

МАТЕРІАЛИ КРУГЛОГО СТОЛУ

«Українське державотворення XVII-XVIII ст.: Правобережний Гетьманат Петра Дорошенка» (19-20 жовтня 2016 р.)

Volodymyr Hazin, Volodymyr Dubinskyi

«ROUND TABLE» ON THE HISTORY OF UKRAINIAN STATE FORMATION DURING THE PERIOD OF HETMANATE OF PETRO DOROSHENKO

This year, 340 years turned since the time when Hetman Petro Doroshenko had to withdraw. This event became a significant one in the history of Ukraine. It marked the end of the Revolution of the 17th century, in which course the Ukrainian Cossack state – Zaporozhian Host appeared. However, after a long struggle because of a number of external and internal factors, the state-building process that was initiated by the Great Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and was continued by his successors, failed. In 1676, the last of the successors of Khmelnytsky the outstanding Ukrainian military and statesman, Hetman Petro Doroshenko also resigned. The attempt to revive an independent synodical Ukrainian state failed. Although the revolution ended in de-feat, it became an important stage of formation of Ukrainian state. No doubt, without the rise of national -liberation struggle in Ukraine in 1648–1676, without the rise of national consciousness, that in fact marked the formation of the Ukrainian nation, without the historical experience of the struggle for the realization of Ukrainian state idea, we wouldn't have not only the modern state building phase in Ukraine, but also the Ukrainian nation as such. Actually, this was the point for the meeting of the «round table» on the topic: «The Ukrainian state building process in XVII–XVIII century: Right Bank Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko», that was held on October 19-20 at the Department of History of Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko. The organizers of the scientific forum were the Institute of History of Ukraine (Director – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of NAS of Ukraine Valeriy Smoliiy) and Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko (Rector – doctor of historical sciences, professor Sergey Kopylov). Scientists, who were actually the organizers of the meeting – the Institute of History of Ukraine NAS of Ukraine and Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko, and the Ukrainian Institute of Archaeography and Source Studies named after Mykhailo Hrushevsky of NAS of Ukraine, Vinnytsia Academy of Continuing Education and Kamianets-Podilskiy State historical Museum-Reserve took part in this scientific forum. The meeting, that was moderated by Doctor of History, Professor, Head of the department of the History of Ukraine of Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko Anatoly Filinyuk was held in the presence of students and masters of the Faculty of History and representatives of civic organisations of Kamianets-Podilskiy.

It should be said that the entry list of the «round table» was quite representative, and subjects of reports were very interesting and covered a number of current issues of Ukrainian history of XVII–XVIII centuries. The emphasis was placed on the various aspects of the history of Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko (1665–1676 years.). In particular, the researchers focused their attention on the features of the development of the processes of state formation during his Hetmanate, his role in the history of Ukraine, the influence of internal and external factors on the political process in Cossack Ukraine in the second half of XVII century, features of sources and historiography of Doroshenko's Hetmanate.

The report of Doctor of History, Professor, Head of the Department of World History of Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko Valery Stepankov «The figure of Peter Doroshenko in the historical fate of Ukraine» should be considered as the main report of the «round table», in which a conceptual understanding of the role of Hetman Petro Doroshenko in the history of Ukraine is defined. It deals with the clarification of the historical significance of Petro Doroshenko and his role in political development of Hetmanate.

V. Stepankov identified the following important components of Doroshenko's activity. First of all, the hetman managed in a short time (1665–1667) to rally around him the best representatives of the young political elite that was formed during the first half of 60's of the 17th century and survived the crisis. Secondly, Doroshenko restored the vertical of power and mended the effective operation of central and local government institutions. Also, as the scientist noted, the hetman tried to achieve implementation of Ukrainian state idea that was formed by Bohdan Khmelnytsky, that meant the creation of an independent state. Herein, as a minimum program, he considered the possibility of Cossack Ukraine to get the protection from another state that would become an intermediate stage of realization of the main goal – establishing an independent, synodical Ukrainian state.

