Recovering the Ancient and Recent Past: The Shaping of Memory and Identity in Early Modern Ukraine
Author(s): Frank E. Sysyn
Source: *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Fall, 2001), pp. 77-84
Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Sponsor: American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS).
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/30054127
Accessed: 04/09/2014 20:38

FRANK E. SYSYN

RECOVERING THE ANCIENT AND RECENT PAST: THE SHAPING OF MEMORY AND IDENTITY IN EARLY MODERN UKRAINE

Twice within a century early modern Ukrainians undertook a project of restoring historical memory. The more renowned effort, in the early seventeenth century, comprised the rebuilding of the medieval monuments of Kyiv and the restitution of the memory of the great medieval state centered on that city. After the massive uprising in mid-seventeenth century Ukraine led by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1648–1657), a new political and social order emerged under the control of the Zaporozhian Cossack Host. By the early eighteenth century, the new Ukrainian elite undertook a project to legitimize the new order by fashioning its own vision of the Khmelnytsky Uprising. The first recovery reached back more than six hundred years; the second, barely sixty. In both instances, early modern Ukrainian intellectuals, through their efforts to recover the ancient and recent past, provided the foundations for modern Ukrainian identity and memory.[1]

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, the large area of what had been the medieval city of Kyiv filled in as the population of the surrounding lands boomed. The city recovered from a century of Tatar attacks that had undermined its late fifteenth-century revival and commercial life reemerged. The ruined Golden Gates of the medieval walls and the cathedral of the Holy Wisdom were evidence of the city's former greatness to its inhabitants. The Monastery of the Caves, with its numerous relics, marked its holiness. Seventeenth-century man could not help but feel small amidst the ruins of what had clearly been a splendid civilization, but he could also take delight in a return of part of its glory.

In the late sixteenth century, the Polish poet Sebastian Klonowic in *Roxolania* thus characterized the significance of the major city on the southeast frontier of the Polish-Lithuanian state:

> Ancient Kyiv, former grand-princely capital,
> How many traces have you preserved of glorious antiquity! . . .
> Know that here in Rus', Kyiv means as much as ancient
> Rome to the early Christians; it has the same importance.
> Kyiv does not lack ancient marvels—it takes constant pride
> In all its wonders: all this it will show to you.
> Deep underground there are great caves, and
> The ancient crypts of princes may be seen in the darkness of underground vaults.
> In the deepest caves there repose the uncorrupted remains
> Of the heroes of Rus'.[2]

Kyiv was like Rome not only in its relics and holy sites and in the remnants of the former polity, but also in its rebuilding program. Not only were the great cathedral and monastery churches rebuilt in the early seventeenth century, but archaeological

---

Dr. Frank E. Sysyn is director of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta. His publications include *Between Poland and Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–53* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, dist. by Harvard University Press, 1985) and studies on the Khmelnytsky Uprising and early modern Ukrainian historiography. He is editor-in-chief of the Hrushevsky Translation Project, associate editor of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, and on the editorial board of the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine* and of the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*.

digs were undertaken on the site of Kyiv's oldest church, the Church of the Tithes, where the relics of Kyiv's Christianizer Prince Volodymyr were discovered and a new church was built. If the rebuilding of the ancient city and reverence for the catacombs made Kyiv similar to Rome, the tradition of the Church had long linked the city with the second Rome, Constantinople. Volodymyr was the new Constantine and his Christian grandmother Olha, the new Helena. Not only had Kyiv received its Christianity from Constantinople, but church tradition, so frequently affirmed in seventeenth-century writings, saw the Apostle Andrew not only as traveling to the site of future Constantinople but also to Kyiv and predicting the rise of a great city on its hills. The link to Constantinople was further reinforced by the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate's subordination to Constantinople. Yet, in the religious turmoil following the union of the metropolitan and most of the bishops with Rome in 1596, the Orthodox Church, which the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had declared illegal, turned to the Eastern patriarchs for support. In 1620, with the authorization of the patriarch of Constantinople, Patriarch Theophanos of Jerusalem consecrated a new hierarchy. As the Orthodox leaders of Kyiv defended their legitimacy and the holiness of their city, assertion of Kyiv as the Second Jerusalem developed. Thus, by the early seventeenth century, Ukrainian churchmen had elevated the status of Kyiv by linking it to the traditions of Rome, Constantinople, and Jerusalem.

