

96

Lesson 14: The Uniqueness of the Zaporozhian Host and the Name Ukraine

We will discuss today two main problems: the uniqueness of the Zaporozhian Host and the name Ukraine. As a result of the Union of Lublin, the nobles of the two states, Poland and Lithuania were granted the right to have lands in any area of the entire commonwealth. This was very important for the Polish nobles, who quickly began to penetrate into the Ukraine and were granted royal charters for the so-called "empty lands." I also discussed the problems with the result of the discovery of America on those countries that had gold. I also mentioned that these newly-founded estates suffered from a lack of laborers, and that as a result they granted exemptions from labor obligations and responsibilities for ten or twenty years for the new colonists. Approximately by the 1580's that period ended. The establishment of obligations caused discontent among the people who had become accustomed to liberty and they resented serfdom, panshchyna, although it had been less burdensome than at home. In 1580, when the years of exemption on the lands of the estates of Prince Wismiewiecki on the Left Bank of the Dnieper ended, almost half of the peasants went to the Donets basin, to the so-called "Wild Field." This is the beginning of the colonization of Slobids'ka Ukraina, the

territory around the city of Kharkiv. In other places, they began moving south, beyond the Dnieper rapids. In the 1590's, a series of peasant revolts broke out against the Polish nobles and the inhabitants of the Sloboda as well as the Cossacks took an active part in them. The first revolt to break out occurred in 1591--the Cossack revolt in the Kiev area, led by Kosins'kyi. But he was soon joined by the peasants and the revolt covered the provinces of the entire Kiev government and Volhynia. For a long time, Poles could not stem the revolts and the rebellion was finally broken only in 1593 in a battle near Zhytomyr. In 1594, Severyn Nalyvaiko marched with a detachment of Cossacks against the Turks in Moldavia on the basis of a treaty with Rudolf II of the Habsburgs, who had problems with the Ottomans and they tried to organize anti-Muslim leagues. In 1595, an embassy was sent to the Zaporozhian Cossacks, headed by Erich Lassota, who left his memoirs (they were first published in 1890). Of course, the very fact that the Roman Emperor now established diplomatic relations with the Zaporozhian Cossacks added prestige to their cause. At the end of military operations in 1595, Nalyvaiko with a Cossack detachment returned to the Ukraine to fight the Poles. Nalyvaiko was supported by the Bratslav burghers in Podolia. With their aid and

with that of the peasants who joined his forces, he took the city of Bratslav. He entered Volhynia, he took the city of Lutsk, then the capital of Volhynia, then continued into Byelorussia, where he captured the cities of Sluts'k and Mogilev. In 1596, the Cossacks went from Zaporozhia, under the leadership of Hetman Gregory Loboda, joined forces with the rebels, and together they defeated the Crown Hetman Zolkiewski, the celebrated Polish commander, at Hostryi Kamin', but they were later defeated at Solonytsia. We see here that in the moment when it was crucial for the Ukrainian peasantry, for the colonists, at the moment when there was danger that they would be converted to serfs, now they found support in the Zaporozhian Cossacks.

This is one of the moments which make the Zaporozhian Cossacks somehow different from the other non-Ukrainian Cossacks. The second moment is that due to circumstances which I will present shortly, a self-consciousness among the Cossacks developed that they were knights, since they were defending the rights of the king, they claimed the rights of knights. The Polish kings Sigismund August, Stephan Batory, and Sigismund III had attempted to establish discipline among the Cossacks who were in their service. In consequence, the Cossacks assumed that

being in the service of the king they were subject to now other authority than that of their own elected officials and that they were free of any responsibility by that of military service, like the Polish aristocracy. They claimed that they did not have to pay any taxes, work for the nobles, or humble themselves before the power of the nobles or their courts. Moreover, they believed that they had the right to collect taxes from the rest of the population, including the townspeople and the servitors of the nobles and of the king, all the supplies needed for war. The government of the king recognized some of these claims of the Cossacks who were registered for the service as a paid army. But as the administration failed to pay them, inasmuch as the Polish-Lithuanian treasury was usually empty, the registered royal Cossack mingled with the unregistered Cossack Host most of the time. After the first registration in 1572, the government made many others, in 1578, in 1583, and in 1590, but they were quite ineffective. As registered and unregistered Cossacks both fought against the Tatars and other foes of Poland-Lithuania and were both called upon by the government officials in time of war, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had no standing army. The Cossack Host recognized no differences in the rights and privileges of the two groups and any Cossack

