisings in 1734, 1750, and particularly 1768 when Uniate clergymen, Polish nobles and Jews were slaughtered in Uman.

These were the perennial conditions of conflict on the Ukrainian borderlands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Thus, throughout the eighteenth century, the Khmelnytsky Uprising was re-enacted on a much smaller scale. Polish Roman Catholic magnates exploited Ukrainian Orthodox or nominally Uniate peasants and Cossacks, frequently through Jewish intermediaries who were tax collectors, tavern-keepers, and, in some cases, continued to be stewards of landed estates and could purchase or lease monopolies that were the exclusive prerogatives of the *szlachta*. Moreover, the Orthodox Church and its concomitant, early modern Ukrainian culture, was under attack. The religious conflict was further heightened by Russia, acting as protector of the Orthodox in Poland. Most likely, Lukomsky wrote his diatribe against Uniates, Poles, and Jews in 1770 under the impression of the 1768 *haidamaka* uprising.

It is this heightened sense of Orthodoxy and Ukraine under siege that colours *Istoriia Rusov*. The work was almost certainly written after the second partition of Poland (1793), when the Right Bank became part of the Russian Empire and brought home the Uniate, Polish and Jew-

ish questions.[42] Initially, the imperial authorities accepted the existing situation on the Right Bank, including the Polish magnate estates, the Jewish leaseholds, and even the hated Uniate Church. Although the forced conversion of the Uniates began in the 1790s, the church itself continued to exist until 1839. There was an influx of Polish nobles into Kyiv, and Polish culture predominated there well into the nineteenth century.[43] Thus, for the author of *Istoriia Rusov*, even though Poland had been vanquished, the Polish issue remained very much alive within the borders of the Russian Empire. Inexorably linked with the Polish issue was the role of the Jews. Moreover, there was a massive influx of Jews into Left-Bank Ukraine, where previously there had been no significant Jewish presence. The Hetmanate, where *Istoriia Rusov* was written, found itself included in the emerging Pale of Settlement. The active and visible Jewish involvement in commerce and crafts, and their lease holding practices in the Pale of Settlement (which included almost all of Ukraine, eight out of nine ethnic Ukrainian provinces) quickly triggered the "discovery" of the Jewish question in the Russian Empire. This discovery came complete with economic anxieties and, subsequently, religious animosity.[44]

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

The early modern historical narrative and folk literature

Scholars have often referred to Ukrainian folk songs as a source confirming Jewish exploitation, including the leasing of churches, as well as

constituting proof of authentic Ukrainian antipathy toward Jews dating back to the time of Khmelnytsky. However, researching the coverage of these topics in the early modern written tradition, I cannot help noting that the folk songs are, in all likelihood, dependent on that – or even some later – bookish tradition; they can hardly be considered an authentic contemporary source. The Jewish theme is elaborated in two Ukrainian *dumy*, "The *Duma* about the Oppression of Ukraine by Jewish Leaseholders" and "The *Duma* about the Battle of Korsun."[45] The latter is of limited interest for my topic, as it concentrates on a grotesque description of the Jews' escape from Ukraine.[46] In what it does say about the causes of social unrest, the *duma* literally follows the traditional motif of the post-war Polish writers, that of blaming the Jews for the rebellion: "Then the Poles conceived of an idea – /They blamed the Jews: /'O you Jews, /You children of pagan parents, /Why did you raise such rebellion and alarums, /Why did you build three taverns per mile? /Why did you collect such high tolls'."[47]