The socio-economic policy of Doroshenko is attributed to his undoubted achievements which provided the establishment of principles which had been developed by B. Khmelnytsky in the early stages of the revolution, defense of national – confessional interests of Ukrainian population that lived outside the territory of Hetmanate, a course on the establishment of a permanent mercenary army and the working out the formation of a separate Kiev Patriarchate .

The reports of Doctor of historical sciences, leading researcher of the Institute of History of Ukraine Taras Chukhlib and PhD, senior researcher, The head of the Ukrainian Institute of Archeology and Source named after Hrushevsky NAS of Ukraine Viktor Brekhunenko and Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor Vinnytsia Academy of continuing education Alexei Strukevych were similar in subjects.

Thus, T. Chukhlib having analyzed the patriotic vocabulary of Hetman Petro Doroshenko, found that Doroshenko used such terms as «Ukraine», «Ukrainian land.» According to the historian, «Ukraine» in discourse of Doroshenko was not only as «ancient, our ancestors' historical territory («land», «region») but as a state «that had to be politically under the ferule of the» His Royal Grace or «Turkish Sultanate.»

As T. Chukhlib noted, the separate important issue during the period of Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko was the problem of territorial integrity of the Cossack Army, which led to the use of such terms of localization as «the other side», «this side», «both sides of the Dnieper», phrases like «all Ukraine», «the whole Ukraine», «integrity of Ukraine» and so on. He noted that in the compellation and official correspondence of Petro Doroshenko such language patriotic localization as «Ukrainian commoners», «Ukrainian inhabitants», «Ukrainian children», «Ukrainian people» and «Ukrainian Cossacks were used to describe people and states of Cossack Army». All of these, as T. Chukhlib proved, pointed at the presence of understanding of the unity of the Ukrainian nation and common homeland that had already existed in the XVII century among the Ukrainian political elite, which was seen in cynodical Ukraine in its ethnic boundaries. It is important that the term of the Ukrainian people, that was present in of that time documents referred to the total population of Ukraine.

This theme was continued by B. Brekhunenko in his the report «Ukrainian», «Ukrainian people» in conceptualizations of elite in period of Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko «This well-known Ukrainian historian noted that these concepts were present not only in the epistolary, hetman's universals or of that time chronicles (where we could talk about a subjectivism or later interpretation), but also in judicial documents in which all said was documented clearly and literally in that form as it was in the XVII century.

O. Strukevych analyzing the political and cultural face of Ukrainian elite during the Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko, focused on issues seen by elders, led by Doroshenko such ideological for political elite political – cultural orientations as political subjectivity of Ukraine – Hetmanate, protection, citizenship, attitude to monarchs and their representatives and others. In his opinion, the political culture of Petro Doroshenko and his officers developed as an extension of the political culture of the time of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. The political elite of Doroshenko's Hetmanate was defined clearly to protect the positions of political subjectivity. On the way to its foremen agreed to the inclusion of the Rich Pospolyta as a politically autonomous entity that was the source of the central government of commonwealth; the recognition of citizenship to the elected monarch-protector. Despite the pressure from political elites of states headed by monarchs-protectors, officers and P. Doroshenko had always favored the positions: subordination of all subjects of political life to the Hetman, and even more – representatives from other states who were on the territory of Hetmanate; parity in international relations; using of change of protectors like a mechanism for protection of Ukrainian interests; understanding of citizenship as the only performance of military duties, provided that the protector obeys their duties of protection of Ukraine, ensures implementation of class «rights and liberties»; denial of the right of the political system of the monarch-protector state to govern in Ukraine or to interfere in its internal affairs.

In general, A. Strukevych concludes that the political-cultural ideal of Doroshenko and his encirclement was not limited political subjectivity of Ukraine, implemented in an independent state.

The report of Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Institute of History of Ukraine Victor Gorobets «Ukrainian state in the period of civil wars and foreign interventions in the second half of the 17th century: social demagoguery in the service of geopolitics» was interesting and relevant in respect the current situation in Ukraine, development of the Ukrainian-Russian relations and «hybrid warfare» conducted by Moscow against Ukraine .