who performed his duty was a free man subject only to the Cossack Host and its courts and laws. This meant that if any man joined its ranks and performed his military service, he was not to any other authority. Accordingly, once this principal was established the townsmen and the peasants who did not want to the landlords, became Cossacks. They recognized the Cossack officials as their superiors, proclaimed themselves Cossacks, and refused to obey the nobles. The political conditions of the beginning of the seventeenth century put the Cossacks in an exceptionally favorable position: Poland wanted Cossack help, both in Moldavia and later in the wars against Sweden and Muscovy. Hetman Semiilo Kishka (1600-1602) used the situation to secure the legalization of the Cossacks and the renewal of parts of their rights. The attacks on Muscovy (1606-1613), during the Time of Troubles (smuta), the rich booty gained there, the mobilization of the Cossacks by high-born free-booters for expeditions against that country, and, finally, the encouragement of the government developed the military strength of the organization to an unprecedented degree. According to a statement by Polish hetman Zolkiewski, 30,000 Cossacks came to the aid of the king in 1609, when he was besieging Smolensk and, later, even more arrived, while another eye-witness estimated the number

of Cossacks who wandered about in Muscovy that winter at more than 40,000, with their number continuously increasing and leaving the country below the Dnieper rapids almost deserted. Though they rendered useful service to the king, not all of them took part in the invasion, but the 40,000 or more mentioned give the idea of their great number and strength in the Ukraine during this period. By the end of 1612, the troubles in Muscovy were coming to a close and, in 1613, the Muscovites begin to drive out the Poles, Cossacks, and other free-booters. The soldier-adventurers, accustomed to warfare and plunder, now saw a new field of operations in the Turkish possessions in Moldavia, Wallachia, and along the Black Sea. The Cossack sea expeditions had been carried out before this time, but they were now vastly increased. The years 1613-1620 mark the heroic era when the Cossacks in their light boats, known as the chaika, cruised all about the Black Sea, inflicting damages upon the Ottoman Porte when all of Europe was trembling in fear. In 1614, they attacked Trebizond, and Sinope in Anatolia, and Ochakov (Ozu) at the mouth of the Dnieper. In 1615, the center of international trade and the center of the slave trade was attacked and slaves were freed. Constantinople in 1615 and Samsun, Trebizond, and so on in 1616. Sultans themselves in their own palaces

did not feel safe from attack. The Ukrainian Cossacks gained world fame by their courage and military skill. The Turkish historian of the seventeenth century, Naima, describes them as follows:

"One can safely say that in the entire world one cannot find a more daring people more careless of their lives or having more fear of death. Persons versed in navigation assert that because of their skill and boldness in naval battles, these bands are more dangerous than any other enemy."

The French minister at Constantinople, who himself witnessed the Cossack expedition, spared no words in praise for the bravery of the Cossacks and advised his government to have no hesitation in spending \$50,000 on the Cossack forces in order to keep the Ottoman fleet occupied to prevent it from entering the Mediterranean Sea, where the Turks were at this time fighting against Spain, an ally of France.

Here, we can see the second moment that the Zaporozhian Cossacks developed the idea that they were knights because they were fighting for the king and should be exempted from all other obligations. Since the Polish and Lithuanian government had no standing army, during times of danger, it had to acknowledge the claims. So the legion received special privileges, which from time to time some of the Polish magnates interfered and tried to take to take these privileges away from them, which they