"The *Duma* about the Oppression of Ukraine by Jewish Leaseholders" is far more relevant, since it contains a long description of Jewish oppression, as well as of the Cossack revenge supposedly ordered by Khmelnytsky himself. The *duma* was recorded in the late 1840s and early 1850s, but from the same peasant bard (the first recording had been incomplete), and the second recorder, Panteleimon Kulish, admitted to relating national history to the *kobzar* even as he recorded this presumably "pure" sample of national folk poetry.[48] Thus, when we discover the numerous borrowings from the Polish and Ukrainian literary traditions in this *duma*, we cannot determine whether they are mostly Kulish's interpolations or whether the oral and written traditions interacted at some earlier stage. Ivan Franko studied this *duma* in the late nineteenth century and found that it reflects the later Cossack tradition rather than the circumstances of the 1640s. In particular, he noted that "the poetically elaborated description of the Jews lording over the Cossacks is closer to the catalogue of Cossack grievances in Hrabianka and Lukomsky than to the reality of the mid-seventeenth century."[49] Volodymyr Antonovych and Mykhailo Drahomanov, who published this *duma* in the 1870s, first noted that the list of the Ukrainian rivers included in it was borrowed directly from Velychko's chronicle; later Ukrainian folklorists thought this proved Kulish's heavy editing of the *duma* on the basis of the Cossack literary tradition.[50] In the early 1920s, Filiaret Kolessa noted the parallels between the plot of the *duma* and the Polish poem about the battle at Zhovti Vody.[51] Finally, Jacob Shatzky has shown that this *duma* displays a striking similarity to a

Polish literary work dating from 1648, *Kruk w złotej klatce, albo żydzi w swobodnej wolności Korony Polskiej* (The Raven in a Golden Cage, or the Jews in the Freedom of the Kingdom of Poland), by Jan Kmita. Shatzky has pointed out that the description of Jewish lease holding and tax collection, as well as the episode in which the Christian takes his hat off to a Jew, seem to have migrated to the *duma* from this Polish source.[52] As to the way by which literary motifs penetrated the oral tradition, the Ukrainian scholar Ivan Ierofeiev suggested as early as 1909 that the stereotypical image of a Jew migrated to the Ukrainian *dumy* from the eighteenth-century stage performances (via the religious school drama theatre or the Ukrainian wandering puppet theater, the *vertep*).[53] In the final analysis, it appears quite likely that the stereotypical image of the Jews, including their possession of the keys to Orthodox churches, passed into the *dumy* from Polish and Ukrainian literary sources, although there is no scholarly agreement on this subject.[54]

The impact of the early modern historical narrative

If we consider the Ukrainian intellectual tradition, the Cossack chronicles and especially *Istoriia Rusov* held considerable sway over the next generation of Ukrainian historians and writers.[55] That influence is particularly apparent in Mykola Markevych's five-volume *Istoriia Malorossii* (History of Little Russia, 1842–1843). This patriotic history, written under the influence of Romanticism, literally recasts most of the stories of *Istoriia Rusov*, especially those concerning the Jewish right to levy duties on blessed bread at Easter, the Cossacks mocking their Jewish victims' curses upon the Christians, the "good Jews" being allowed to leave after paying ransom, the capture of Bar, etc.[56] Markevych's book was very popular in its own right; its importance was magnified, moreover, thanks to its use by Ukrainian Romantic writers, most notably Taras Shevchenko.

The image of Jews and the Khmelnytsky Uprising that finally emerged from early modern history writing found particular resonance in Ukrainian Romantic populism, which became the dominant intellectual current in the mid-nineteenth century. The populists focused on the history and life of the common people. The same individuals were frequently ethnographers, historians, and writers of popular fiction. They not only studied or wrote about the common people, but also identified themselves with their suffering. To the Romantic populists, the image of Jews and the Khmelnytsky Uprising that they perceived

in early modern historiography was an accurate representation of the terrible suffering and exploitation of the Ukrainian people. This image was further reinforced by what the Ukrainian Romantic populists considered the ultimate authentic historical source, Ukrainian folklore.

The most famous, important, and representative of the Romantic populists was Mykola Kostomarov. He paid considerable attention to Jewish exploitation of the Ukrainian people in his folkloristic, historical and journalistic works. In a study of Ukrainian folk songs, Kostomarov emphasized their reflection of the historical "tyranny of the arrogant Jews."[57] This condemnation of the social role of the Jews of Ukraine is also prominent in his publicistic writings of the early 1860s:

> When the Judeans settled in Poland and Little Russia, they occupied the place of the middle class, becoming willing servants and agents of the mighty nobility; they clung to the stronger side, and they fared well until the people, rising against the lords, brought under their judgement the helpers of the latter. The Judeans, caring only about their own comfort and that of their tribe, began to extract [advantages] from the relationship that then existed between the nobles and the serfs. In this way, the Judeans became the *factotum* of the lords; the lords entrusted to them their income, their taverns, their mills, their industry, their property, and their serfs, and sometimes even the faith of the latter.[58]