Speaking about the period of «Ruin», W. Gorobets said that despite elements of civil conflict, which are considered by many researchers, noted this period, the foreign intervention was more important in the context of the devastating impact on Ukrainian society. Moreover, the latter were not only the result of the weakening of the Ukrainian state as a result of internal strife, but largely if not the root cause of the origin of conflicts, at least strongly influenced their escalation, having transformed the bloodless social contradictions in the opened armed confrontation.

Actually active intervention in the internal affairs of Ukraine in order to incite civil conflict was observed in the second half of the 50's. XVII from Moscow, which aimed to establish a strict control over the Ukrainian foreign policy of the government of Hetmanate and its internal policies (through the implementation in the last structure the element of waywode governance). As part of this intervention, numerous examples of stirring up of social and political divisions in Ukrainian society and politicians campaigning against the Cossack elite, which carried the king's messengers who came to Ukraine, were recorded in the documents.

Analyzing the events of the civil war that broke out on the Ukrainian lands in 1658, W. Gorobets focused attention on the tight interlacing of the civil conflict and the foreign intervention from Moscow. He noted that the phase of armed civil conflict became possible providing external stimulation confrontation.

The question of the role of Ukrainian factor in the political processes in Central-Eastern Europe was discovered in the report of the candidate of historical sciences, associate professor of the history of Ukraine Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko Volodymyr Gazin. In particular, analyzing the policy of Hetman Petro Doroshenko and reaction on it from the governments of Rich Pospolyta and Moskow State, he concluded that only coming to power of Doroshenko and his clear and consistent actions which were directed towards the implementation of the idea of establishing of united independent Ukrainian state, which did meet the interests of neither Warsaw nor Moscow, became one of the factors (along with the factor of mutual exhaustion during the long war, the definition of a balance of power, threat from Crimean Khanate and Turkey, etc.), which led to the Polish-Moscow «understanding» which resulted in the entering into Andrusivskiy contract in 1667.

The interest of the audience and applause were caused by the following reports. So, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor Yuri Mytsyk and Ph.D., senior researcher of the Institute of Ukrainian Archeology and Source named after Hrushevsky NAS Ukraine of Inna Tarasenko focused their attention on the peculiarities of sources in the time of Hetmanate of Petro Doroshenko. Assistant of the Department of world history of Kamianets-Podilskiy University named after Ivan Ogienko Volo-

dymyr Verstyuk focused on the question of characterization of the figure of Petro Doroshenko in the works of prominent Ukrainian historian of the nineteenth century Mykola Kostomarov. Historiographical theme was continued by candidate of historical sciences, senior researcher of the Institute of History of Ukraine Valentyna Matyah who analyzed the features of elucidation in historiography and estimation of the doctrine of Hetman Petro Doroshenko.

Social problems in the history of Ukraine of the second half of XVII–XVIII centuries were covered in reports of Ph.D., senior researcher at the Institute of History of Ukraine Andriy Hurbyk and Ph.D., senior researcher at the Institute of History of Ukraine Alexander Gurzhiy. The first focused on the issues of the features of urban and rural governments in the context of development of Ukrainian Hetmanate's management system, and the second – on migration processes in Right-Bank Ukraine.

In particular, A. Gurzhiy in his report, focusing on the specifics of migration in Right-Bank Ukraine, which was the part of the Rich Pospolyta almost to the end of the XVIII century, said that for quite complex and controversial circumstances (relocation of right-bank Ukrainian Cossacks and the Ukrainian nobility to the Left Bank, in contrast, active migration of Polish peasants and townspeople to the lands of the right bank) in the XVIII century continued to form the ethnic structure of the Right Bank, the majority of which were Ukrainian. The given facts of development of villages and towns, most population of which was formed by Ukrainian, according to historian refute allegations of the thoughts of some scientists about enlightening role of Polish magnates and gentry in the process of settlement of vacant land on the territory of Right-Bank Ukraine in the XVIII century.