gained from the king. This was also the main propaganda story which accompanied the revolution of Bohdan Khmelnyts'ky in 1648. Contrary to the Don Cossacks or to other Cossacks, the Zaporozhian Cossacks, and I would stress this, developed the idea that they were not serfs or servants of somebody, but the idea of knighthood. In the second decade of the seventeenth century, another moment is coming into being, a very important and effective moment. The Ukrainian Cossacks, like the other Cossacks, were of course originally completely indifferent to religion. Certainly they were also indifferent to the Rus' faith's struggle for survival. Now the situation changed. Due to the fact that some leaders with high education took the responsible offices within the structure of the Zaporozhian Host, here I would like to mention Hetman Sahaidachnyi, the situation changed. The people responsible for the religious movement for the Orthodox reaction to the Union and to Catholicism moved their seat to the old capital, Kiev, now under the protection of the Zaporozhian Cossacks. Kiev had been lost in oblivion for several hundred years, since 1240, and was of course almost completely deprived of cultural and religious importance. In 1615, a printing office was established in Kiev. At the same time, a brotherhood (a bratstvo), founded by a bequest of land by

104

Halyshka Hulevych, the wife of a wealthy nobleman. Now Hetman Sahaidachnyi and the entire Cossack Host officially joined the brotherhood, providing armed defense for all of its activities. This meant the nationalization of the Zaporozhian Host. For the bratstvo and for the people engaged in cultural activities, this was very important since in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth only if someone had force could they implement laws. Without having a military force, it was impossible to do so. With such a protector, the townspeople of Kiev were relieved of anxiety of the attitude of the Polish government and promoted the cultural work so zealously that Kiev, an isolated community at the beginning of the seventeenth century, speedily grew and soon became again the center of East European cultural life as it was in the period between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. Now the Kievan circles decided to take advantage of the visit to the Ukraine of the Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem to revive the Orthodox hierarchy. Such a step was imperative for ever since the death of Bishop Balaban in L'viv in 1607 and Kopestens'kyi in Peremyshl' in 1610, there remained no Orthodox bishop in the Ukraine. It was the policy of Hetman Sahaidachnyi to avoid war with Poland, to cooperate with Poles, and to await the time when Poland should need the

assistance of the Cossacks in war. Meanwhile, he attempted to develop the strength of the Cossacks throughout the Ukraine. Sahaidachnyi first became famous as the leader of the sea expedition in 1616, in the course of which he captured the city of Kaffa and freed the Christian slaves there. Born in the vicinity of Sambir, in Galicia, of local gentry, Sahaidachnyi was one of these who had migrated East because of Polish oppression. Educated at the College of Ostrog, he later entered the Cossack army and participated in both the Moldavian and Livonian wars. His Polish companion, Jan Sobieski, described him as always being favored by fortune. Several times he seriously defeated the Tatars in the steppe and his prestige was further enhanced by his sea expedition, when he destroyed many Turkish coastal cities and set fire to the suburbs of Constantinople. Sahaidachnyi gained the respect and favor of the Polish government during the war with Muscovy in 1617. Cossack aid was indispensable to the King, while the Cossacks also found it a favorable opportunity and willingly responded to the call of the king. Under the cover of mobilization, the Cossack Host ruled Ukraine independently throughout the winter and spring of 1618. This again was a very important moment because it again was the preparation for what later happened in 1648.

106

In the summer, Sahaidachnyi entered Muscovy at the head of 20,000 picked Cossacks to bring aid to Wladyslaw, son of Sigismund III, but the united forces were not able to capture the city of Moscow. Sahaidachnyi also helped the Poles in the Turkish war. He saved Crown Prince Wladyslaw at Khotyn in 1621, but died from wounds received there in the following year, 1622. You can see now that the two moments, the nationalization of the Cossacks and the possibility that they were able to renew the Orthodox hierarchy, were not accidental. It would be impossible without the distinct personality of Sahaidachnyi, a leader who not only had authority among the Cossacks, but also among the Poles. Therefore, whatever he entered into had his authority and the Poles had to take this into consideration. Upon learning that the Patriarch was passing through the Ukraine, on way from Moscow, the Kievans invited him to Kiev and showed him the educational institution and cultural work there, after which, they begged him to renew the hierarchy by ordaining a metropolitan and five bishops at various places to fill all the Ukrainian Orthodox dioceses. After this, under the protection of the Cossacks, he departed for safety to Moldavia, ignoring the invitation of the Polish government. Now the new Kiev intelligentsia considered itself obliged to create a

noble genealogy for the Cossacks and to explain that the Cossacks were not adventurers, but that they were progeny of the Old princely Rus'.