Kostomarov's book *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* (1857) was written in semi-scholarly style under the influence of Velychko and *Istoriia Rusov*. Nevertheless, he dropped *Istoriia Rusov* as a source in the second edition, and in later editions also took into consideration other sources, in particular the testimony of the Jewish eyewitness Nathan Hanover once it became available in Russia (beginning with the fourth edition of 1884).[59]

Istoriia Rusov and Markevych's *History* provided Ukrainian (and Russian) Romantic populist writers with subjects and archetypes for the literary imagination. The latter were, of course, highly significant at a time when Ukrainian society was in the process of developing a modern national consciousness. The stereotype of the Jew as leaseholder, often the one holding the keys to the Christian church, as Polish spy or agent, or simply as go-between – certainly someone not to be trusted – became prominent in nineteenth-century Ukrainian literature and was only displaced in early twentieth century with works which portrayed Jews sympathetically as natural allies of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in its struggle for freedom.[60]

Modern Ukrainian history writing evolved along similar lines. As Frank E. Sysyn has shown, with the advent of positivism, new liberal and socialist ideals entered Ukrainian populist historiography, gradually dissolving traditional anti-Jewish rhetoric.[61] For example, the greatest Ukrainian historian of the early twentieth century, Mykhailo Hrushevsky, understood the Khmelnytsky Uprising primarily as social movement, although with national and religious "motifs" present as well. Incidentally, Hrushevsky shows great appreciation of Nathan Hanover's account of pre-war social antagonisms:

> This Jew from Volhynia penetrated more deeply into the foundations from which the uprising developed and produced an even broader analysis of its social and ethnic causes than our own "Eye-witness," who, without concentrating on the general condition of enserfment, merely refers to some of its secondary symptoms and manifestations: the arbitrary behaviour of the leaseholders, Jewish ones in particular. Such superficial attention to various details of social relations under serfdom, with no thorough analysis of the primary class and ethnic antagonisms, is quite typical: we encounter it in other authors as well.[62]

The Khmelnytsky Uprising, the image of Jews, and the shaping of Ukrainian historical memory

Although early modern Ukrainian historical writing began some decades after the uprising, it focuses neither on Jews nor on the massacres. Jewish leaseholders are mentioned in a long catalogue of Polish abuses, but the main focus is on the violation of Cossack rights and the persecution of the Orthodox Church. The slaughter of Jews is registered together with the slaughter of Poles, Catholics, and others, and is reported with no attempt at explanation, justification or moralizing. In all the early modern historical literature there is no Jewish issue, only a Polish one. It is the perfidy of the Poles that allows a Christian people be lorded over by the infidel Jews. However, an image gradually emerges of the Jew as ultimate exploiter: economic through the leasing of virtually everything, trade monopolies, and tax-farming; legal and physical through his ability to exert legal power over peasants, and at times, Cossacks in the name of the lord; and spiritual through his alleged possession of the keys to the church, which gives him control over access to the sacraments and salvation – control that represents a profanation of true Christian faith. Elements of this image appear

in Hrabianka (1709); it gains resonance in Lukomsky (1770), and is fully developed in *Istoriia Rusov*, which, probably, began to circulate at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This image is borrowed from seventeenth-century Polish historical writing, which attempted both to explain the great revolt and, in part, to lay the blame for it on the Jews. It is my contention that this image was embellished and codified in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries because of the renewal of the Uniate problem, continuing relevance of the Polish question, and, as a result of the partitions of Poland, the emergence of a Jewish question.

Thus, by the turn of the nineteenth century, which marked the end of early modern Ukrainian history writing, a Jewish stereotype had emerged. Owing to the immense popularity of *Istoriia Rusov*, and the specific interests of Ukrainian Romantic populism, that stereotype was incorporated into modern Ukrainian historiography and made its way into the new genre of historical fiction. But it was not the only source or even, perhaps, the most important one. For the populists, the more vivid and exciting images of oral folk literature, the dumy, were as important as any early modern Ukrainian source. Moreover, the anti-Jewish Polish literature on the Khmelnytsky Uprising was also available to nineteenth-century Ukrainian historians, poets, and writers. All three strands coalesced to shape modern Ukrainian historical memory. And although by the beginning of the twentieth century the leading Ukrainian intellectuals rejected the anti-Jewish stereotypes, their embodiment in historical memory would prove difficult to modify.

