

UKRAINIAN AUTONOMISTS OF THE 1780's AND 1790's AND COUNT P. A. RUMYANTSEV-ZADUNAYSKY

OLEXANDER OHLOBLYN

Modern Ukrainian historiography is wont to regard the figure of Field Marshal Count Peter Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky (1725-1796) rather unfavorably, and even negatively. This is quite understandable. Indeed, the name of Rumyantsev was too closely associated with Ukrainian history of the second half of the eighteenth century, a time of the complex and painful process of ruination of the Ukrainian Cossack-Hetman State. Rumyantsev's leading part, as Governor-General of the Left-Bank Ukraine (appointed in 1764), in liquidating the Hetmanate and in subsequent Russian reforms in the Ukraine, could not but contribute to a negative attitude toward him on the part of Ukrainian historiography.

Earlier Ukrainian historiography, however, appraised Rumyantsev quite differently, and its influence was noticeable almost to the end of the nineteenth century (particularly in the works of O. Lazarevsky). Actually, *Istoriya Rusov*, the perennial monument of Ukrainian national-state ideas of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, contains a statement that Rumyantsev "really fulfilled the people's hopes by his *patriotic* attitude in behalf of their welfare."¹ Favorable treatment of Rumyantsev is also found in the Ukrainian literature of memoirs. This earlier tradition continued in the Ukraine for some time.

We should not be surprised at the way *Istoriya Rusov* evaluated Rumyantsev. But though this response was characteristic of the period of the 1780s and 1790s, it was not so in the 1760s, the latter being a time when Rumyantsev's name was odious to all. After the passions incited by the liquidation of the Hetmanate in 1764 had subsided, however, the bad

¹ *Istoriya Rusov ili Maloi Rossii*, Moscow, 1846, p. 255. Ukrainian edition: *Istoriya Rusiv*, New York, 1956, p. 344. (Author's italics in word "patriotic.")

feelings against Rumyantsev died down, too. Out of the territory of the former Hetmanate, the establishment of three governorships (Kiev, Chernihiv and Novhorod-Siversky) in 1781-1782 with its concomitant opportunities for service careers, security of social-economic interests of Ukrainian landowners (particularly by the ukase of Catherine II of May 3, 1783), excellent prospects for colonization which opened to the Left-Bank Ukrainian nobles in the Southern Ukraine, and somewhat later, in the 1790s, in the Right-Bank Ukraine, were in, and of, themselves sufficiently conciliatory factors. If we add to this Rumyantsev's favorable attitude toward the nobilitation demands of a host of Ukrainian nobles,² and finally, the very person of Rumyantsev, a renowned military leader and talented administrator, a long-serving and fairly tactful imperial Viceroy in the Ukraine (especially as Chairman of the Little Russian Collegium), a person of high culture³ who was moreover connected with Ukraine since his childhood⁴—all impressed the Ukrainian nobility of the 1780s

² Rumyantsev stood for the rights of nobility, also in behalf of *znachkovi tovaryshi* (flag comrades), military clerks, staff of *sotnya*, and clergy of noble ancestry (cf. *Kievskaya Starina*, 1897, Vol. II, p. 215).

³ Among other languages, Rumyantsev knew German well, and was an avid reader of German literature (cf. *Kievskaya Starina*, 1897, Vols. VII-VIII, p. 62: account of V. Ya. Lomykovsky; also *Zapiski S. A. Tuchkova*, St. Petersburg, 1908, p. 12).

⁴ Rumyantsev's childhood was spent in the Ukraine (his father, General-en-Chef A. I. Rumyantsev, was in charge of the Hetmanate between 1738 and 1740). Here he studied under Tymofiy Senyutovych (subsequently Regimental Judge of Chernihiv), a relative of the Archimandrite of Kiev Lavra Monastery (1715-1729) Ioannikiy Senyutovych, and a graduate of foreign "Latin schools"; cf. A. Lazarevsky, "Uchitel' grafa P. A. Rumyantseva-Zadunaiskago, T. M. Senyutovich" (Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky's teacher, T. M. Senyutovych), *Kievskaya Starina*, 1889, Vol. XXIV, January, pp. 223-224.

