

"COSSACK" AND "UKRAINIAN" PROBLEMS: THE ISSUE OF CORRECTNESS OF SCIENTIFIC TERMS USED FOR DESCRIPTION OF EVENTS OF THE MIDDLE OF THE XVIIth CENTURY

One of problems that despite significant scientific achievements in the study of Ukrainian national revolution of the middle of the XVIIth century continues to maintain its actuality and is marked by its controversial nature is the question of scientific correctness of use of the concepts of "Cossack" and "Ukrainian problem." Reliability of disclosure of events and processes of socio-economical and socio-political life as of both Cossack Ukraine and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the middle of the XVIIth century depends on their scientifically proved usage.

First of all it is necessary to figure out the semantic content of each of the concepts in the close contact with the concrete historical events of the specified period. So, in the case of events of 1648-1657, the use of the first term is justified only to the nature of the actual events of the Cossack rebellion, which was during February – May 1648. In this case, the "Cossack" refers to the problem, which was created by the Cossacks for starting in February 1648 the rebellion in Zaporizhya. However, to claim that "Cossack issue" arose in the early 1648 is wrong, because the term can be applied to the events of the previous period (before 1648) during which there were performances of Cossacks against the Polish strict policy on the Ukrainian lands. So, before Polish elite "Cossack issue" first arose in 1591-1596 when the first Cossack rebellion broke out. That's when Zaporizhya Army reasonates to King the idea of independence of border authority chiefs and provincial governors and takes the path of formation of "alternative authorities" ¹. Cossack's "Conditions" of S.Nalyvaiko to King Sigismund III in 1596, which contained the requirement to give Registered Cossacks a separate area – "the desert area between the Bug and Dniester", defined "a number of Cossack troops" and expanded the rights of Cossack hetman² testified the formation of the idea of independent status of Cossack Army in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The draft of the Kyiv Bishop J. Vereschynsky testifies about this.³

Gradually Zaporizhya Army went beyond their narrow interests and approached the role of the representant of national interests of Ukrainian society⁴, that expanded the content of "Cossack problems". Starting from 1603 Registered Cossacks expanded the list of requirements directed to the King. They wished "that we were in respect of each class," and that the king, "admitted us the children of the crown"⁵, which raised the question of the equality with the Polish gentry. In addition, after the signing in 1596 of the Union of Berestechko and abolition of the Orthodox Church Zaporizhya Army appears as the defender of the Orthodox faith⁶. The idea was articulated in 1603⁷. It received its further development in the Cossack Protest of 20 March 1610, in which Cossacks promised to provide any support for the Orthodox Church in the fight against

restricting their rights⁸. Thus Orthodox faith has become the common foundation that linked Zaporozhian Army with all "Rus people". According to the statement of P. Sas, "Cossacks as a political force, united in Zaporizhya Army, left their Class "snail cottage" that was too small for them, and turned to indigenous needs and interests of their people". Gradually Cossacks have approved a reputation of the defenders of ethnic interests⁹. In 1625 King Sigismund III himself noted that "Cossacks see themselves as a separate Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. All Ukraine (Kyiv and Bratslav province at that time) is in their hands <...> the Cossacks have all control, all power, all jurisdiction, they establish laws ..." ¹⁰.

Thus, the main structural components of the "Cossack problem" during the last third of the XVIth century by the summer of 1648 were: Cossacks desire to receive and retain special rights and privileges, increasing the number of registry, independence from the authority border chiefs and provincial governors, the recognition of the autonomy of the territory where they lived (southern and central part of Kyiv province), equal rights with the Polish gentry, protection of the interests of the Orthodox Church.

Since the summer of 1648 joining of peasants and town dwellers to the Ukrainian Cossacks uprising testified the release of events beyond the purely "Cossack problem" and its development into a "Ukrainian problem". Mostly "Ukrainian problem" became the result of the evolution of the idea of protecting by troops of Zaporizhya Registered Cossacks class interests in defending the rights and freedoms of "Rus" people. It is worth noting that an important qualitative change in the evolution of "Cossack issue" became the fact that the Cossacks went beyond defending only class interests and realized the importance of taking into account the interests of other groups of the population (even Polish Gentry, who, despite a long history of its existence as a class, defended only their purely class interests failed to do this). In our opinion, this was due to the openness of the Cossack class – free affiliation of people from different social strata contributed to a wide range of views on the events that took place and consequently the consideration of various interests. In this context, the important point were the negotiations of representatives of Bohdan Khmelnytsky with Crown Hetman M. Potocki, in March 1648 during which the following requirements of uprising Cossacks were formulated: reestablishment of ancient rights and freedoms, the removal of officers and colonels of Polish origin from regiments, the freedom to elect from "their (Ukrainian) people", permission to sea campaign and the withdrawal of Polish troops from Zadniprovya and the Cossack region, and the abolition of the Commonwealth authorities¹¹. As you can see, it was not only the class interests of the Cossacks.

Already in May in submitted by B. Khmelnitsky to M. Potocki requirements of Cossack Army to the Government they spoke about creation of Cossack state up to Bila Tzerkva and Uman.