For the Ukrainian literate classes, the texts of Polish Renaissance historiography, which utilized the medieval Rus' chronicles, provided an account of the great Rus' polity. By the early seventeenth century, stimulated by Polish historiography, Ukrainian churchmen themselves turned to the old chronicles, as well as to the Polish works, to demonstrate the primacy of Orthodoxy through examination of traditions of the conversion of Rus'. Indeed, even their opponents in union with Rome testified to the importance of Kyivan Rus' in the Christian world, albeit seen according to Catholic tradition. At the same time, the lives of the saints of the Kyiv *Patericon* were reedited and even translated into Polish to demonstrate the holiness of Rus' to the Latins. As the old chronicles were recopied, the copyists at times created the most fundamental links to the glorious past by penning marginal notes describing the tenth and eleventh-century figures as ancestors of great men of their day, often by playing on names and their meanings.[3]

By the age of the great metropolitan Petro Mohyla (1632–47), Kyiv had reemerged as a religious and cultural centre, above all because of the collegium (later an academy) established by the churchman. Its clerics had reasserted the primacy of Kyiv, the Christian history of Eastern Europe, and its role as a medieval political centre. The great monasteries had revived as centers of history writing, above all by copying and reworking the Ukrainian version of the old Rus' chronicles. To live in Kyiv in the age of Petro Mohyla was to witness the revival of Kyiv's medieval glory and the restoration of its historical memory. Yet, despite the allusions to Kyiv as the Rus' capital and to the traditions of Rus' rulers and polities, early seventeenth–century Kyiv was merely the main city of a palatinate, and the four Ukrainian palatinates surrounding it (central and eastern Ukraine) had merely the right to retain the Ruthenian (middle Ukrainian-Belorusian) language as the official language and a separate legal statute within the structure of the Kingdom of Poland. The cultural renaissance and the recovery of the past characterized the Rus' religious-cultural community as the Ruthenian nation. However, that nation had no political embodiment and had a lay elite that, despite the revival, was more and more frequently abandoning the Orthodox Church to join the dominant Catholic Church, acculturating and even assimilating to the Poles.

The political map of Ukraine was redrawn by the Khmelnytsky Uprising that broke out in 1648.[4] Initiated because of the dissatisfaction of the Cossacks with their situation in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and sustained by their ability to gain the support of the Crimean Khanate, the uprising led by Bohdan Khmelnytsky, a Cossack officer who had suffered personal injustices, ignited an explosion that combined peasant anger at expanding serfdom, burghers' antagonism to Jewish competitors, Orthodox abomination of Catholic oppression, and much of the Ukrainian population's resistance to the misrule of the magnates. Numerous social, economic, religious, and national conflicts combined to create the massive and bloody explosion of 1648 and to stoke the flames of resistance to the old order for years after. As the rebels formed a military and civil administration, a new polity, the Cossack Hetmanate, emerged in the central Ukrainian lands. With foreign powers taking advantage of the disorder in the Commonwealth, the rebels seized the opportunity to break with the Polish king. Lacking the legitimacy of a recognized monarch and facing the implacable drive of the Commonwealth to regain the Ukrainian lands, the Cossack hetman turned to the Muscovite tsar for protection. The controversial swearing of an oath to the Muscovite tsar at Pereiaslav in 1654 was interpreted differently by the Ukrainian and Russian sides and by subsequent historians.[5] While the Russian armies that attacked the Commonwealth offered the Cossack Hetmanate sorely needed help, the Russian tsar refused to swear an oath to uphold privileges of the Hetmanate. Therefore, even before Khmelnytsky's death in 1657, the Ukrainians were looking to other possibilities, above all to Sweden, to break with Moscow, and after Khmelnytsky's demise even attempted rapprochement with Poland. The relatively stable new political and social structure that emerged after the massive upheaval of 1648 was plunged into internecine conflict in the late 1650s, so that by the 1660s rival hetmans fought for control in Ukraine. Only by the end of the 1670s did stability return, though this meant the eradication of the new Cossack order in the territories won back by Poland and ever closer Russian control of the two Cossack polities, the Zaporozhian Sich and the Cossack Hetmanate, that emerged.[6]