Rumyantsev retained good command of the Ukrainian language even at a later age and, according to testimony of his contemporaries, "he could never completely rid himself of his Little Russian accent," *Anekdoty, obyasnayushchiya dukh fel'dmarshala P. A. Rumyantseva-Zadunaiskago* (Anecdotes illustrating the personality of Field Marshal P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky), St. Petersburg, 1811, p. 63. An unknown author of that time (probably a Ukrainian), wrote:

and 1790s. A whole generation of leaders who came out of Rumyantsev's milieu came to occupy positions of leadership in Ukrainian life of the late eighteenth century. Rumyantsev's name was especially popular among the large number of Left-Bank nobles who were descended from Cossacks, and also among the so-called "Rumyantsev's *kornets*" (warrant officers) who were indebted to him for their noble status.⁵ Rumyantsev, once the stern Russian Viceroy of the Ukraine, gradually turned into a benevolent Ukrainian landlord (he was granted huge estates in the Ukraine),⁶ and the Ukrainian citizenry, both old and young, many among whom had at one time fought under his glory-covered banners, gave him his due respect.⁷

"Count Rumyantsev, *who had been raised in Little Russia*, was so much attached to his *homeland*, that every time he met a countryman he used all his powers to captivate him. He became so famous for his love of Little Russia that every native of that land who found himself in St. Petersburg considered Count Zadunaysky to be his best protector . . ." (*Ibid.*, p. 63). This tradition continued in the Ukraine until the end of the nineteenth century. Count H. O. Myloradovych, a well-known historian and genealogist of Chernihiv, noted in his (as yet unpublished) diary on December 8, 1896: "The one-hundredth anniversary of Count Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky, 1796-1896, who loved and governed Little Russia for a long time." (Chernihiv State Historical Archive; fund of Count Myloradovych).

⁵ Rumyantsev had the authority to commission *kornets*—the lowest officer rank (warrant officer) which carried with it privileges of nobility at the time. Petty landowners in the Hetmanate took advantage of this on a large scale. Cf. M. Lazarevsky, "Pamyati moi" (My Memoirs), *Ukrayins'kyi Arkhеоhrafichnyi Zbirnyk*, Kiev, 1927, Vol. II pp. 26-27.

⁶ A. Lazarevsky, *Ocherki, zametki i dokumenty po istorii Malorossii* (Essays, Notes and Documents on History of Little Russia), Kiev, 1898, Vol. IV, pp. 23-26. Cf. this author's *Ocherki istorii ukrainskoi fabрики. Manufaktura v Hetmanshchine* (Outline of the History of Ukrainian Industry. Manufacturing in the Hetman State), Kiev, 1925, pp. 144-146, 155, 160, 162.

⁷ On the subject of Rumyantsev's activities in the Ukraine, cf., in addition to general works, also: A. Lazarevsky, "Materiyaly dlya biografii gr. P. A. Rumyantseva-Zadunaiskago" (Material for a Biography of Count P. A. Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky), *Kievskaya Starina*, 1895, Vol. III, pp. 385-404; the same author's, "Po povodu sta let ot smerti grafa P. A. Rumyantseva" (On the Occasion of 100 Years Since the Death of Count P. A. Rumyantsev),

This had its repercussions upon the appraisal of the person and activities of Rumyantsev in *Istoriya Rusov*.

It is therefore not surprising that Rumyantsev was on fairly good personal terms with Ukrainian autonomists. As early as 1771, Hryhoriy A. Poletyka sent Rumyantsev greetings on the occasion of the latter's victory over the Turks, and this was, in all likelihood, not merely an expression of courtesy. Answering Poletyka with an interesting letter (December 20, 1771), Rumyantsev wrote that it was a pleasure to hear "praise from a co-citizen, decorated with this and other honors."⁸

Later, Rumyantsev was also on good terms with the well-known Ukrainian autonomist leaders, the brothers Skoropadsky,⁹ Hryhoriy K. Dolynsky,¹⁰ Pavlo H. Koropchevsky, Opanas K. Lobysevych, General Andriy V. Hudovych,¹¹ and others. It was well known that the Field Marshal's relations with many other noble Ukrainian families were friendly and almost familial through God-parentage. There was a definite preponderance of Ukrainians on his staff, among the officials of his estates and in his personal entourage (V. V. Hudovych, P. H. Dubovyk, A. H. Ivanenko, P. I. Myklashevsky, M. K. Mostsipanov, M. R. Polytkovsky, V. I. Skoropadsky, M. M.