Viacheslav Stanislavsky (Ph.D., senior researcher at the Institute of History of Ukraine), in his report, «Trade relations of Ukraine with Turkey at the beginning of the eighteenth century: new archival findings, their analysis and interpretation» commented on a number of subjects, which actually refer to the history of Ukrainian-Turkish trade and political, economic and cultural relations around it. In particular, these are types and origin of goods in the Ukrainian-Turkish trade; the place of Left-Bank Ukraine in the transit trade with people from the Baltic states to Turkey during the Great Northern War; Russia's diplomatic efforts on the opening of nautical and closing overland trade route through Ukraine to Turkey; taxation of merchants from the Cossack Army in the Ottoman Empire; identification of Ukrainian merchants from Hetmanate in the «external» and «internal» records of the Russian Embassy in the Ottoman Empire; merchants engaged in trade between the Cossack Army and the Ottoman Empire: the names, ethnic and national identity; trip of Ukrainian merchant from Nizhin to Egypt; participation of merchants involved in communication of information and conveying of diplomatic correspondence between Russia, Ukraine and Turkey.

At the end of the «round table» the reports of senior lecturer from the department of world history of Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogiienko Alexander Yuga on «periodization» of Ukrainian politics «political elite of Rich Pospolyta in the middle of XVII century: formulation of the problem» and

researcher from Kamianets-Podilskiy state historical museum Sergei Kalutsky: «The role of Ukrainian Cossacks in the state building process XVII: the view of V. Lipinsky.»

The meeting of the «round table» was ended by discussion. According to its results, it was decided to continue the practice of such forums in order to discuss various actual issues of history of Ukraine XVII–XVIII centuries. The materials of the «round table» are decided to publish as a separate section in the proposed 26 volume collection «Research papers of Kamianets-Podilskiy National University named after Ivan Ogienko. Historical Science».

Отримано: 22.11.2016 р.

Валерій Степанков

ПОСТАТЬ ПЕТРА ДОРОШЕНКА В ІСТОРИЧНІЙ ДОЛІ УКРАЇНИ

Одним із найвидатніших державних діячів Гетьманщини середини XVII–XVIII ст. безперечно був Петро Дорошенко, значимість діяльності котрого, на превеликий жаль, явно недооцінюється як у науковій літературі, так і в інтелектуальному просторі українського суспільства в цілому. У свідомості переважної більшості вчительства, викладацького корпусу вишів й студентства його постать знаходиться в одному оціночно-смысловому ряді поряд з С. Опарою, М. Ханенком, П. Суховієм, Д. Ігнатовичем (Многогрішним) тощо. У такій аберрації світоглядного образу лежать причини переважно методологічного характеру, породжені сучасним рівнем стану осягнення сутності подій кінця 40-х – першої половини 70-х рр. XVII ст. Не вдаючись до аналізу термінологічного інструментарію використовуваного науковцями (його огляд зроблений мною у травні 2015 р. на круглому столі «Ранньомодерна Україна: проблеми термінології та уніфікації понятійного апарату»¹), значимість якого у даному випадку не є визначальною, виокремлю з поміж них дві найважливіших, що проходять наскрізною ниткою як через наукову, так і навчально-методичну літературу.

Перша з них, витoki якої сягають останньої третини XIX ст., полягає у тяглоті ідеї виокремлення подій середини XVII ст. у різні часи під назвами «Хмельниччина», «Визвольна війна українського народу й возз'єднання України з Росією 1648–1654 рр.» та «Національно-визвольна війна українського народу (1648–1657 (1658) рр.)» у самостійний, змістовно й хронологічно завершений період ранньомодерної історії. Однак ніхто з істориків так і не спромігся до сьогоднішнього дня чітко довести, як і обґрунтувати його типологічну відмінність, від смыслового наповнення наступних подій. І дуже сумніваюсь, що комусь вдасться подібного досягти, бо всі вони (і середини, і кінця 50-х – першої половини