While the Sich on the steppe frontier represented a Cossack formation similar to that of pre-1648 Cossackdom, the Hetmanate emerged as a polity with a stable political class formed from the Cossack officers, and a multifaceted Ukrainian culture—often labeled Cossack baroque—arose. The new lay political-social elite diverged from that of the early seventeenth century in Ukraine in that it expanded its activities into fields such as the writing of history that had been the preserve of the clergy in the early seventeenth century. The essential difference was that in the early seventeenth century the traditional Ukrainian secular elite, the nobility, was integrating into the Polish political culture, while in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, the Cossack officer class constituted an autonomous political-social group distinct from the elites of neighboring countries. At the same time, while the Orthodox clergy of the early seventeenth century turned to the national Rus' past and the distinctions between Ruthenians and Poles as a way of shoring up their faith, by the end of the seventeenth century, the Orthodox clergy of Ukraine increasingly turned to the Orthodox Russian tsar as a source of ideology and legitimacy, especially after the Kyiv Metropolitanate was subordinated to the patriarchate of Moscow in 1685–86. Although Ukrainian society expected that the clergy would continue to write the history of the people and land, the Orthodox clerics no longer fulfilled this role as they turned to more spiritual writings or in some cases (Inokentii Gizel and Teofan Prokopovych) writing the history of the dynasty of the Russian tsar. The stability

of the late seventeenth century and the patronage of the Hetman Ivan Mazepa
(1687–1709) had brought the clergy back into the production for Ukrainian pa-
trons for a short time. However, the failure of the Hetman to break with Russia
and the disastrous Battle of Poltava (1709) during which he fought on the side of
the Swedes accompanied by a campaign of terror by Peter the First and the
anathemizing of the emigre hetman by the Orthodox church further alienated the
clergy from the secular leadership. History now was the domain of the chancery
stratum of the Cossack Hetmanate, men educated at the Kyiv and other acad-
emies, who sought to convey legitimacy on their social group and polity.[7]

Between 1680 and the mid-eighteenth century, the Cossack Hetmanate
constructed a new Ukrainian cultural formation. The building and restoration
program of the early seventeenth century resumed. The ancient churches of Kyiv
were restored and expanded, and new churches arose throughout the Hetmanate.
Icon painters continued to merge Western and Byzantine styles and to develop
secular portrait painting. New church singing and composition transformed the
tradition of the Eastern church. The Kyiv academy and its offspring in Chernihiv,
Pereiaslav, and Kharkiv became the leading institutions of learning of the Ortho-
dox Slavs, largely through the adaptation of Jesuit and other Western programs.
The Poltava debacle undermined the stability of the secular patron class and in-
creased Moscow's and St. Petersburg's control of Ukraine, which by 1721 included
a ban on the publication of church books of the Ukrainian tradition in favor of
Russian versions. At the same time, new opportunities in the imperial capitals
sapped Ukraine of its elites, but the real end of the Ukrainian cultural renaissance
would come with the abolition of the office of hetman in 1764 and the autonomy
of the Hetmanate by the Russian tsars in 1783.[8]

In the early eighteenth century, the Cossack chancellerists sought to docu-
ment the history of their homeland so that it would take its proper place among
the lands and societies of Europe. In so doing, they sought to solidify the position
of Ukraine's sociopolitical elite among the political nations of Eastern Europe and
against the centralizing pressures of the Russian autocracy. Unlike their predeces-
sors among Ukrainian historians, who had focused on the ancient history of Kyiv
and the Christianization of Rus' when they asserted that a Ruthenian should know
his history, the Cossack historians were primarily interested in more recent his-
tory, above all the revolt of 1648 and its consequences. The *Eyewitness Chronicle*,
the oldest of these texts and most useful as a historical source (usually attributed
to Roman Rakushka) is structured as a chronicle and does not have a highly
developed historical ideology. In contrast, the works of Hryhorii Hrabianka (1709)
and Samiilo Velychko (1720s) were shaped by Renaissance and Baroque history
writing and served to convey legitimacy on their fatherland and its elite.[9] These
authors above all sought to demonstrate the legitimacy of the revolt of 1648 in
terms acceptable to the socially conservative elite that had evolved out of the
Cossack officer stratum. They also sought to furnish Ukraine, or Little Rus' as it
was increasingly being called, with a heroic age and founder. Both texts cast Bohdan
Khmelnytsky as the ideal leader.