The term Rus', from a grammatical point of view, is a Slavic collective noun, derived from Rus, the singular form being Rusin. Kiev became the center of their rule and the Kiev territory came to represent the land of Rus' par excellence. The princes of Rus' in the broadest sense included all branches of the Rus' dynasty, the so-called Rurikids, their retinues, and territories. After the acceptance of Christianity, the Metropolitanate, which united all of Eastern Europe under a single ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was termed the Metropolitanate of All of Rus'. Since the metropolitan was usually a Byzantine Greek, an agent and guardian of the idea of the universal rule of the Byzantine emperor and of his interests, the political concept of a single, complete Rus' state did not emerge in the Kievan period. The sole unity which Rus' possessed at that time was limited to the Metropolitanate of Kiev and All of Rus'. The process of creating a political concept of the state related to the name of Rus' began only in the fourteenth century, when on the periphery of the Rus' territories, there emerged two states, the Galician-Volhynian state and the Great Vladimir and later Moscow principality. The rulers of the latter,

beginning with Ivan Kalita (d. 1341) titled themselves "Princes of All-Rus'." They, of course, adopted the title of metropolitan. It was the metropolitan, Peter of Ratna, after he went to Muscovy, who advised the prince to change his title to include "Vseia Rusia," to have the same title as he himself (the metropolitan) had. Before the reign of Peter I, the term Rus', both in the East and in the West, was customarily applied to the present Ukrainian territory and its inhabitants. For what is today known as the center of Russia proper, the term Muscovy was employed. The term "Malorossia" was of Greek origin. In Latin, the translation was "Rusia minor." The term was applied by the Byzantine patriarch to identify the second Rus' metropolitanate, established in 1303 in Halych at the insistence of the Galician-Volhynian rulers in response to the decision of the then metropolitan of Kiev and All of Rus', the Greek Maxim, to take up residence in Vladimir in 1299. In adopting the title of metropolitan, the rulers of the Galician-Volhynian state called themselves the rulers of all Minor Rus', as, for example, Boleslaw Iurii II, the last. It is important to note that this assumption of the title of metropolitanate testified to the fact that sovereignty in Eastern Europe until the fifteenth century was closely related to the metropolitanate. First, we have the title of the

metropolitan, then the prince adopted the same time. The Byzantine concept, which lay behind the use of the terms "Major Rus" and "Minor Rus'," is a matter of conjecture. It is known that among the Greeks the metropolis or "mother polis" was denoted with the adjective minor, micros, in contradiction to the colonies, which were termed mezas. An analogous situation exists with the term Asia Minor. This interpretation is supported by the fact that the Lithuanian prince Olgerd in 1354 referred to Kiev as Mala Rus'. Under the influence of humanism, the Greek term Rosia, adopted later by Muscovy as a result of its interpretation of the Pereiaslav Treaty of 1654 came to be used among the Kiev clergy in the fifteenth century and especially during the seventeenth century and became prevalent in the Mohyla College in Kiev during the seventeenth century. The ancient Latin name Roxolania was also used at that time, with reference to the Ukrainian territories. It is interesting that the Chancellor Vyhovs'kyi, Khmel'nyts'kyi's successor, insisted during the negotiations with Sweden in 1657 that the basis of the treaty should be the right of all of Old Ukraine or Roxolania, where the Orthodox Reside and Have Resided to the Vistula River. In the middle of the seventeenth century, in the Ukraine, the term Rosia was employed, while, in Muscovy, the term