Kievskaya Starina, 1896, Vol. XII, p. 374-390; G. Maksimovich, *Deyatel'nost' gr. Rumyantseva-Zadunaishkago po upravleniyu Malorossiei* (Activities of Count Rumyantsev-Zadunaysky in Governing Little Russia), I, Nizhen, 1912; P. Maikov, "P. A. Rumyantsov" in *Russkii Biograficheskii Slovar'*, Petrograd, 1918, Vol. *Romanova-Ryasovsky*, pp. 521-573; bibliography, *ibid.*
⁸ *Chastnaya perepiska G. A. Poletiki, 1750-1784* (Private Correspondence of H. A. Poletyka, 1750-1784), Kiev, 1895, p. 124.

⁹ This is apparent from I. M. Skoropadsky's letter to Rumyantsev of February 10, 1778, Kiev Central Archive of Old Documents, Fund of the Little Russian Collegium, Chernihiv Division, 1778. I. M. Skoropadsky's son, V. I. Skoropadsky, was Rumyantsev's wing-aide-de-camp.

¹⁰ Dolynsky's letter to Rumyantsev of February 10, 1778, *ibid.* Cf. this author's article "Hryhoriy Dolynsky, ukrayins'kyi avtonomist XVIII st." (Hryhoriy Dolynsky, Ukrainian Autonomist of the Eighteenth Century), *Ukrayins'kyi Litopys*, Augsburg, 1954, No. 2, pp. 40-45.

¹¹ Cf. *Starina i Novizna*, St. Petersburg, 1900, III, p. 152.

Storozhenko, I. M. Khanenko, O. H. Podluzky, I. Ya. Seletsky, O. H. Tumansky, A. I. Chepa and others).¹² There were close ties of friendship between Rumyantsev and Oleksander A. Bezborod'ko, and particularly with Petro V. Zavadovsky.¹³ The latter had good reason for writing Rumyantsev in 1790 that people in the Ukraine "adored him."¹⁴ And so it was after Rumyantsev's death. This is what A. S. Polubotok wrote about him to his granddaughter and her husband I. S. Lashkevych in December 1796: "The Count, the benefactor of us all, Pyotr Aleksandrovich, died on December 8th."¹⁵

Thus, Rumyantsev's relations with Ukrainian patriotic circles were quite friendly toward the end of the 1780s. Moreover, there is basis for belief that Ukrainian autonomists, who had despatched Vasyl' Kapnist abroad in 1791 to

¹² Cf. V. Modzalevsky, "*Malorossiiskii Rodoslovnik*" (Little Russian Genealogical Dictionary), Vols. I-IV, Kiev, 1908-1914, *passim*. There is a wealth of material in the archives of the Little Russian Collegium and of Rumyantsev's Military Field Chancery.

It is not surprising that Rumyantsev's mother, Countess M. A. Rumyantseva, replying to a letter from her daughter-in-law (Rumyantsev was married to Princess K. M. Golitsyn), who complained that she "was bored" in the Ukraine, wrote (July 13, 1765): "I don't think that it's so boring there. I used to live there and found no boredom. I would not like people to talk about you as they did about Katerina Ivanovna [the wife of Hetman Kyrylo Rozumovsky, nee Naryshkina] that she refused to know anybody. You yourself need their goodwill; whatever river you are sailing on, there you make your reputation," (*Starina i Novizna*, St. Petersburg, 1900, Vol. III, pp. 143-144).

¹³ Cf. N. Grigorovich, "Kantsler Knyaz' Aleksandr Andreevich Bezborodko v svyazi s sobytiyami ego vremeni" (Chancellor Prince Alexander Andriyevych Bezborod'ko in Connection With Events of His Time), Vols. I, II, *Sbornik Imperatorskago Russkago Istoricheskago Obshchestva*, Vols. 26, 29, St. Petersburg, 1879, 1881, *passim*.

Rumyantsev considered Zavadovsky not merely a friend, but "true in friendship" (*Russkii Biograficheskii Slovar'*, Vol. *Romanova-Ryasovskiy*, pp. 569, 570).