The early eighteenth-century historians faced a problem of loss of memory
and records. The wars of the seventeenth century had decimated the Hetmanate's
elites, and political reversals had devastated archives. Both Hrabianka and Velychko
wrote just after the Ukrainian elite had once again been decimated, and the ar-
chives of the Hetmanate was again lost after the Russian armies' destruction of
the hetman's seat of Baturyn. Works on the revolt existed in Latin, Polish, Italian,

French, English, Hebrew, and German, but no major account had been written by those who traced their origins to those who rose in revolt. Indeed, Velychko directly raised this problem of sources and native versus foreign histories in the introduction to his work.

Trained in the humanistic tradition at schools that were Orthodox adaptations of Baroque institutions in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Ukrainian secular elite learned of history through classical and Polish Renaissance and Baroque texts (in Latin and Polish). Unlike the early seventeenth-century Ukrainians who could augment their search for their distant past in classical and Polish historians by turning to the great medieval chronicles of Rus', the early eighteenth-century historians' search for the history of their Cossack ancestors and events of the mid-seventeenth century could only reference some short Ukrainian texts of seventeenth-century chroniclers and the *Eyewitness Chronicle* that compared poorly with the histories written by Polish and other historians. They also lacked the advantage of native archives and found their contemporaries ill-informed about the events that had occurred only half a century earlier. Admitting this poverty of works in their own culture and tongue, they fell back on the common topos that their ancestors had been great warriors rather than great writers.[10]

In the case of Velychko, who used the great Polish seventeenth-century baroque epic by Samuel Twardowski as both a source and a foil against which he created an opposing view of the wars of the mid-seventeenth-century, the desire for a native source appears to have led to fabrications of similar impact in the Ukrainian context to James Macpherson's later eighteenth-century fabrications of the Ossian epics.[11] Velychko liberally cited documents from the diary of Samiilo Zorka, the chancellor of Hetman Khmelnytsky, including his eulogy on the death of the hetman. He even describes how he had to borrow this precious manuscript.[12] But no one has ever found even a trace of this purported chancellor. The ornate and ideologically complex texts ring of the early eighteenth century, not the mid-seventeenth. While earlier Ukrainian historians argued about whether the documents were authentic and Zorka existed, later historians concentrated on whether the base of the Zorka documents might be an earlier compendium reworked or whether an eighteenth-century author, someone else, or Velychko himself penned the texts. The controversy over the authenticity of the Zorka documents cast a pall over all the sources in Velychko, many of which have proven to be accurate citations and reworkings of original documents.

In providing a proper heroic past for society, Velychko and Hrabianka not only studied foreign and domestic sources on the revolt but also strove to elevate the national past by providing appropriate scenes and personages from the past. As was common in their age, they did so by translating appropriate models. Therefore, in describing the destruction of the suburbs of Lviv in the 1670s, Velychko used a passage from Torquato Tasso, *Gerusalemme liberata*, which was available in Piotr Kochanowski's seventeenth-century Polish translation.[13] Another striking example of such a borrowing is the description of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky by Hryhorii Hrabianka. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars have pointed to Hrabianka's praise of the hetman as essential in creating the cult of the hetman:

> A man worthy of the name hetman: boldly he rose from misfortune, he found counsel in the misfortunes themselves. No toils tired his body, a positive mood did not fall away under any difficulties. He endured cold and

heat equally. He did not eat or drink to excess, except what nature de-
manded. When affairs and military matters permitted, he slept a bit, and
then not on expensive beds, but on such bedding as a military man ought.
And he did not seek to find a place apart to sleep, but he slept calmly amid
the military din, in no way concerned. His dress did not stand out at all,
only the gear of his horse was somewhat better than the others. He was
often seen covered with a military cloak, as he slept among the guards, tired
from toil. He went first into battle and was the last to leave it.

Recently, Marko Antonovych has pointed out that what we are reading
is a translation of Livy's characterization of Hannibal, with the negative com-
ments removed.[14] Many of Hrabianka's eighteenth-century readers must have
recognized the source, but this would in no way have interfered with its effective-
ness in creating the Khmelnytsky cult.