Since the summer of 1648 and the following years, along with the already mentioned, the brand new components of "Ukrainian problem" appeared: the formation of administrations of Cossack Army on the lands liberated from the power of the Polish government, the idea of building of the Ukrainian state with western border along the river Visla (since 1649), defending the equality of Catholic and the Orthodox faith, the abolition of the Union. Thus, in our view, "Cossack problem" continued to exist as one of the internal components of the problem nationwide. However, it was not its skeleton. For example, during the Polish-Ukrainian negotiations in early 1649 in Pereyaslav and in the conditions of the reached truce there is no word about the requirement to equal Cossacks as a class with the Polish gentry (there was not such a requirement in the text of Zborivsky Agreement). Instead, when A. Kysil at the final stage of the negotiations reminded Bohdan Khmelnytsky, "to keep the truce", the Hetman replied: "I do not know what will be with the second commission, when the Cossacks will not want to be satisfied with the twenty or thirty thousand of register troops and a separate state. We'll see!"¹². Thus the importance of the issue of official recognition of Cossacks as a class was not important, they spoke about their own separate state in which all rights would belong to Cossacks. During a meeting in late April 1649 with the Russian ambassador Unkovsky B. Khmelnitsky clearly emphasized that unlike the Crown of Poland and Lithuania, that swore the new King Jan Cazimir and that swore to the King, "we (Cossack Ukraine) were liberated by Lord God from them – the king was not elected by us and was not crowned by us and we didn't kiss his cross. And they did not tell us about that and did not sent for us and we will be liberated from them by God's will". Thus, if during the end of the XVIth – first half of the XVIIth century the Union of Lublin in 1569 was seen by the Cossack Army as an agreement of three equal nations – Polish, Lithuanian and Russian, and this was driven by the desire to equal the Cossacks rights with the Polish nobility, after the election of King Jan Cazimir the desire to build their own state was traced. Therefore, there is no reasons to speak about "Cossack issue" because if it is really in its essence remained only as a narrow social class problem in the coming years, then there would be no sense to continue the fight against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after the Zboriv contract of 1649.

At the same time the fact that the "Cossack issue" remained within 1648-1657 the integral part of the nationwide problem is proved by the requirements to increase the register, obey Cossack's rights and liberties, to care about widows and orphans and so on.

Despite this, unfortunately in modern Polish historiography the events of Ukrainian national liberation struggle of the middle of the XVIIth century continue to be interpreted as "Cossack problem." Primarily this is due to the fact that their nature is considered through the prism of contemporary views of Commonwealth politicians. We believe that this approach is unacceptable, and in the analysis of the events of the middle of the XVIIth century and expressing their own judgments it is appropriate to use a concept "Ukrainian problem" (it is different, when the subject of the research is

the Ukrainian events in the view of representatives of the political elite of Polish-Lithuanian state, that operated the notion of "Cossack issue").

So, the importance of the use of the concepts "Cossack" and "Ukrainian problem" is primarily due to substance of specific historical events of the middle of the XVIIth century and qualitative changes in the evolution of the actual "Cossack problems." There exist at least two fundamentally important qualitative features that allow us to identify the bound of transition of "Cossack issues" into the "Ukrainian problem": leaning of peasants and middle class in the national liberation struggle, in summer 1648 and development of the Zaporizhyya Troops government on the liberated territories. Since 1649 it has received its continuation in the idea of the construction of the national state.

Примітки:

¹ Брехуненко В. Дванадцять листів гетьманів Війська Запорозького XVI – першої половини XVII століття з польських рукописних зібрань / В. Брехуненко, М. Нагельський // Український археографічний щорічник. – К.; Нью-Йорк, 2004. – Випуск 8/9. – Т. 11/12. – С. 440; Леп'явко С. Козацькі війни кінця XVI ст. в Україні / С. Леп'явко. – Чернігів, 1996. – С. 71-72, 79; Смолій В. А. Становлення козацького політичного автономізму / В. А. Смолій, В. С. Степанков // Історія українського козацтва. Нариси у двох томах. – К.: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. – Т. 1. – С. 228-229.

² Zbiór pamiętnik6w do dziej6w polskich / Wyd. W.S. Broel-Plater. – Warszawa, 1858. – Т. 2. – S. 214-218; Кондиції, подані від Наливайка Його Милості Королеві / Пер. Р. Радишевський // Тисяча років української суспільно-політичної думки. У 9 т. – К.: Дніпро, 2001. – Т. II. – Кн. 1 (XVI ст.). – С. 435.

³ Верещинський Й. Війську Запорозькому пресвітлий виказ, як і з боку виховання, так теж вічного забезпечення на Задніпров'ї. 1596 / Пер. Р. Радишевський // Тисяча років української суспільно-політичної думки. У 9 т. – К.: Дніпро, 2001. – Т. II. – Кн. 1 (XVI ст.). – С. 426.

⁴ Смолій В., Степанков В. Українська національна революція XVII ст. (1648– 1676 рр.) / В. А. Смолій, В. С. Степанков. – К.: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2009. – С. 73.

⁵ Смолій В.А. Становлення козацького політичного автономізму / В. А. Смолій, В.С. Степанков // Історія українського козацтва. Нариси у двох томах. – К.: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. – Т. 1. – С. 230.

⁶ Drozdowski M. Religia i kozaczyzna zaporoska w Rzeczypospolitej w pierwszej polowie XVII wieku / M. Drozdowski. – Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG, 2008. – S. 66.

⁷ Сас П. «Своя земля» у сприйнятті запорозьких козаків (початок XVII ст.) / П. Сас // П'ятий Конгрес Міжнародної Асоціації Україністів. Історія. – Чернівці, 2003. – Ч. 1. – С. 191-194.

⁸ Акты ЮЗР. – Т. 2. – С. 59.

⁹ Щербак В. О. Чинники становлення козацької самосвідомості / В. О. Щербак // Українська козацька держава: витоки та шляхи історичного розвитку: Матеріали П'ятих Всеукраїнських історичних читань. – Київ – Черкаси, 1995. – Вип. 5. – С. 96.

¹⁰ ВУсР. – Т. 1. – С. 64.

¹¹ Смолій В., Степанков В. Богдан Хмельницький... – К., 2003. – С. 102; Смолій В., Степанков В. Українська національна революція XVII ст. (1648– 1676 рр.)... – С. 83.

¹² Там само.