¹⁴ *Starina i Novizna*, St. Petersburg, 1901, Vol. IV, p. 327, (9.1.1790), p. 330 (14.VI.1790).

¹⁵ *Lyubetskii Arkhiv*, Kiev, 1898, p. 192.

seek aid against Russia, counted on Rumyantsev's support or sympathy.¹⁶ The point is that during Kapnist's negotiations with Prussian official circles in Berlin, he stressed as the motive of his mission Ukrainian dissatisfaction with Prince Potemkin and his "tyranny." This would seem surprising, at least on first appearance. For actually, Potemkin's activity directly concerned the Southern Ukraine only, and moreover, "Hryts'ko Nechosa" (the "uncombed," a name by which Potemkin was called in Zaporizhzhya) had at one time been on good terms with the Zaporozhians, and he later had plans to re-establish a South-Ukrainian Cossack Host of which he wanted to become "Grand Hetman" (of the Cossack Katerynoslav and Black Sea Armies), an office to which he was actually appointed on January 10, 1790.¹⁷ Rumors spread in Western Europe at that time that Potemkin wanted to become Hetman of the Ukraine, and, "like Mazepa," establish there an independent state.¹⁸

Nevertheless, Kapnist's sharp action against Potemkin (obviously inspired by the initiators of Kapnist's foreign mission) is quite understandable. In the first place, the Ukrainian Left-Bank landlords were indignant at Potemkin for his policy in the matter of peasant-escapees from the Hetmanate and Slobidska area. Southern Ukrainian landlords gladly took in those escapees, and the local administration, on the direct advice of Potemkin, did not extradite them. Furthermore, Potemkin's favorable attitude toward the Zaporozhians, and even more so his plan to re-establish the Cossacks in the

16 More details on this are to be found in this author's article "Vasyl' Kapnist," part. II, *Zbirnyk Ukrayins'koyi Literaturnoyi Hazety* 1956, Munich, 1957, pp. 167-182.

17 B. Nolde, *La formation de l'Empire Russe*, Paris, 1953, V. II, pp. 232-233.

18 This report was made in 1791 in the *London Annual Register or a view of history, politics and literature* (V. XXXIII, p. 106). Cf. E. Borschak, *L'Ukraine dans la littérature de l'Europe occidentale*, *Extrait du Monde Slave*, 1935, p. 67.

Prince G. A. Potemkin-Tavriysky, of Smolensk nobility, was related to some Ukrainian families in the Hetmanate.

Southern Ukraine, went very much against the grain of leading Ukrainian circles in the Hetmanate toward the close of the eighteenth century: suffice it to recall the negative attitude of *Istoriya Rusov* to the Zaporozhians or their characterization in Kotlyarevsky's *Aeneid* as robbers and killers. Finally, we must consider the attitude of the army which was under Rumyantsev's command and Rumyantsev's own attitude toward Potemkin. Rumyantsev's army was much worse off than Potemkin's, especially as regards material status. Ukrainian military units (regiments of carabineers) which were part of Rumyantsev's army had every reason to share their commander's dislike of his southern competitor.

Therefore, we must pay particular attention to Rumyantsev's position in the late 1780s and early 1790s. Since the early 1780s the Field Marshal had been relegated gradually to a secondary position, overshadowed by the brilliant successes and imposing figure of the all-powerful Prince of Tauria. This was particularly noticeable during the trip of Catherine II to the Ukraine and the Crimea in 1787. The observant French ambassador in St. Petersburg, Count Ségur, who accompanied the Empress to the South, noticed that Rumyantsev had a dissatisfied look during the entire period of her stay in Kiev. This was ascribed by some to the inspection of educational establishments in Kiev by Count F. Anhalt, and even more to the matter of investigation of three Left-Bank governorships conducted in 1785 by senators Count A. R. Vorontsov and President of the Commercial Collegium A. V. Naryshkin. But this was not the gist of the matter. Similar investigations were a normal thing, Rumyantsev had been given notice about them, and results of the investigation were quite favorable.¹⁹

Neither is the problem explained by reports of Rumyan-

¹⁹ *Zapiski grafa Segyura o prebyvanii ego v Rossii v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II (1785-1789)*, (Notes of Count Ségur about his stay in Russia during the reign of Catherine II, 1785-1789), St. Petersburg, 1865, p. 152; P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