By the early eighteenth century, the two major historians, as well as writ-
ers of other genres, had created a great age in their examination of the recent past.
They had turned Khmelnytsky into the archetypal Ukrainian hero and father of
the fatherland. They had produced a vision of the revolt that was acceptable to
the new conservative elite and that justified the position of the Hetmanate's elite.
They had concentrated on the issue of political rights of Little Rus' in forging a
place for the Hetmanate in the community of polities and peoples. They had
provided an image of their homeland's relationship with the Russian tsar as a
territory that had freely submitted in return for rights and privileges. The vision
that they created was out of line with the autocracy and the newly forming Rus-
sian empire. Indeed, that their works did not fit the Russian ruler's policies may
explain why they were not published at the time. Nevertheless, Hrabianka's work
circulated widely in manuscript form and shaped the Ukrainian elite's self-identi-
fication and the political culture of the Hetmanate. The early eighteenth-century
recovery of the past influenced subsequent Ukrainian historiography, above all
the transitional work of Ukrainian political culture, *The History of the Rus' People*
(*Istoriia Rusov*), an early nineteenth-century work that demonstrated the impact
of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution on early modern Ukrainian po-
litical thought.[15] Their recovered seventeenth-century past dominated the vision
of the Romantics and the early nineteenth-century national revival.[16] It took gen-
erations of historical criticism to demystify this compelling image of the seven-
teenth century.

NOTES

1. For the cultural context of this age, see Ihor Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West*
(Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1996). Bibliographies with
extensive literature in English and other Western languages are appended. For the Ukrainian cultural
revival and the Cossacks, see Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 7 *The Cossack
Age to 1625*, trans. Bohdan Struminski (Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian
Studies Press, 1999), which contains extensive bibliographic updates by Serhii Plokhy.

2. I am grateful to Serhii Plokhy for providing this translation, which is to appear in his forth-
coming book, *A Rebel Faith: The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. See also the
recent edition and translation, *Roxolania/Roksolania czyli ziemie Czerwonej Rusi*, ed. and trans.
Mieczysław Mejor (Wrocław: Instytut Badań Literackich, 1996) and the Ukrainian translation
Sebast'ian Fabian Kl'onovych, *Roksolaniia*, trans. Mykhailo Bilyk (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1987), 70–2.

3. On Ukrainian history writing in this period, see Frank E. Sysyn, "Concepts of Nationhood in
Ukrainian History, 1620–1690, "*Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10, 3–4 (1986): 393–423, and "The
Cultural, Social and Political Context of Ukrainian History-Writing 1620–1690," *Europa Orientalis*
5 (1986): 285–310.

4. See Frank E. Sysyn, "The Khmelnytsky Uprising and Ukrainian Nation-Building," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 17, 1–2 (1992): 141–70.

5. John Basarab, *Pereiaslav 1654: A Historiographical Study* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1982).

6. See C. B. O'Brien, *Muscovy and the Ukraine: From the Pereiaslavl Agreement to the Truce of Andrusovo,1654–1667* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1963). On the Hetmanate, see Lev Okinshevich, *Ukrainian Society and Government, 1648–1781* (Munich: Ukrainian Free Univ., 1978).

7. On this stratum and the writing of Ukrainian history, see Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi (Mikhail Grushevskii), "Ob ukrainskoi istoriografii XVIII veka. Neskol'ko soobrazhenii," *Bulletin de l'Academie des Sciences de L'URSS. Classe des Sciences Sociales* (1934): 215–33, translated by Zenon Kohut as "Some Reflections on Ukrainian Historiography of the XVIII Century," in *The Eyewitness Chronicle*, vol. 1 (Munich: Fink Verlag, 1972; Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies 7, pt. 1), 9–16. On the political culture of the Hetmanate and its eventual integration into the Russian Empire, see Zenon E. Kohut, *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate 1760s–1830s* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, distributed by Harvard Univ. Press, 1988).

8. On Ukrainian literature in this period, see D. Čyževs'kyj, *A History of Ukrainian Literature: From the 11th to the End of the 19th Century*. trans. D. Ferguson, D. Gorsline, and U. Petyk (Littleton, CO: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975). On national consciousness in this period, see Zenon E. Kohut, "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nation-Building," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10 (1986): 559–76. On the cultural significance of the Ukrainians in the Russian Empire, see David Saunders, *The Ukrainian Impact on Russian Culture, 1750–1850* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1985).