Notes

1. I would like to thank my colleagues Frank Sysyn, Serhii Plokhy, and Serhy Yekelchyk for contributing to my thinking about these issues. Also I would like to thank Moshe Rosman and Adam Teller, the original editors of this collection, for permission to use some materials from this article in "The Image of Jews in Ukraine's Intellectual Tradition: The Role of *Istoriia Rusov*," *Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Essays in Honor of Roman Szporluk*, ed., Zvi Gitelman, et al., (Cambridge: Ukrainian Research Institute Publications, 2000), 343–358.

2. A convenient survey of the Russian, Polish and Ukrainian interpretations of the Khmelnytsky Uprising is provided by Stephen Velychenko, *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914* (Edmonton: CIUS Press, 1992). An earlier work, documenting the evolution of the Russian, Ukrainian and Soviet views on the results and significance of the Cossack-Polish war, is John Basarab, *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study*

(Edmonton: CIUS, 1982). The Jewish image of the events is analyzed in Joel
Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial: The Fate of the Jews in the Wars
of the Polish Commonwealth during the Mid-Seventeenth Century as Shown
in Contemporary Writing and Historical Research* (Boulder: East European
Monographs, 1995).

3. Hans Rothe, ed., *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facsimile mit einer Einleitung* (Köln:
Böhlau Verlag, 1983), 365ff.

4. Feodosii Sofonovych, *Khronika z litopystsiv starodavnikh*, ed. with commentary
by Iu. A. Mytsyk and V. M. Kravchenko (Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1992), 228.

5. One Cossack chronicler, Hryhorii Hrabianka, went further than others in affirm-
ing the Ukrainians' historical distinctiveness. He traced the Cossacks' genealogy
to the Khazars, thus further distancing any affinity with Russia.

6. *Letopis' Samovidtsa* (Kyiv, 1878; repr. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972),
3–5.

7. Ibid., 11. For this time period, the term "Ruthenian" refers to the Ukrainian
and Belarusian population of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

8. Ibid., 12, 13.

9. Ibid., 13, 15.

10. Hryhorii Hrabianka, *Deistviia prezel'noi i ot nachala poliakov krvavshoi neby-
valoi brani Bogdana Khmel'nitskogo, getmana zaporozhskogo, s poliaki* (Kiev,
1854) repr. in *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj*
(Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1990), 30 (314).

11. Ibid., 32, 48.

12. Ibid., 51.

13. Ibid., 52. The very next sentence reports on Princess Wiśniowiecki's lament,
indicating that this part of the text may well be based on a Polish source.

14. Samiilo Velychko, *Litopys*, trans. with an introduction by Valerii Shevchuk
(Kiev: Dnipro, 1991), vol. 1, p. 23 and footnote on p. 90.

15. Ibid., 32.

16. Ibid., 80.

17. Ibid., 84.

18. Ibid., 89.

19. Ibid., note 150 on p. 84, cf. also p. 10.

20. Stefan Lukomsky, "Sobranie istoricheskoe," in *Letopis' samovidtsa* (Kiev, 1878,
repr. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972), 371, 372. Some scholars argue that
Lukomsky planned to continue his narrative with his own translation of Twar-
dowski's *Wojna domowa*, the text of which was eventually lost (Introduction by
Orest Levytsky, xi).

21. Lukomsky, "Sobranie istoricheskoe," 371, 372.

22. *Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* (Moscow, 1846), 40, 41.

23. Ibid., 48, 49.

24. Ibid., 40, 41. The translation is adapted (with minor changes) from George G.
Grabowicz, "The Jewish Theme in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century
Ukrainian Literature," in ed., Howard Aster and Peter J. Potichnyj, *Ukrainian-
Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of
Ukrainian Studies, 1988), 327–342, here 331.