Cf. Kiev Central Archive of Old Documents, fund No. 211, case No. 233.

tsev's illness and depression, although he was really ill at the time. Count I. G. Chernyshev, Vice-President of the Admirals' Collegium who accompanied the Empress, wrote on March 21, 1787, to his friend, "ober-kamerger" (Chief Equerry) Prince A. M. Golitsyn (in Moscow) as follows: "Field Marshal Count Rumyantsev was really ill, with eruptions on his head and face, but now he is better; still he says that he is thinking about asking to be relieved of all affairs, believing himself to be extremely weak and not in a position to continue in any kind of service, particularly military."²⁰

Even the Empress did not attach any significance to Rumyantsev's illness, when she met him in Chechersk on January 20, 1787. She wrote to Count Ya. A. Bryus that Rumyantsev "looks fresh and healthy and as vigorous as I had seen him six years ago."²¹ It seems therefore, that Ségur was closest to the truth when he wrote: "Field Marshal Rumyantsev received the Empress on the border of the governorship. The face of this venerable and distinguished hero was an expression of his soul; it reflected secretiveness and pride, sign of real distinction; but it showed a shade of sadness and dissatisfaction evoked by the preference for and immense power of Potemkin. Competition for power disunited those two military leaders; they went along, fighting for glory and favor, and, as usually happens, it was the Empress' favorite who won out. The Field Marshal [Rumyantsev] did not receive any wherewithal for governing the dependency; his work proceeded slowly; his soldiers wore old clothes and his officers persistently demanded promotions. All favors, all

²⁰ *Kievskaya Starina*, 1891, II, p. 231. Replying to Chernyshev, Golitsyn wrote: "Count Zadunaysky has been talking about his retirement for a long time, but to talk and to act are two entirely different things, and since he has not done anything, then perhaps he will die without retiring according to the example of similar famous men. There is a saying that people accustomed to wars and command, and in love with these honors, rarely part with them voluntarily." (*Ibid.*, p. 231).

²¹ *Kievskaya Starina*, 1890, XII, p. 405.

encouragement went to the army which the First Minister [Potemkin] commanded."²²

Catherine was altogether dissatisfied with the results of Rumyantsev's work in the Ukraine, especially when compared with the bright picture which Potemkin opened before the enraptured eyes of the Empress in the South. She had good reason to write N. I. Saltykov on May 3, 1787 from Kremenchug: "In three Little Russian governorships, because nothing had been set in motion, the deficit reaches a million, the cities are drab and nothing is done."²³ And on May 19, 1787 Emperor Joseph II wrote from Koydak to Field Marshal Count Lassi: "Poor Field Marshal Rumyantsev is in disgrace."²⁴ In 1789 Rumyantsev was in fact removed from the governorship of the Ukraine, and this was entrusted in 1790 to the Governor General of Tula and Kaluga, General M. N. Krechetnikov.

One might assume that all these circumstances contributed to Rumyantsev's conflict with the government and to his going over to the opposition.

In this connection, it is necessary to say a few words about Rumyantsev's relations with Crown Prince Paul Petrovich, subsequently Paul I. They were tied by kinship,²⁵ old friendship, a son's deep gratitude for an aide's devotion to his father (Peter III), common political and cultural interests, especially a great liking for German culture and King Frederick II,²⁶ and finally, what is probably most important, the

²² *Zapiski grafa Segyura*, pp. 152-153.

²³ *Kievskaya Starina*, 1891, VII, p. 31.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁵ Court circles almost recognized Rumyantsev (since the time of Empress Elizabeth) as the son of Peter I and Countess M. A. Rumyantseva (nee Countess Matveeva). Paul I, grandson of Peter I, attributed some significance to these family relations.