9. For Hrabianka, see the Harvard Library in Early Ukrainian Literature 9: *Hryhorij Hrabjanka's The Great War of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj* (Cambridge: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, distributed by Harvard Univ. Press, 1990), which contains an introduction by Yuri Lutsenko and a bibliography of the major literature. Velychko's *Skazanie o voini kazatskoi z poliakamy i rech Zynoviia Bohdana Khmelnytskoho Hetmana Voisk Zaporozhskykh* was published in the *Letopis' sobytii Iugo-Zapadnoi Rossii v XVII veke*, 4 vols. (Kyiv: I. Val'nera, 1848–64). The first volume was published in a new edition in Kyiv in 1926: *Samiila Velychka Skazanie o voini kozatskoi z poliakamy*, ed. Kateryna Lazarevs'ka (Monumenta Litterarum Ucrainicarum 16). In 1991 a modern Ukrainian translation by Valerii Shevchuk was published: Samiilo Velychko, *Litopys*, 2 vols. (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1991), with an introduction by the translator. The scholarly work on Velychko is very limited. Most of the literature is mentioned in Iaroslav Dzyra, "Samiilo Velychko ta ioho litopys," *Istoriohrafichni doslidzhennia v URSR* 6 (1971): 198–223.

10. The introduction to Samiilo Velychko's work provides one of the best explanations of the state of Ukrainian historiography of the time: "The chivalrous and heroic deeds of our Sarmatian Cossack ancestors, whose equal those of foreign nations, have been left unrecorded by our historians and have been covered with the mantle of oblivion. And even if a Cossack writer wrote anything worthy, to preserve what he saw in his own time, he did this for the most part for his own use, in a few scanty words, without mentioning the causes or the results of what happened. If in the writing of this old Cossack ancestor of ours there is anything praiseworthy, then it comes not only from our lazy historians, but from foreign, Greek, Latin, German, and Polish historians, who are difficult to translate into the Cossack language, and also impossible to obtain in Little Rus'. . ." quoted from the translation in Dmytro Doroshenko, "A Survey of Ukrainian Historiography," in *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the US*, vols. 5–6, no. 4 (18)–1, 2 (19, 20): 48–9, which contains a larger passage in translation.

11. Samuel Twardowski, *Wojna domowa z Kozaki i Tatary, Moskwą potym Szwedami i z Węgry. . .* (Kalisz, 1681). The relationship of the two works is discussed in V. Petrykevych, *Litopys S. Velychka i Wojna domowa S. Tvardovs'koho* (Ternopil', 1910).

12. See Mykola Petrovs'kyi, "Pseudo-diariush Samiila Zorki," *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN* 17 (1928): 168–204. See the translation of Velychko's account of borrowing a copy of the diary made by his colleague, Sylvestr Bykhovets': Doroshenko, "A Survey," 60.

13. This is pointed out by Dmytro Doroshenko in "A Survey," 50.

14. Marko Antonovych, "Kharakterystyka B. Khmel'nyts'koho u Hrabianky i Liviia (Zamitka)" *Ukrains'kyi istoryk* 32 (1995): 165–6. These passages are from Livy, *Ab urbe condita*, 21.4. See *Books 21–25; The Second Punic War*, trans. Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb (London: Macmillan, 1883), 4–5:

> There was no one whom 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 or the infantry he was by far the first soldier; the first in battle, the last to leave it when once begun.

Hrabianka leaves out the following passage:

> 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 an 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.

15. Volodymyr Kravchenko, *Poema vil'noho narodu: 'Istoriia Rusov' ta ii mistse v ukrains'kii istoriohrafii* (Kharkiv: Osnova, 1996); Stefan Kozak, *U źródeł Romantyzmu i nowo żytnejmyśli społecznej na Ukrainie* (Wrocław: Zakład Naukowy im. Ossolińskich, 1978); Mykhailo Vozniak, *Psevdo-Konys'kyi i psevdo-Poletyka* (Lviv: Ukrains'ka Mohylians'ka-Mazepyns'ka Akademiia Nauk, 1939); E. Borshak, *La légende historique de l'Ukraine* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1949); Andrii Yakovliv, "*Istoriya Rusov* and its Author," *Annals UAAS U.S.* 3, 2 (1953): 620–69. Oleksander Ohloblyn wrote an introduction for the translation of *Istoriia Rusov* (that appeared in New York: Visnyk, 1956), as well as several articles: see his "The Ethical and Political Principles of *Istoriya Rusov*," *Annals UAAS U.S.* 2, 4 (1952): 388–400, and "Where Was *Istoriya Rusov* Written?," *Annals UAAS U.S.* 3, 2 (1953): 670–95.

16. On the significance of the Cossack chronicles, see Frank E. Sysyn, "The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (1990): 593–607.

❖