25. *Istoriia Rusov*, p. 52. The Jews are referred to as the Polish spies again on p. 106.

26. Ibid., 65.

27. Ibid., 67, 74.

28. Ibid., 70.

29. Ibid., 76.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid., 80, 82.

32. Ibid., 118.

33. Ibid., 122. To substantiate his defense of Cossack rights and privileges, the author claimed that Ukraine's treaty of union with Muscovy in 1654, like Lithuania's union with Poland in 1569, contained a clause whereby the Cossack state united with Muscovy "as equal with equal and free with free" (Ibid., 6, 7, 209).

34. Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy* (Kyiv, 1922; repr. New York: Knyhospilka, 1956), vol. 8, part 2, 120, 121.

35. Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial*, 111-12, quoting K. Koppi, ed., *Historia belli Cosacco-Polonici authore Samuele Grondski de Grondi* (Pest, 1789), 32, 33.

36. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, part 2, 124, 125.

37. Frank Sysyn, "A Curse on Both Their Houses: Catholic Attitudes toward the Jews and Eastern Orthodox during the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising in Father Paweł Ruszel's *Fawor niebieski*," in *Israel and the Nations: Essays Presented in Honor of Shmuel Ettinger* (Jerusalem: Historical Society of Israel and Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1987), xi–xxiii, here xvii, xviii and xxiii.

38. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, part 2, 122. Cf. "Letopis' sobytii v Iuzhnoi Rusi l'vovskogo kanonika Iana Iuzefovicha, 1624–1700," in *Sbornik letopisei otnosiashchikhsia k istorii Iuzhnoi i Zapadnoi Rusi* (Kyiv, 1888), 121, 122.

39. "Notwithstanding a certain interest in this matter, no documentary evidence of Jewish leasing of churches or any related conflicts has been uncovered so far. The blaming of Jews for such misdeeds emerges relatively late in [Ukrainian] historical tradition, but this accusation comes to occupy a prominent and permanent place among the arguments of this historical antisemitism," (Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, part 2, 122–126, here 126).

40. I. Galant, "Arendovali li evrei pravoslavnyie tserkvi na Ukraine," *Ievreiskaia starina* 1 (1909): 71–87. This topic had been also debated in Israel. Most recently, Judith Kalik of Hebrew University indicated that although a rare phenomenon, there is clear documentary evidence of the leasing of both Catholic and Orthodox churches to Jewish leaseholders. This fact was brought out in the discussion of her paper "The Orthodox Church and the Jews in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth" at the International Conference "Gezeirot Tah-Tat-East European Jewry in 1648–1649: Context and Consequences" at Bar-Ilan University, May 18–20, 1998.

41. M. J. Rosman, *The Lord's Jews: Magnate-Jewish Relations in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth during the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1990), 109, 110.

42. *Istoriia Rusov* mentions the Tmutarkan stone, which was found in 1792. (This point was originally made by Anatolii Iershov in 1928. See Anatolii Iershov, "Do pytannia pro chas napysannia 'Istorii Rusov,' a pochasty i pro avtora ii," *Iuvileinyi zbirnyk na poshanu akademika Mykhaila Serhiievycha Hrushevs'koho* (Kyiv, 1928), vol. 1, 286–291, here 288, 289.) Since news of the find would have taken considerable time to circulate in the eighteenth century, it is very likely that the work was written after the 1793 partition of Poland. Many scholars think that *Istoriia Rusov* was written or edited as late as 1815–1825. See O. Ohloblyn, "Istoriia Rusov," *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), vol. 2, 360.

43. Michael F. Hamm, *Kiev: A Portrait, 1800–1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 55–81.

44. Cf. Klier, *Russia Gathers Her Jews*, chs. 3, 4.

45. Both are to be found in *Ukrainian Dumy: Editio Minor*, trans. George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina, introduction by Natalie K. Moyle (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1979), 163–169 and 156–161. This edition provides parallel texts in Ukrainian and English. In the title and text of the first *duma*, the word *orendari* (leaseholders) is rendered mistakenly as "merchants."