²⁶ "The Field Marshal [Rumyantsev] was very much attracted by Prussia" (L. Engelgardt, *Zapiski*, Moscow, 1868, pp. 21-22). Cf. *Otchet o 27 prisuzhdenii nagrad grafa Uvarova*, St. Petersburg, 1885, p. 139. According to F. Vigel', "Rumyantsev . . . was overflowing with the German spirit; . . . he

negative attitude of both toward the foreign policy of Catherine II, and personal dislike of Potemkin. It is therefore not surprising that in the 1780s, when Crimean affairs came under Potemkin's jurisdiction in 1782, ties between Paul Petrovich and Rumyantsev grew stronger.²⁷

Even earlier, in the 1770s, Rumyantsev went to Berlin with Paul Petrovich on two occasions, on the very delicate mission concerning the marriage (first and second) of the Grand Duke. Paul Petrovich visited the Ukraine in 1781 and met Rumyantsev.²⁸ Secret contacts, undoubtedly of a political nature, were maintained between the Grand Duke, who headed the opposition against the policy of Catherine II on a wide international scale, and Rumyantsev. According to the memoirs of M. O. Kotlubysky, aide-de-camp of the Grand Duke, Paul I once summoned him (Kotlubysky was going to the Ukraine) and "tied a letter for Rumyantsev to the chain which held the cross around his neck. On arrival at Rumyantsev's, Kotlubysky was to tell the Field Marshal's midget (these were the instructions given by Paul) that he must see the Field Marshal. After reading Paul's note, Rumyantsev tied another note to the chain of Kotlubysky's cross, remarking that the secret must be kept, that he was putting his gray head into his hands and Kotlubysky must eat the note in case of danger."²⁹ There is not the slightest doubt

fought the great Frederick, and . . . admired his art and genius; finally he had an opportunity to meet him personally, and could not talk about him without enthusiasm. . . . He lived always surrounded with Germans" (*Vospominaniya F. F. Vigelya*, part I, Moscow, 1864, p. 80).

²⁷ P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, p. 555. Cf. B. Nolde, *La formation de l'Empire Russe*, Paris, 1953, Vol. II, pp. 161-161.

²⁸ P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, pp. 549-550, 561. They met in Kiev, and earlier Paul Petrovich visited Rumyantsev's estate in Homel (L. Engelgardt, *Zapiski*, Moscow, 1868, p. 26).

²⁹ V. Andreev, *Predstaviteli vlasti v Rossii posle Petra I*, St. Petersburg, 1870, p. 263.

Mykola Osypovych Kotlubysky was the son of Osyp Hryhorovych Kotlubysky—the Assessor of the Collegium of Foreign Affairs, landlord of Kono-

that at that time Paul Petrovich and Rumyantsev were closely united in their opposition to Potemkin's Austrophile policy. It was of the utmost importance to Paul, devoted to Prussia and Frederick II, to have on his side Rumyantsev, ruler of the Ukraine with full powers and commander-in-chief of the Southern Army. The Russian *opposition* was precisely capable of drawing Rumyantsev even closer to Ukrainian autonomists.

On the one hand, closely connected with the Russian opposition and personally with its leader, Grand Duke Paul, and on the other hand, standing close to Ukrainian autonomists, Rumyantsev realized the extent of his power and was able to bare his teeth to the government of Catherine II whenever he wished. The conflict between them became particularly strong and overt during the Second Russo-Turkish war which began in 1787. Rumyantsev was not put in charge of all armed forces on the Turkish front (the chief command was divided between him and Potemkin) and this gravely insulted the old and deserving military leader. The first years of the war were marked by a series of clashes and conflicts between the two marshals. In March 1789 Catherine II decided to recall Rumyantsev and transferred his command to Potemkin, who thus became commander-in-chief,³⁰ and on April 23, 1789 Rumyantsev was recalled to St. Petersburg, where he was ordered to assemble a separate army for possible action against Prussia, then opposed to Russia and to Russia's ally, Austria. This was a great blow to Rumyantsev, obviously calculated to bring about discord between him and the opposition in the person of Paul Petrovich, and certainly

top and Marshal of the Nobility—and of his wife, nee Myklashevskia. O. H. Kotlubyt'sky had close ties with leaders of the Novhorod-Siversky patriotic circle in the 1780s and 1790s.

³⁰ There is no doubt about the initiative of Catherine II in the matter of Rumyantsev's removal from the command of the Danubian Army. She wrote Potemkin in 1789: "I have the intention of recalling Field Marshal Rumyantsev from the army and to give command of the army to you so that things will go better." (P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, p. 565).

a provocative step toward a Field Marshal known as a friend of Prussia.