Rusia was used. The Greek form vs. the Slavic form. The Kievan metropolitan Sylvestor Kosov bore the title Metropolitan of Kiev of Galicia and of All Rosia (or Malyia Rosia). The title of the tsar of Muscovy was Vseia Rusiia. Also in the documents relating to the Pereiaslav Treaty, the tsar calls himself "Vseia Velikia i Maleia Rusia," not Rosia. There developed the concept of three Rusias, the major, the minor, and later the White Rusia. We have this in the Synopsis of the 1670's. Synopsis, written in Kiev, was the first handbook of East Eastern history. Under the influence of the idea of the Mohyla College, the Muscovite tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, after the conclusion of the Pereiaslav Treaty of 1654, changed his official title from "Tsar of Vseia Rusiia" to "Tsar of All Great, Little, and White Rosia," because he became the sovereign over Rosia, which was Kiev. The hetmans of the Ukrainian Cossack state prior to 1709 did at times designate the people of their territory which they called Ukraina as Malorossiis'kii, as Mazepa did in 1707. In 1713, Peter I, by means of a decree, established the practice of referring to the Old Muscovite state as Rosia and of using the term Malorosia instead Ukraina. Prior to this, the term Rosia had been only in the tsar's title and not in reference to the Muscovite state. The

association of the term Malorossia with the incomplete nature of the Zaporozhian Cossack statehood as a result of the repressive measures employed by Peter I and his successors caused the term to become unpopular among the Ukrainians. Malorossia, when employed by the Russians, especially in the nineteenth century, was felt by the Ukrainians to be derogatory. The term Ukraina in Kievan and Galicia-Volhynian chronicles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries is used in a general sense to refer to country or borderlands (1187, 1189, 1213, 1268, 1280, 1282, and so on). In the sixteenth century, the term Ukraina was used as a more specialized geographic term to refer to the middle Dnieper region on the Right Bank of the Dnieper to the south of Kiev, the Kievan government, more or less. Accounts of the period referred to the inhabitants of that territory as Ukrainians. The prominent polemicist Meletius Smotrec'kyi, in enumerating in his verification of the various Rus' tribes--it means there various Ukrainian and White Ruthenian tribes in the Polish state--mentions the Volhynians, Podolians, Ukrainians, and others. Since the middle Dnieper region became at that time the center of Ukrainian Cossackdom, they came to be called Ukrainian Cossacks, in the manner comparable to the Russian practice of calling them "Cherkassians," since

the town of Cherkasy was the most important center of the Ukrainian Cossack movement. The term Ukraina became intimately associated with the Ukrainian Cossacks. They began calling the Ukraine their motherland and fatherland and some of the Hetmans and even colonels of the Zaporozhian Host used the term in their titles. As the Cossack movement broadened, the term Ukraina was extended to all lands embraced by the movement.

Ukraina que estra Cossakorum--Ukraine--the land of the Cossacks or

l'Ukraine u pay Cossaque of the Western authors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is not only the name of the territory, but designates the relation of the land to the people inhabiting it. This meaning of the term Ukraine penetrated the masses. The population of the Ukrainian land did not experience any general emotional uplift--either in the Kiev Rus' or in the Galician-Volhynian Rus'. The wars with the Polovtsians (Cumans, Kipchaks) never had an "all-national" character. In addition to the Polovtsians, like the Poles and Hungarians and other peoples, were an inseparable part of the princely Rus'. War was waged against them one day and the next day and the following day they became allies in a military campaign of one Rus' prince against another. The Khmel'nyts'kyi era, which happened after the nationalization, after the 1620's, elicited an

emotional appeal never before experienced by the Ukrainian masses. This elemental force, misled later by demigods when it was more destructive than creative in the Ruina period, but it arose an individual and collective feeling which was to leave an indelible mark. The Ukrainian masses idealized Khmel'nyts'kyi's struggle against the Polish lords and created for this Ukraine a utopian state of ideal freedom. Hence, it is not surprising that after the term became discredited because it had become a symbol of the colonial policies of the Russian state after 1709, the son of the people from the Right Bank of the Dnieper, born in the territory where Ukrainian Cossackdom first emerged, I mean here Taras Shevchenko, associated his great talent not with the name Malorossiia, but with the name Ukraina, and resolved the question of what these people should be called. This is, of course, a very moment--how the name Malorossiia or the name Rossiia was exchanged for another name.