

institution for the fair and reasonable application of the law on criminal liability. The introduction of the concept of age-related irresponsibility by law into national legislation will allow developing a unified approach to determining the irresponsibility by law of persons who have not reached a certain level of mental development and will contribute to a more objective resolution of issues of their liability. This will ensure compliance with the principles of justice, humanism and individual approach when assessing the actions of juvenile offenders. The absence of an upper age limit for criminal liability is justified, since the psychophysiological changes that accompany ageing do not always lead to a loss of the ability to be aware of one's actions. However, in the case of chronic mental illness or temporary mental disorders, a detailed assessment of a person's sanity is necessary to prevent unjustified convictions.

References:

1. Бурдін В. М. Осудність та неосудність у кримінальному праві України: проблеми теорії і практики : Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора юридичних наук : 12.00.08. Львів, 2011. 316 с.
2. Кримінальний кодекс України : Кодекс України від 05.04.2001 № 2341-III : станом на 1 лют. 2025 р. URL: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2341-14#Text> (date of appeal: 08.03.2025).
3. Mudrenko I. The role of impairment of higher mental functions in suicidogenesis in the dementia caused by Alzheimer's disease. *Psychosomatic Medicine and General Practice*. 2018. Vol. 3, no. 3. P. e0303104. URL: <https://doi.org/10.26766/pmgp.v3i3.104> (date of appeal: 08.03.2025).

FROM ALLIANCE TO OPPRESSION: THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PEREYASLAV TREATY

MARIIA PIEKH, student

ALLA I. RADU, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language Adviser
Ivan Franko University of Lviv

This year the russians,invented the "Pereyaslav legend" and are trying convince the world and even the Ukrainians themselves that the legend is true. This fake legend speaks of some strange desire of the Ukrainian people to renounce their sovereignty and statehood and "unite" with the enemy.

In the context of the modern russian-Ukrainian war, when Russia false historical arguments to justify its aggression, the importance of a deep and comprehensive study of the Ukrainian history, including the events of 1654, becomes particularly important. Understanding the historical context allows us to resist russian propaganda and protect the national interests of Ukraine.

The events of 1654 had a decisive influence on the further development of the Ukrainian-russian relations. Although the agreement provided for protection over the Hetmanate, the gradual limitation of its independence by Moscow later led to the final destruction of the Ukrainian statehood in the 18-th century. This was a turning point, the consequences of which are still felt today.

After the death of the Hetman, the events mentioned above, began to be distorted in the eyes of the world. Even then, the Muscovites used two methods for this: 1) they destroyed the original text of the condition, operating with its falsification; 2) renewing the "Pereyaslav Treaty" with each new hetman, each time usually in a changed wording, imprinting, thus, in human consciousness the fabrication, as if that treaty is truly some kind of "final goal" or "cornerstone" on which only the Ukrainian people wanted to build their life [1].

The March Articles of 1654 (Articles of Bohdan Khmelnytsky) are a set of documents that regulated the political and legal situation of the Hetmanate after the Pereyaslav Council and the inclusion of Ukraine into the Moscow Kingdom.

During the negotiations between the Hetman government and Moscow, the Ukrainian party constantly sought from the Tsar confirmation of the rights and privileges of the Zaporizhzhya Sich, the Ukrainian nobility, the Orthodox clergy and the cities. In response, the Tsar's ambassadors assured Hetman B. Khmelnytsky and the officers that all rights and orders that existed in Ukraine would be preserved.

Nowadays, there is no precise definition, no precise assessment of the Pereyaslav Treaty. In my opinion, it was only a military alliance of two states, similar alliances were concluded by Ukraine with Poland, the Crimean Khanate, and others. This is clearly proven in the works by V. Lypynsky. Also, the so-called "unification" of Ukraine with Russia is critically assessed by well-known researchers M. Hrushevsky and M. Braichevsky. D. Dontsov had reason to assert: Ukraine was in no way united with Moscow into one state. Both states continued to exist, but within the framework of a kind of confederation. However, in terms of legal form, the concluded agreement was more reminiscent of the establishment not of confederal relations, but those of nominal vassalage or protectorate. The significance of the agreement was that it fixed legally the separation of Ukraine from Poland and the lifelong power of the hetman in Ukraine as its sole and full-fledged ruler.

The consequences of the treaty had a far-reaching impact on the subsequent history of Ukraine. At first, it provided military assistance in the war against Poland, but later it became the cause of the gradual loss of the Ukrainian independence. Muscovia began to actively interfere in the internal affairs of the Hetmanate, which ultimately led to the limitation of autonomy, the destruction of the Cossack system and the final inclusion of Ukraine into the Russian Empire. Thus, the treaty of 1654, which was initially aimed at strengthening the positions of the Ukrainian state, became the beginning of the process of its dependence on Moscow. This decision of Khmelnytsky was dictated by historical circumstances, but its consequences significantly influenced the future of Ukraine, precipitating a centuries-long struggle for independence.

References:

1. Переяславська угода в плянах Б.Хмельницького і «переяславська легенда» / Роман Бжеський. – Торонто : Гомін України, 1954. – 32с.