It is not surprising that on May 24, 1789, Rumyantsev, offering his thanks for this, not without irony, could not refrain from mentioning his "sorrow" caused by his removal from the southern front (then at war) with which he was well acquainted. The well-informed Bezborod'ko said that Rumyantsev would not go to St. Petersburg but would ask permission to go abroad to take the cure. And this is what actually happened. The necessary permission was granted, but Rumyantsev did not go abroad and stayed in Yassy. This disturbed Catherine II very much: "His [Rumyantsev's] presence in Moldavia will give rise to rumors detrimental to my own and general affairs," she wrote Potemkin on September 6, 1789. "I wish and demand," the Empress added "that he should leave Moldavia." Rumyantsev nevertheless did not leave. Catherine then wrote him personally (April 17, 1790) that he should either go abroad or to Russia because his stay in Yassy was harmful to her interests. Even this order from the Empress was not obeyed by Rumyantsev. We can assume that he did not wish to take leave of the army where he had many devoted officers. Catherine lost her patience and wrote Potemkin on August 20, 1790 that "it would be best if you would send for Rumyantsev and tell him that it might easily happen that the Turks will take him away unless he gets away himself first, *and if even this does not help, then send him a convoy which would accompany him and take him out.*" This was a direct threat, but even then Rumyantsev did not give in. He did not leave for his estate, Vyshenky, in the Krolevets region until late in 1790.³¹

Catherine was very much dissatisfied with Rumyantsev for this disobedience,³² and did not forget it for a long time. She

³¹ P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, pp. 563-565. In July 1791 Rumyantsev went to another of his estates, Tashan', where he stayed until the beginning of 1794. (*Ibid.*, p. 565).

³² Catherine spoke about this to her secretary, Khrapovitsky, on December 30, 1790 (*Dnevnik A. V. Khrapovitskogo 1782-1793*, St. Petersburg, 1874).

refused (on December 30, 1790) to sign an already prepared letter of thanks for his New Year's greetings to her. On January 2, 1792 she crossed out from a letter to him the words: "wishes for success in your affairs and plans" stating that "he is not doing anything." After the signing of the Yassy peace on December 29, 1791, Rumyantsev received only a jewelled sword for occupying Moldavia (at the beginning of the war).³³

Thus, the Ukrainian autonomists of the 1780s and 1790s, most of them united in the Novhorod-Siversky patriotic circle, could count, if not on support, then at least on sympathy from Rumyantsev. This was of the utmost importance to the Ukrainian irredentist movement because it facilitated putting through the necessary political moves, and perhaps it even provided assurances in the event of failure. We can also believe that this played a major part in the flawless conspiracy which marked the affair of Kapnist's foreign mission, and in the entire political activity of Ukrainian autonomism of the late eighteenth century.³⁴

A few words about Rumyantsev's subsequent position. Although he was removed from governing the Ukraine, he continued to live there (in Tashan') and exercised much influence upon local affairs and conditions. His semi-private position was, to a certain extent, beneficial in this respect. But Rumyantsev's political role was by no means ended. On February 27, 1794, he was appointed commander-in-chief of the Russian Army in Right-Bank Ukraine for action against Poland. Contemporaries attest that the Field Marshal was then in full command of his mental faculties and will, although he ailed physically; his legs were failing him. Paul I's ascension to the throne opened new prospects to Rumyantsev. On December 3, 1796, he was given the inspection command of the Ukrainian division, i.e., chief command of all armed forces in the Ukraine. On this occasion Paul I sent him a decree in

³³ P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, p. 565.

³⁴ The very interesting problem of Rumyantsev's masonic connections, particularly in the Ukraine, requires special research.

which he assured him of his "most benevolent feelings" for him.³⁵

But the old Field Marshal was already on his way out of this world. He died on December 8, 1796, in his Tashan,"³⁶ deeply mourned by his Ukrainian friends and favorably remembered in Ukrainian historical tradition.

³⁵ P. Maikov, *op. cit.*, pp. 566-567.

³⁶ Rumyantsev was buried on January 8, 1797, in the Uspensky Cathedral of the Kievan Lavra Monastery. A beautiful tombstone was erected over his grave (the work of I. Martos).