46. There is also a variant combining this grotesque picture of Jewish flight with the story of Jewish wrongdoings from the the second *duma.* As the researchers have shown, this variant had been heavily edited, if not entirely rewritten, in the 1850s by the publisher, Mykola Kostomarov. See B. P. Kirdan, *Ukrainskii narodnyi epos* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 44, 45 and Marko Plisets'kyi, *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy: siuzhety i obrazy* (Kyiv: Kobza, 1994), 218, 219.

47. *Ukrainian Dumy: Editio Minor*, 157, 159.

48. Kulish's publication is in P. Kulish, ed., *Zapiski o Iuzhnoi Rusi*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1856), 56–63; his account of "recording" the *duma* from Andrii Shut in the village of Oleksandrivka is on pp. 63, 64. For a critical view of Kulish's technique of recording, specifically as regards this particular *duma*, see *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy*, ed. and with an introduction by Kateryna Hrushevs'ka, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy, 1927), lii, lxv.

49. Ivan Franko, "Studii nad ukrains'kymy narodnymy pisniamy," in his *Zibrannia tvoriv u p'iatdesiaty tomakh*, vol. 43 (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1986), 184.

50. Marko Plisets'kyi, *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy*, 217.

51. Filiaret Kolessa, "Ukrains'ki narodni dumy u vidnoshenniu do pisen', virshiv i pokhoronnykh holosin'," *Zapysky NTSh* 131 (1921): 1–63, here 49, 50. However, Kolessa rejected the possibility of the direct literary influences on the dumy.

52. In reporting the conclusions of Shatzky's Yiddish-language publication, I rely on Raba, *Between Remembrance and Denial*, 217.

53. Ivan Ierofeiev, "Ukrains'ki dumy i ikh redaktsii," *Zapysky Ukrains'koho naukovoho tovarystva u Kyievi* (Kyiv, 1910), kn. 7, 17–64, here 45, 46.

54. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, most students of Ukrainian folklore, in particular Pavlo Zhytetsky, Volodymyr Peretts, and Ivan Ierofeiev, recognized significant influence of contemporary written literature on the dumy. Filiaret Kolessa, who worked in interwar Western Ukraine and, subsequently, in Soviet Ukraine, suggested that the similarities between the two reflect the fact that both depended on the "Cossack tradition," Soviet folklorists understandably insisted on the authenticity of the *duma*s as oral literature. Western

and post-Soviet Ukrainian folklorists are more open to the question of the high culture's influence on the Ukrainian folklore. See: P. Zhitetskii [Zhytets'kyi], *Mysli o narodnykh malorusskikh dumakh* (Kyiv, 1893); I. Ierofeiev, "Ukrains'ki dumy i ikh redaktsii;" V. N. Peretts, *Issledovaniia i materialy po istorii starinnoi ukrainskoi literatury XVI–XVIII vv.* (Leningrad, 1926–1929), vols. 1–3; Filiaret Kolessa, *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy* (L'viv, 1920), here p. 83; Kirdan, *Ukrainskii narodnyi epos* [the Soviet view]; Plisets'kyi, *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy* [the post-Soviet Ukrainian view].

55. See Frank E. Sysyn, "The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14, nos. 3/4 (December 1990), 593–607.

56. N. Markevich, *Istoriia Malorossii* (Moscow, 1842), vol. 1, 121, 127, 128, 171, 191.

57. N. I. Kostomarov, "Istoricheskoie znachenie iuzno-russkogo pesennogo tvorchestva," in *Sobranie sochinenii* 8, 809.

58. "Iudeiam," *Osnova*, no. 1 (1862), 38–58, here 43, 44. The English translation is adapted, with minor changes, from Roman Serbyn, "The *Sion-Osnova* Controversy of 1861–1862," in Aster and Potichnyj, *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 85–110, here 99.

59. N. Kostomarov, *Bogdan Khmel'nitskii* (St. Petersburg, 1904), 638–650.

60. For a more detailed discussion, see George G. Grabowicz, "The Jewish Theme in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-century Ukrainian Literature," 327–343.

61. Frank E. Sysyn, "The Jewish Factor in the Khmelnytsky Uprising," in Aster and Potichnyj, *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 43–54, here 46.

62. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, vol. 8, part 2, 119, 120.